Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MNSW Mental Health Nursing and Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	26 – 27 April 2016

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 7 July 2016. At the Committee meeting on 7 July 2016, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the conditions outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes:

- MNSW Adult Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- MNSW Children's Nursing and Social Work, full time;
- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time;
- BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time; and
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award), full time.

The education provider, the NMC and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the NMC, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Roseann Connolly (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sonya Lam
Proposed student numbers	8 per cohort, 1 cohort per year, across this programme and the BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing and Social Work (MNSW exit award)
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Kathryn Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Dawne Bell (Internal panel member)

	Karen Boardman (Internal panel member) Tony Gilbert (External panel member) Emmanuel Idowu (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Arija Parker (External panel member) Jennifer Pennington (External panel member) David Nilsson (External panel member) Kay Mafuba (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Nick Medforth (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Gordon Mitchell (Nursing and Midwifery Council) Wendy Wesson (Nursing and Midwifery Council)

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the already running BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

2.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that appropriate information will be communicated to applicants prior to applying, including information regarding programme fees.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the University Validation Document (UVD) which outlines the information that will be made available to applicants. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding programme fees. The visitors note that information regarding programme fees is crucial to ensuring that applicants have the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. In addition to this the visitors noted that the UVD was not a document that would be made available to applicants and were therefore unable to see where applicants will be able to access relevant information prior to applying to this programme. The programme team stated that relevant information would be made available on the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that applicants will be given all the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how this information will be effectively communicated to potential applicants.

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that practice placement providers are committed to delivering placements for this programme. Therefore the visitors cannot be certain this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed to ensure commitment from all practice placement providers.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers to ensure that the programme is effectively managed

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this, one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the

placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the processes to gain student consent prior to participating in role play activities are appropriately and consistently applied.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme has a consent form in place to take student's consent prior to role play activities. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the consent form was appropriate. However, in a meeting with students it was stated that they were unaware of a consent form and had not signed one prior to participating in role play activities. Students stated that they gave informal, verbal consent. Although the students were not from this programme specifically the visitors note that without evidence that the consent form is being used on other programmes they cannot be certain that the processes attached to gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied to this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure that the processes around gaining student consent will be appropriately and consistently applied for this programme.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide all up to date and signed memorandums of co-operation with placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the memorandums of co-operation with practice placement providers had not been signed. In addition to this one of the memorandums of co-operation made reference to the placement setting meeting the requirement of the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors note that without confirmation of all memorandums of co-operation being signed and up to date they cannot be sure that the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that all memorandums of co-operation are signed and remove any references to the GSCC to ensure they are up to date.

Roseann Connolly
Gary Hickman
Sheila Skelton