hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Durham
Programme name	Master of Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	30 – 31 October 2014

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. The education provider has until 25 December 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 23 February 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 March 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Alan Murphy (Social worker in England) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker in England) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	32 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Douglas Halliday (University of Durham)
Secretary	Ellen Chapman (University of Durham)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Sue Furness (The College of Social Work)

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	☒	☐	☐

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)	☒	☐	☐

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 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 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 have also made a number of 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

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process in place for dealing with criminal convictions checks and how this process ensures consistency, transparency and equity at the admission stage when dealing with any declaration.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided prior to the visit, that the education provider has a process in place to carry out criminal conviction checks. However, it was not clear from the documentation how this process is carried out or what this process involves. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the disclosure of conviction is required on the initial UCAS application form. From the time of application, applicants can declare any previous conviction(s) at any stage of the admission process. However, the visitors noted that it is not clear how the decision to allow the applicant to declare a conviction is determined. They also noted that it was not clear who had the final authority to make a decision on suitability of an applicant, as the Policy for considering applications with Criminal Convictions states that the admissions tutor will decide prior to the interview with the programme director. However if declared at interview the decision is by the programme director, admissions tutor and member of PMC (programme management committee) who must be a partner agency rep. In addition at this stage the candidate may be invited to give their own statement about the conviction whereas previously they are not. The visitors noted inconsistent information from the documentation relating to how this process is carried out. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence of the process in place dealing with criminal convictions checks and how this, when carried out ensures consistency, transparency and equity.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process in place for checking that applicants can meet the health requirements of the programme and how this process ensures consistency and transparency at the admission stage when dealing with any health declaration.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided prior to the visit, that the education provider has a process in place to carry out health checks to ensure that reasonable adjustments can be made for students who may require them. However, it was not clear from the documentation how this process is carried out or what this process involves. The visitors noted that health requirements are discussed at the interview stage with applicants. However, they were unable to determine how applicants would be alerted to the fact that they would need to declare or discuss their health requirement at the interview stage. It was also not clear how the handling of any declaration relating to an applicant's health would be monitored and who would have overall responsibility for this monitoring to ensure consistency in decision making. The visitors also noted that the application form for the programme has a section for disability, but not a section for health declaration. From this, the visitors were unclear how decisions regarding an applicants' health may be made when it is not considered a disability. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide further

evidence of the process in place for checking any health requirements and how when carried out, the process ensures consistency and transparency.

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the selection and entry criteria applied in relation to applicants' previous experience, how these criteria will be communicated to potential applicants.

Reason: The visitors noted the academic entry requirement for this programme in the admission information submitted. Document 13 (page six) states 'applicants holding a Lower Second class Honours degree (2:2) may be considered where there is evidence of extensive relevant employed work experience in a social care setting'. Discussions with the students revealed confusion regarding what would be considered appropriate work experience and the length of experience required to get on to the programme. From the documentation and discussions with the programme team it was not clear what type of experience would be considered, the length of experience, and how applicants would be informed of these criteria. It was also unclear how these criteria would be applied to ensure that there was consistency in making admissions decisions when applicants do not meet the academic criteria for entry onto the programme. The visitors therefore require further information on the selection and entry criteria applied in relation to applicant previous experience and how this criterion will be communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating in these sessions.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that in the SETs mapping document under SET 3.14 the education provider states 'students are not required to participate as service users in practical teaching'. The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that role play is used in teaching and students are required to participate as service users in practical simulation and role play activities. The programme team revealed that students are asked to draw up a guide line on how to work effectively in a group; the guideline typically covers agreements around confidentiality of information shared in group and classroom settings. From this information, the visitors could not find evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved when students participated as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. Also the visitors could not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent and how this is monitored should a student decline to participate.

