

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	MA Degree in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	4 – 5 March 2014

Contents

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

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 7 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work (in England) profession came onto the register in August 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BA (Hons) Degree in Social Work, PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) and Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice. The professional body (for the social work provision) and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Richard Barker (Social worker) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker) Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort once per year inclusive of students from the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Sue Palmer (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Sheila Casey (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Julie Irvine (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	<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 SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<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 (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 standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. 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 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Recommendations

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 education provider continue exploring ways to support students financially whilst they are on placements.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied the programme provides support for the students in all settings and are therefore satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted during meetings with the placement providers / educators and students that students have raised concerns around the travel costs whilst on placement with one particular placement provider. The programme team indicated they are aware of this concern. It was also highlighted that students are made aware before joining the programme that the placements may incur travel costs. The programme team indicated that due to financial constraints placements providers find it hard to support students financially for costs incurred during placements. The visitors recommend the programme team continue to work closely with the placement providers to support students including considering ways to support students financially.

Richard Barker
Paula Sobiechowska
Shaaron Pratt

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	4 – 5 March 2014

Contents

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

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 7 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work (in England) profession came onto the register in August 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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BA (Hons) Degree in Social Work, MA Degree in Social Work and Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice. The professional body (for the social work provision) and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Richard Barker (Social worker) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker) Shaaron Pratt (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort once per year inclusive of students from the MA Degree in Social Work programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Sue Palmer (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Sheila Casey (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Julie Irvine (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	<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 SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<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 (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 standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. 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 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Recommendations

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 education provider continue exploring ways to support students financially whilst they are on placements.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied the programme provides support for the students in all settings and are therefore satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted during meetings with the placement providers / educators and students that students have raised concerns around the travel costs whilst on placement with one particular placement provider. The programme team indicated they are aware of this concern. It was also highlighted that students are made aware before joining the programme that the placements may incur travel costs. The programme team indicated that due to financial constraints placements providers find it hard to support students financially for costs incurred during placements. The visitors recommend the programme team continue to work closely with the placement providers to support students including considering ways to support students financially.

Richard Barker
Paula Sobiechowska
Shaaron Pratt

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Leeds Metropolitan University
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	4 – 5 March 2014

Contents

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

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 March 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome and approve the programme.

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 part of a joint event. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Degree in Social Work, MA Degree in Social Work and PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The professional body (reviewing social work provision only) and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the criteria for approving approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional) Lynn Heath (Approved mental health professional) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	15 per intake once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	February 2014
Chair	Paul Sharples (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Holly Hume (Leeds Metropolitan University)

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 section 1 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 2 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC also met with service user and carer representatives.

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 the programme is approved.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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

Recommendations

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 an programme

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider review the admissions materials to enhance consistency and clarity.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures gave applicants the information they required to make informed choices about the programme and were therefore satisfied this criterion is met. The visitors noted there were some ambiguities within the submitted documentation:

- The required level of prior academic study (a generic second class degree or an upper second class);
- The required level of post qualifying experience (at least a minimum of two years or “no fixed period of prior experience required for admission” (Course Approval Template); and
- The nursing professions that can access this programme are explicitly stated in some places and not in others.

The visitors considered these were not omissions that meant the criterion is not met but suggest they be corrected in order that the documentation is as clear as possible for applicants and students.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the criteria in section 2

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider revise the programme documentation to include more explicit reference to legal accountability and liability for AMHPs (Criterion 1.2).

1.2 Understand the legal position and accountability of AMHPs, employers and the authority the AMHP is acting for in relation to the Mental Health Act 1983.

Reason: During the visit the visitors asked the programme team how they ensured that legal accountability and liability were contained within the programme. There was discussion around this and the visitors heard several explanations as to how the programme ensured students would be able to understand and apply criterion 1.2. Along with the mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met section 2 the visitors were therefore satisfied this criterion was met. The visitors however felt that the documentation did not include the detail contained within the explanation and suggest that the programme team add to the documentation to expand on the information of legal accountability and liability for an AMHP in order to make the programme team’s explanations more prominent for students.

David Abrahart
Lynn Heath
Ruth Baker