

## Visitors' report

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Name of education provider</b> | University of Manchester                           |
| <b>Programme name</b>             | Post Graduate Certificate in Applied Mental Health |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>           | Work based learning                                |
| <b>Type of programme</b>          | Approved mental health professional                |
| <b>Date of visit</b>              | 14 – 15 May 2014                                   |

## Contents

|                           |    |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary .....   | 2  |
| Introduction.....         | 3  |
| Visit details .....       | 3  |
| Sources of evidence ..... | 4  |
| Recommended outcome ..... | 5  |
| Conditions.....           | 6  |
| Recommendations.....      | 10 |

## 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 a protected title 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.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health professionals (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 26 August 2014. At the Committee meeting, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. 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

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

## Visit details

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role    | David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional)<br>Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance)    | Abdur Razzaq   |
| Proposed student numbers                  | 40 per year  |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2014   |
| Chair                                     | Phil Padfield (University of Manchester)   |
| Secretary                                 | Lorna Dawson (University of Manchester)  |

## 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  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators / mentors  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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 44 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval.

Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **B.2 The programme must be effectively managed**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the placement management structure of the programme, including the lines of responsibility and links to the practice placement providers.

**Reason:** At the visit, the HCPC Panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement providers and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions, the visitors were unable to determine the placement management processes in place for the programme or how the education provider maintains overall responsibility for the practice placements. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine if there are effective structures in place to manage the programme particularly considering the dual management between the education provider and the practice placement providers. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates:

- the placement management structure of the programme;
- the roles and lines of responsibility;
- where the links to the practice placement providers are; and
- any associated processes.

This will enable the visitors to determine this programme will be effectively managed.

### **B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place**

**Condition:** The education provider must identify where attendance is mandatory, the associated monitoring mechanisms and provide evidence to demonstrate these are clearly communicated to students and practice providers.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the education provider has identified attendance and monitoring processes in place for the academic setting. The visitors noted that there were no defined attendance and monitoring processes in place for the practice placement setting. Discussion highlighted that whilst the programme team would contact the practice placement if there were issues with attendance, there are very little or no requirements for practice placement providers to inform the programme team. The visitors were concerned that low attendance at placement would have a negative impact on students' learning. They considered if the programme team are unaware of placement attendance they will be unable to monitor it and step in to take action ensuring absence does not affect students' learning and development. The visitors therefore require the education provider to identify where attendance is mandatory, the associated monitoring mechanisms and provide evidence to demonstrate these are clearly communicated to students and practice providers.

## **D.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 submit evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes for students' placement are identified and agreed with the education provider.

**Reason:** Documentation provided before the visit included placement documentation. The visitors noted the practice portfolio refers to the learning outcomes that need to be addressed by students whilst on placement. The documents stated a practice learning agreement is used to set out the requirements for students to meet at placement and is written and agreed by the student and practice educator. There are meetings throughout placement to initially agree learning outcomes, review the achievement of the competencies and then finally assess completion of the competencies. These meetings are all attended by the practice educator and the student. The student's line manager and an Agency Co-ordinator are in attendance when necessary. The visitors noted there is no education provider representation at the meetings and could not determine how the education provider is involved with the student's practice learning. The visitors therefore could not determine how the education provider maintains overall responsibility for placement and ensures the learning agreement is appropriate for the students' needs. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how the learning needs for students placement are identified and agreed with the education provider.

## **D.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 submit evidence to demonstrate how they ensure the duration and range of placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit included practice placement management and organisation. Meetings are held between the student and practice educator at placement to initially agree learning outcomes and review achievement of the competencies. The visitors heard from students that the duration and nature of placement differed from placement to placement. Some students were based at their workplace and their day to day duties were considered as part of the placement. The visitors also learnt that for some students the 50 placement days could be spread out over a longer timeframe than other students and that learning outcomes would be met in substantially different ways. The visitors noted the education provider is not involved in the organisational management of the students' placements. The visitors considered information about the differing placement experiences had not been fully reasoned and communicated to students which led to feelings of disparity and inconsistency. They could not determine how the education provider endeavours to maintain parity or ensures the placement is appropriate for the students' needs with very little or no involvement in reviewing and checking the agreed learning outcomes and learning opportunities offered by the placement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how the learning needs for students are identified and agreed with the education provider and how this is communicated to students.

### **E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme exit awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP.

**Reason:** This criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate students' progression and achievement within the programme documents and therefore the awards that can and cannot lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP within a local authority. From the documentation submitted before the visit and discussions at the visit regarding the programme, it was apparent the education provider will change and confirm the exit awards as these interim programme awards were not clear as to which would lead to eligibility to apply and work as an AMHP. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors require the education provider to confirm the exit programme awards, ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates all programme awards consistently and clearly, and articulates whether the awards will lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP.

### **E.8 Assessment regulations must clearly specify that any requirements for an aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly state in the programme documentation that any aegrotat awards given will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.

**Reason:** This criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate students' progression and achievement within the programme documents and therefore the awards that can and cannot lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP. From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that that any aegrotat awards given will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors require the education provider to clearly state in the programme documentation that any aegrotat awards given will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.

### **E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be



from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit and were satisfied they were appropriately experienced and qualified for the role as external examiner. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard and update programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

**A.4 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the programme team formulate a strategy to ensure the consistent implementation of equality and diversity.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors noted evidence of an overarching equality and diversity policy in relation to applicants and students and how this is implemented and monitored. The visitors suggest the programme team consider formulating an equality and diversity strategy at a programme level to ensure the work around equality and diversity is conducted in a consistent, transparent and measured way.

David Abrahart  
Graham Noyce