3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the plans for continued service user and carer involvement within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that service users and carers are involved in the programme. Discussion at the visit indicated there were dedicated service users who had long standing relationships with the programme and who contributed to the programme in a number of ways. Discussion with the students indicated the contribution of these individuals was valuable to their learning. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be made to involve service users in the programme. It was indicated by the service users group that they plan to develop a service user and carer forum, but the programme team provided limited detail about how this forum would run, or how it would involve service users and carers in the programme or how often the forum would take place. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place on how service users will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for further service user and carer involvement.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However, in considering the programme documentation and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and students' questionnaires feed into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: Further evidence must be provided to demonstrate how the approval and monitoring processes in place ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and that any issues which arise as a result of these policies are fed back effectively to the education provider.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors noted, from the documentation provided, that the education provider at the time of approving placements, invite placement providers to have explicit discussions around equality and diversity policies at the placements. However the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how the equality and diversity policies, ensures that any relevant equality and diversity data was being monitored. They were also unsure how any issues, if they arose, would be flagged and who would be responsible for resolving these issues. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the approval and monitoring processes in place ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place and that any issues which arise as a result of these policies are fed back effectively to the education provider. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how this standard can be met by the programme.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted the roles and responsibilities of staff involved with supporting students whilst on placement, as set out in the Practice Education Module(s) Handbook and Practice learning Handbook. The SETs mapping document outlines that the education provider is committed to providing ongoing training and support for practice placement educators. In considering the programme documentation and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of policies and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. In line with the condition for this standard, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensures all placement settings have placement educators who have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In particular, how the audit process ensures all placement settings have practice placement educators who have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the policies and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware of the Placement Approval Process used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around how the process is used to ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate practice placement educator training. The programme team and placement providers discussed various practice educators training options that are offered and what level of qualification is required from the practice placement educators for each placement. The visitors

acknowledged that there were several training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual practice placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feed into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitably trained practice placement educators were in place for students. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The programme team must further demonstrate how they will ensure and monitor that the practice educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware of the Placement Approval Process used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation provided limited information around how the process is used to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors however, noticed in the SETs mapping document that the education provider evidenced document 23 (List of Practice Educators, Placements and PEPs Compliance) as evidence to meet this standard. Upon receiving this document, the visitors noted that this document does not record whether practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or if other arrangements have been agreed. Discussion with the programme team revealed that the team are currently in the process of obtaining practice placement educator registration details. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the requirements for registration or other arrangements for placement educators at each placement, and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are implemented and monitored.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the effective collaboration with local authorities providing practice placements.

Reason: The visitors noted the relationship the education provider has with Durham County Council, Gateshead Council and placements in Sunderland. In meeting with the senior team and practice placement providers and educators the visitors were informed that regular meetings took place between Durham County Council and the education provider in which both parties discuss the programme and matters regarding the provision of placements. The visitors were provided with programme management committee minutes between the two organisations. However, from the minutes the visitors were unable to gather an understanding of the strategic involvement between the two organisations, or a written document that details how regular meetings will take place. The visitors noted that some of the key members in maintaining a regular and effective collaboration are new in post. In discussion with the practice placement providers and educators it was made clear that there was not a regular, formal communication mechanism in place to manage communication between the education

provider and organisations providing placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of regular collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

6.11 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 provide further evidence which makes clear 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. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Recommendations

2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team consider changing the wording in document 14e (Guidance for Interviews with International Students) to clearly articulate that the interview questions for international students are in essence the same questions as for home students.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme has appropriate admission procedures that applies selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards and therefore consider this standard to be met. However, reviewing the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were under the understanding that interview questions vary between international students and home students. Discussions with the programme team reveal that the questions at the interview stage are the same. However, the programme team recognises that cultural differences for international students may exist and in order not to disadvantage any international applicant, confirmed that certain words would be altered or clarified. Based on this rationale, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider changing the wording used in document 14e (Guidance for Interviews with International Students), so there is no confusion that the interview questions in essence are the same but take into account cultural differences.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team consider the best way to communicate the availability of resources to students.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme has appropriate resources to support student learning in all settings and so considered this standard to be met. However, from discussion with the students it was clear that students were not aware of all of the resources available for this programme, such as the policy to order additional books if students felt that they required it for this programme. The programme team indicated that they are aware of this problem but revealed that they have a budget for book that goes unspent each year, and that they have tried to inform students of this. The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider how best to communicate the availability of resources to students.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team consider reviewing the facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of student particularly around social space.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied the programme provides support for the students in all settings and are therefore satisfied this standard is met. However, discussion with the student revealed that at times they struggled with finding social space within the School. The programme team agreed that space is often a problem and that they are aware of this continuing issue with students. This issue was raised with the senior team,

who revealed that there is currently a consultation out for a new building. The visitors in the meantime would like to encourage the programme team to consider reviewing the social space facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider changing the title of the exit award from ''Research in Social Work'' so that it no longer contains the profession.

Reason: The visitors identified from the documentation before the visit that none of the exit awards from the programme include specific reference to the protected title of 'social worker' or the 'social worker' part of the HCPC register in their named award. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors noted from the documentation that the exit award is named ''Research in Social Work'', although it is clearly labelled that this award does not lead to eligibility to register with the HCPC. The visitors consider the words 'social work' within the exit award title could cause confusion for the lay person as it is a close link to 'social worker' the protected title. Therefore, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider changing the title of the exit award from ''Research in Social Work'' so that it no longer contains the profession. In this way, the visitors can be sure that no confusion will arise from the exit award.

<div align="right">

Alan Murphy
Deborah Kouzarides
Manoj Mistry

</div>

Observation: University of Durham, Master of Social Work, Full time

Dear Amal

Jamie Hunt responded to my initial email on the Report of the Approval Visit which detailed a number of points of accuracy. He indicated that three points made did not qualify as point of accuracy and invited me to submit these as observations instead. I do so below.

C2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process in place for dealing with criminal convictions checks and how this process ensures consistency, transparency and equity at the admission stage when dealing with any declaration.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided prior to the visit, that the education provider has a process in place to carry out criminal conviction checks. However, it was not clear from the documentation how this process is carried out or what this process involves. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the disclosure of conviction is required on the initial UCAS application form. From the time of application, applicants can declare previous convictions? at any stage of the admission process. However, the visitors noted that it is not clear how the decision to allow the applicant to declare a conviction is determined.

Observation: The highlighted wording appears illogical to us since declaration of convictions is required.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Recommendation: The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider changing the title of the exit award from ''Research in Social Work'' so that it no longer contains the profession. (1)

Reason: The visitors identified from the documentation before the visit that none of the exit awards from the programme include specific reference to the protected title of 'social worker' or the 'social worker' part of the HCPC register in their named award. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. However, the visitors noted from the documentation that the exit award is named ''Research in Social Work'' (2), although it is clearly labelled that this award does not lead to eligibility to register with the HCPC. The visitors consider the words 'social work' within the exit award title could cause confusion for the lay person as it is a close link to 'social worker' the protected title. Therefore, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider changing the title of the exit award from ''Research in Social Work'' so that it no longer contains the profession. In this way, the visitors can be sure that no confusion will arise from the exit award.

(1) **Observation:** We believe this is a misreading of the documentation for SET 6.8 (Doc 3 Page 21) and Doc 15 (Programme Regulations) (P72) regulations 14, 15, 16. The exit awards at Masters, PGDip and PG Certificate level all refer to 'Social Work Studies' and include the wording 'without eligibility to register as a Social Worker). Reference to

Research in Social Work is the title of the Year 2 MSW module that includes a research proposal and a dissertation. This module is, indeed, concerned with Research in Social Work.

(2) **Observation:** The Economic and Social Research Council supports a Social Work and Social Policy panel for the Research Excellence Framework and Durham has a social work and social policy pathway for doctoral training (funded by the ESRC). Those researching in the field of social work are not necessarily registered social workers.

I hope the format of these observations is appropriate
With best wishes
Helen

_____

_____

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	13 – 14 November 2014

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 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 practitioners (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. The education provider has until 8 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 February 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 14 May 2015.

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 visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Social Work, full and part time. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the criteria for approving approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Andrew Nash (Approved mental health professional)
	Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
	Louise Whittle (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
HCPC observer	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	12 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Linsey Woodcock (University of Lincoln)
Secretary	Sapphira Kingfisher (University of Lincoln) – day 1
	Bethany Robinson-Benstead (University of Lincoln) – day 2

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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☒	☐
Admissions materials	☒	☐	☐
Service user and carer materials	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC did not review two years of external examiner reports prior to the visit as the education provider submitted the previous year only.

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	☒	☐	☐
Student	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the post-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

The visitors met with one student during the visit. Attempts were made to speak to another student via telephone but this was not possible due to technical issues.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 28 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 22 criterion.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Conditions

A.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 ensure that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were unclear about the admissions requirements and noted that clarification should be provided around some of the entry requirements. From the student and programme team meetings, the visitors learnt that the majority of students were nominated, and their course fees paid for, by their employer. They also learned of a self-funding student who had recently completed the programme. However, the visitors could not locate information about the costs associated with the programme within the admission documentation submitted.

In addition, the visitors were provided with a copy of the university's Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) policy. They noted there was no reference to this policy within the programme specific admissions information on the website. In discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt the policy would only be used in very specific circumstances due to the design of the programme, for example, for an applicant who had previously started, but not completed, a different AMHP programme. From the student meeting, the visitors noted a lack of awareness of this policy.

The visitors considered the admissions materials should enable applicants to make an informed decision about whether to undertake the programme and therefore should include further information about the costs associated with the programme and the APL policy. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the admissions materials to ensure they are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarification about their requirement for applicants to have prior mental health experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted applicants were required to have "Substantial and relevant mental health experience" (website print out) upon application to the programme. The programme team confirmed they had previously required applicants to have two years' experience within a mental health environment. This requirement had been changed to allow "...more flexibility to judge each case on merit" (page 9, AMHP Programme Handbook). The visitors were unaware of any further guidance which articulated the type of experience which would be considered relevant to the programme or how long the duration needed to be.

As applicants to the programme could be from one of four professions and therefore may have very different backgrounds, the visitors considered it important for guidance

to be available for applicants when reaching a decision about the programme. The visitors also considered it important that there was guidance available as part of the admissions process so the education provider could ensure consistency and transparency across the process. For use by applicants and as part of the admissions process, the visitors require further information which clearly outlines the how decisions will be made about the relevance of applicants' mental health experience, and how this will be communicated to potential applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted the Corporate and Diversity report 2013 and Senior Management Team Equality and Diversity Statement. However, the visitors did not receive any information about how the education provider's equality and diversity policies translated to and were implemented by the programme. From the mapping document, the visitors learnt "The small sample sizes of cohorts of AMHP students mean that it is inappropriate to draw any meaningful conclusions about equality and/or diversity from a single year". The visitors considered that while the small numbers of students per cohort could make it difficult, it is possible to determine appropriate and meaningful conclusions by monitoring equality and diversity policies in other ways, for example across the cohorts. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate how the equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors learnt about recent changes to the programme management structure and the ongoing recruitment within Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Trust (LPFT) for a Principal Social Worker to work closely with the education provider in running the AMHP programme (Contextual statement). Previously the liaison between the education provider and practice placement settings had been managed through a joint Senior Lecturer / Professional Social Worker Lead role which meant there was clear and regular communications between the two organisations. The programme team recognise that with the ending of this arrangement, formal policies and procedures need to be put in place to replicate / replace the previous arrangements. To ensure the Principal Social Worker and education provider are clear about the responsibilities of all involved and the communication channels, the visitors noted that it was important to clearly document the relationship between the two organisations.

The visitors also noted from the programme documentation that the programme leader role is shared between Robert Geomans and Jim Rogers. From the programme team discussions, the visitors learnt that both taught specific elements of the programme and were personal tutors to the students. The programme team confirmed the lines of

responsibility for the joint roles had not been formalised. The visitors considered it important that the lines of responsibility were clearly outlined so students and practice placement providers / placement supervisors know who to contact in particular circumstances.

To ensure the programme is effectively managed, the visitors require further evidence of the management structure, including the lines of responsibility of the programme leaders and formal links to the practice placement providers.

B.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register

Condition: The education provider must identify who has overall professional responsibility for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted the programme leader role was shared between Robert Geomans and Jim Rogers. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that both programme leaders taught specific elements of the programme and were personal tutors to the students. The programme team confirmed the lines of responsibility for the joint roles had not been formulised. The visitors considered it was not made clear in discussions with the programme team who had overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors therefore require further information detailing who this is, and require the programme documentation to reflect this. In this way the visitors can determine that the programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, is on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that staff are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors received a number of Curriculum Vitae of individuals teaching on the programme. The visitors noted in the documentation, that there were also additional teaching staff, for example visiting / sessional lecturers. However the visitors did not receive information about their qualifications or experience to determine whether they were appropriately qualified. To ensure the staff teaching on programme are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver an effective programme, the visitors require further information about the additional teaching staff, including visiting / sessional lecturers.

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors received a number of Curriculum Vitae of individuals teaching on the programme. The visitors noted in the documentation, that there were also additional teaching staff, for example visiting / sessional lecturers. However the visitors did not receive information about their qualifications or experience to determine whether they had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the appropriate subject area. To ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further information about the additional teaching staff on the programme, including visiting / sessional lecturers.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for AMHP programmes.

Reason: The visitors noted several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) within the programme documentation. For example, page four of the programme specification states that the "Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body Accreditation" for the programme is the General Social Care Council (GSCC). In addition, the four module specifications, say they meet the GSCC (2006) Post Qualifying Framework for Social Work Education and Training and the GSCC (2007) Specialist standards and requirements for post qualifying education and training.

The visitors also noted on page six of the programme handbook "Whilst the regulatory bodies insist on the AMHP programme being nested within a post graduate diploma…". The HCPC does not require AMHP programmes to be offered at a particular qualification level, rather we require that all programmes meet the criteria outlined in Section 1 and 2 of the Approval criteria for AMHP programmes. The decision about the qualification level to deliver the programme at is a decision for the education provider.

It is important students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC's role in the regulation of AMHP training. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscape of regulation of AMHP training. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the duration of the practice placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted the duration of the practice placement differed between documents. For example, page 3 of the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook states "the programme requirement is a minimum 40-day supervised mental health placement plus 6 study days". It also states

"The Mental Health Placement period is an approximate estimate: it needs to cover: 35 Placement Days, 6 Study Day, 1 Day (recall)". The practice placement providers confirmed the placement requirement was 35 days, however, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt the requirement was 40 days. To ensure the resources are used effectively, it is important for students and placement supervisors are equipped with accurate information about the duration of the programme. As such, the visitors require the programme documentation must to be updated.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure service users and carers receive appropriate documentation to support their involvement in the programme.

Reason: From the service user and carer meeting, the visitors learnt about the range of activities that service user and carers are involved in, for example admissions, assessment and teaching. The service user and carer representatives said they were supported and felt valued by the programme team. Within the documentation, the visitors received a Handbook for service user/patient and carer involvement. The visitors noted that this handbook had been developed for use by the Social Work programmes but it "… has been drafted with the intention of adoption by Nursing and Health and Social Care courses". The visitors considered it was important for the service users and carer representatives to receive appropriate programme specific information relating to their role including the support mechanisms available to them. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate this criterion is met.

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook. From this, the visitors noted references to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the "Procedures for interruption, suspension and termination of AMHP practice placements including concerns". The visitors noted the education provider refers to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and that they work alongside their own internal code of practice to help determine whether a student's placement should be suspended or terminated, and in discussions when serious concerns are raised about a student's practice learning and development.

The programme team confirmed the HCPC and / or NMC standards were covered within the Theory and Interventions in Mental Health Practice module. However, from the module descriptor and reading list, the visitors could see no references to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives. The visitors were unsure about how the programme team ensures the students understand the implications of

the relevant document on their practice as an AMHP. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate this criterion is met.

D.1 Practice placements are integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure practice placements.

Reason: Within the documentation provided, the visitors received a copy of a Memorandum of Co-operation (MOC) with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC). The visitors noted the MOC primarily reflected the relationship between the two organisations in terms of the social work programmes run by the education provider. The programme team confirmed the requirements for the AMHP programme were outlined in the section "CPD opportunities for qualified social workers through Post Qualifying training". Within this section, while it was stated that LCC will arrange for suitably qualified employees to act as mentors for students on placement, the visitors were unable to clearly identify a requirement for LCC to provide practice placements for the AMHP programme.

From the contextual statement and discussions with the practice placement providers and programme team, the visitors recognised that the majority of practice placements are undertaken with Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Trust (LPFT) which delivers mental health social care on behalf of LCC. The visitors did not receive any documentary evidence to illustrate how practice placements are secured within LPFT. The programme team confirmed they are in negotiations with LPFT about an agreement which will secure practice placements for the AMHP programme.

As practice placements are an integral part of programme and to ensure the security of the placements, the visitors require further information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placements are available to the students.

D.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment

Condition: The education provider must ensure the health and safety policies of practice placements ensure a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors noted the draft Practice Placement Agency Profile form which asks the Agency to declare whether they have health and safety policies in place, which "can be made available to the education provider on request". The visitors did not receive any further information to explain how or when the Practice Placement Agency Profile would be used, including the circumstances leading to when the policies would be requested or how the education provider would assess these. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the Practice Placement Agency Profile will be implemented over the "next few months".

The visitors considered it was important the education provider checked the quality of the placements, to ensure they provide a safe and supportive environment for students. The visitors therefore require further information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Condition: The education provider must implement a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements, together with an outline of when and how this will be implemented.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors received a copy of the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook. Page 11 of this document outlines the education provider's responsibilities in relation to placements, including "To verify and audit placements regularly and to ensure that an agreed placement is suitable to meet the learning outcomes for this role and to meet the requirements for AMHP practice".

The visitors also received a draft copy of the Practice Placement Agency Profile form, which is intended as an audit tool for placements. The programme team explained that until recently, the quality of placements had been managed informally as previously there was a joint Senior Lecturer / Professional Social Worker Lead role which ensured regular communication between the education provider and placement providers. This meant the education provider had regular links to the placement settings. As students are starting to use placements which are outside the region or not as well known to the education provider, the audit tool is being implemented over the "next few months". The visitors considered it was important for the education provider to assess the quality of all practice placements before students undertake the placement, and have a mechanism to monitor placements when they are being undertaken. As such the visitors require the education provider to implement a thorough and effective process for approving and monitoring all placements. In order to determine how this criterion is met, the visitors require further information about this process, including an outline of how and when it will be implemented.

D.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these are implemented and monitored.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors received a draft copy of the Practice Placement Agency Profile form which asks agencies to declare whether they have equality and diversity policies in place, which "can be made available to the education provider on request" (page 2). The visitors did not receive any further information to explain how or when the Practice Placement Agency Profile form would be used, including the circumstances leading to when the policies would be requested. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the Practice Placement Agency Profile will be implemented over the "next few months". To ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, and determine how practice placement providers implement and monitor these policies, the visitors require further information which demonstrates how this criterion is met.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting

Condition: The education provider must ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced placement supervisors at the practice placements.

Reason: From the practice placement provider and student meetings, the visitors noted there were opportunities for students to directly observe individuals who were not their direct placement supervisor, for example, if they needed to gain experience of a different aspect of AMHP practice in order to meet the required competences. The visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensured there was a sufficient number of individuals at the placement setting for students to do this and that these individuals were appropriately qualified and experienced.

Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook. Page 5 of this document outlines that "Each student will be under the direct supervision of a pre-agreed AMHP who is currently warranted and practising as an AMHP…". Also within the documentation, the visitors received a draft copy of the Practice Placement Agency Profile form. The profile asks for the name, contact details and practice educator qualifications of two placement supervisors. The visitors did not receive any further information to explain how or when the Practice Placement Agency Profile form would be used. The programme team confirmed that the Practice Placement Agency Profile will be implemented over the "next few months".

To ensure practice placements provide an appropriate learning environment for students, the visitors considered it was important for the education provider to check the level of supervision available to the student and the qualifications and experience of placement supervisors before the placement commences. The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced placement educators.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure placement supervisors are appropriately trained.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors learnt about the recommendation that placement supervisors hold a current practice educator qualification, though it is not mandatory. Page 7 of the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook provides information about the possible qualifications this could include. The visitors were unsure about how the education provider ensured placement supervisors held such a qualification and what the implications were for the student and / or supervisor, if the supervisor did not hold an appropriate practice educator qualification.

The visitors noted it was important for all new placement supervisors to receive training and existing placement supervisors to receive regular refresher training about programme specific knowledge. This knowledge would particularly be about the

learning outcomes required from the placement, and how the placement supervisor assessed these outcomes to ensure the minimum requirement was met and therefore there was consistency across the placement settings. The programme team confirmed they had previously required placement supervisors to attend programme specific training sessions, however, due to the low number of placement supervisors, this was changed so these discussions occurred during the mid-point visit to the placement. The visitors recognised there were many different ways to ensure placement supervisors had the knowledge they needed about the programme. However, the visitors were concerned this mid-point visit was half way through the placement and that learning outcomes were being met and assessed throughout the whole duration of the placement. To ensure consistency in delivery and assessment of the learning outcomes across the placement settings, the visitors considered it was important for appropriate programme specific training to be provided to all placement supervisors so they were prepared before students arrived.

The education provider must therefore provide information to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators are appropriately trained.

D.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed

Condition: The education provider must ensure placement supervisors are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From discussions the practice placement provider and student meeting, the visitors noted there were opportunities for students to directly observe individuals who were not their direct supervisor, for example, if they needed to gain experience of a different aspect of AMHP practice in order to meet the required competences. The visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensured these placement supervisors were appropriately registered with either the HCPC or the NMC, or, if required, agreed other arrangements with ourselves.

Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook. Page 5 of this document outlines that "Each student will be under the direct supervision of a pre-agreed AMHP who is currently warranted and practising as an AMHP…". Also within the documentation, the visitors were referred to a copy of the draft Practice Placement Agency Profile form. The visitors could not determine from this form, how the education provider receives information about the registration status of a placement supervisor.

The visitors considered it was important for placement supervisors to be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements had been agreed with the HCPC, to ensure students were being supervised by an individual with the appropriate experience, qualifications and training to the particular placement. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures placement supervisors are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements with ourselves if appropriate.

D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors learnt about recent changes to the programme management structure and the ongoing recruitment within the main practice placement setting (LPFT). The recruitment was for a Principal Social Worker to work closely with the education provider in running the AMHP programme (Contextual statement). Previously this relationship had been managed through a joint Senior Lecturer / Professional Social Worker Lead role which meant regular and clear communications were occurring between the two organisations. The programme team recognise that with the ending of this arrangement, formal policies and procedures need to be put in place to replicate / replace the previous arrangements.

The visitors also recognise that while the majority of practice placements occur within LPFT, some placements do take place outside of Lincolnshire. It is important for there to be an ongoing partnership with all placements. This ensures that all students benefit from regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice placement provider, irrespective of where they are undertaking their practice placement.

The visitors therefore require further information about the collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers to allow them to determine whether this criterion is met.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes

Condition: The education provider must ensure the assessment methods used within the placement setting ensure that students who successfully complete the programme can meet the relevant learning outcomes.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook and the Mental Health Practice Portfolio. From these and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt about the assessment process to be undertaken within the placement setting. Students are required to achieve 33 competences which they need to discuss with, and gain approval from, their placement supervisor before completing a 30 word summary of each competence within their portfolio. Subsequently the placement supervisor signs each competence as met.

From the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that students were required to observe / undertake a particular activity as many times as was necessary in order for the placement supervisor to sign the competence as met. The visitors could find no further guidance which outlined the education provider's expectation of the minimum standard to be demonstrated by a student in order for them to meet the learning outcomes either in terms of frequency and / or level of competence to be demonstrated. Under the current arrangements, the visitors therefore considered there was a possibility a student could demonstrate how they met a competence on the first attempt and this would mean there would be no further assessment of the competence. If a student was directly involved in one mental health assessment or Community Treatment Order, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensured this was adequate practice experience to demonstrate the

associated learning outcomes. The visitors were therefore concerned about the robustness of the process in ensuring students had demonstrated the learning outcomes at the appropriate level for a student to practise safely and effectively. They therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how the assessment methods ensure students can successfully meet the learning outcomes.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective practice as an AMHP

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the measurement of student performance ensures safe and effective practice as an AMHP.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook and the Mental Health Practice Portfolio. From these and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt about the assessment process to be undertaken within the placement setting. Students are required to achieve 33 competences which they need to discuss with, and gain approval from, their placement supervisor before completing a 30 word summary of each competence within their portfolio. Subsequently the placement supervisor signs each competence as met.

For the majority of these competences students were not required to submit further evidence to the education provider which demonstrated how the competence was met. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider therefore moderated how students met these competences. The visitors considered there was a possibility that placement supervisors could therefore assess how a student meets these competences differently. It is important for the education provider to outline their expectations of the assessment methods, train placement supervisors accordingly and have in place mechanisms to ensure consistency and objectively in assessment, to ensure an individual is safe and effective to practice as an AMHP. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how this SET is met.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment

Condition: The education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of the practice portfolio.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook and the Mental Health Practice Portfolio. From these and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt about the assessment process to be undertaken within the placement setting. Students were required to achieve 33 competences which they need to discuss with, and gain approval from, their placement supervisor before completing a 30 word summary of the competence within their portfolio. Subsequently the placement supervisor signs the competence as met.

In addition, students were required to submit detailed evidence to the education provider regarding five key competences and their direct participation in a formal mental health community admission or supervised community treatment. The

assessment of these aspects of the practice portfolio were undertaken by the education provider and subject to internal and external moderation.

However, for the majority of the 33 competences outlined within the programme documentation, students were not required to submit further evidence to the education provider to demonstrate how the competence was met. The assessment of whether a competence was met, was the "…sole responsibility on Supervisors to authenticate the legitimate achievement of each individual AMHP competence" (page 7, Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook). The visitors considered there was a possibility that placement supervisors could therefore assess how a student meets the competences differently. To ensure students meet the knowledge, skills and experience outlined in Section 2 of the Approval criteria for approved mental health professionals (AMHP) programmes, the visitors considered it was important for assessments across the placement settings to be undertaken in a transparent and consistent manner. This would allow internal and external moderation of all aspects of the portfolio to be undertaken.

The visitors therefore require further information about how the education provider ensures there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

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 is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors learnt of the requirement for the programme to have an external examiner in place which is approved and appointed by the Academic Board (page 24, Taught Postgraduate Regulations 2013/14). The visitors were unable to locate where in the programme documentation it stated the external examiner needed to be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate register. In order to determine this criterion is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

<div align="right">

Andrew Nash
Christine Stogdon
Louise Whittle

</div>

Observations

Name of education provider	University of Lincoln
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	13 – 14 November 2014

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must ensure service users and carers receive appropriate documentation to support their involvement in the programme.

Reason: From the service user and carer meeting, the visitors learnt about the range of activities that service user and carers are involved in, for example admissions, assessment and teaching. The service user and carer representatives said they were supported and felt valued by the programme team. Within the documentation, the visitors received a Handbook for service user/patient and carer involvement. The visitors noted that this handbook had been developed for use by the Social Work programmes but it "… has been drafted with the intention of adoption by Nursing and Health and Social Care courses". The visitors considered it was important for the service users and carer representatives to receive appropriate programme specific information relating to their role including the support mechanisms available to them. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate this criterion is met.

Observation
The visitors appear to be saying that service users and carers are involved in a wide range of activities relevant to the programme, and that they are well supported. A condition appears to have been set as the visitors feel that the handbook that service users and carers are given should be more specific to this course. We would ask that the visitors consider whether this request is relevant to meeting this criterion.

D.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure placement supervisors are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From discussions the practice placement provider and student meeting, the visitors noted there were opportunities for students to directly observe individuals who were not their direct supervisor, for example, if they needed to gain experience of a different aspect of AMHP practice in order to meet the required competences. The visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensured these placement supervisors were appropriately registered with either the HCPC or the NMC, or, if required, agreed other arrangements with ourselves.

Within the documentation, the visitors were referred to the Mental Health Practice Placement Handbook. Page 5 of this document outlines that "Each student will be under the direct supervision of a pre-agreed AMHP who is currently warranted and practising as an AMHP…". Also within the documentation, the visitors were referred to a copy of the draft Practice Placement Agency Profile form. The visitors could not determine from this form, how the education provider receives information about the registration status of a placement supervisor.

The visitors considered it was important for placement supervisors to be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements had been agreed with the HCPC, to ensure students were being supervised by an individual with the appropriate experience, qualifications and training to the particular placement. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures placement supervisors are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements with ourselves if appropriate.

Observation
We are unable to tell from the reasons given, who it is that the visitors require further information on regarding their registration.

The reasons given begin by referring to AMHPs and other professionals that the students will observe on their placement in addition to their "direct supervisor" (by "direct supervisor" we assume they are referring to the practice placement educator). The reasons then go on to refer to these other AMHPs and professionals as 'practice supervisors' and appears to be asking for how the university checks the registration details of such people.

If this is the case, then we would not consider checking the registration details of such people as part of the university role or relevant to meeting this criteria. We note that the HCPC only asks that the Practice Placement Educator is appropriately registered.