

Inspection Report

Course provider: London Metropolitan University

Course approval: Pg Cert Approved Mental Health Practice

Inspection dates: 6th – 8th September 2022

Report date:	23/09/2022
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	09/01/2023
Date conditions met and approved:	14/06/2023

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Course admissions	7
Standard two: Course management and resources	9
Standard three: Curriculum.....	15
Standard four: Practice placements.....	18
Standard five: Assessment	23
Proposed outcome.....	26
Conditions	26
Recommendations	27
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	28
Regulator decision	34
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	35
Findings	36

Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses. Inspections form part of our process to make sure that courses meet our [AMHP processes and procedures](#) (Approved Mental Health Professional) and ensure that students successfully completing these courses can meet our AMHP knowledge and skills criteria (based on Schedule 2 to the Mental Health (Approved Mental Health Professionals) (Approval) (England) Regulations 2008).
2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. One inspector is a social worker registered with us or an AMHP and the other is not a registered social worker (a 'lay' inspector). These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review information and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, placement provision, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, training placement providers, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.
3. The process we undertake is described in our legislation; the Social Worker Regulations 2018¹, and the Social Work England [\(Education and Training\) Rules 2019](#).
4. You can find further guidance on our course change, approval and annual monitoring processes on our website.

What we do

5. When an education provider wants to make a change to a course, or request the approval of a new course, they are asked to consider how their course meets the AMHP processes and procedures and knowledge and skills criteria, and provide evidence of this to us.
6. The education quality assurance officer reviews all the documentary evidence provided and will contact the education provider if they have any questions about the information submitted. They also provide advice and guidance on our approval processes.
7. When we are satisfied that we have all the documentary evidence required to proceed with an inspection we assign one registrant/AMHP and one lay inspector. We undertake a conflict of interest process when confirming our inspectors to ensure there is no bias or perception of bias in the approval process.
8. The inspectors complete an assessment of the evidence provided and advise the officer if they have any queries that may be able to be addressed in advance of the inspection.

¹ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2018/9780111170090/contents>

9. During this time a draft plan for the inspection is developed and shared with the education provider, to make sure it is achievable at the point of inspection.
10. Once the inspectors and officer are satisfied that an inspection can take place, this is usually undertaken over a two to three-day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards. As a result of the COVID 19 pandemic, some inspections are still being carried out via remote virtual arrangements, and typically last three to four days.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, approved without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval. Where the course has been previously approved we may also decide to withdraw approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final regulatory decision about the approval of the course.
13. The final decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. London Metropolitan University, PGCert Approved Mental Health Practitioner, was inspected as part of Social Work England's new approval cycle; whereby all course providers with qualifying social work courses will be inspected against the new Education and Training Standards 2021.

Inspection ID	CPP370
Course provider	London Metropolitan University
Validating body (if different)	N/A
Course inspected	Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of study	Work based
Maximum student cohort	24
Date of inspection	6 th – 8 th September 2022
Inspection team	Catherine Denny - Education Quality Assurance Officer Lainy Russell - Lay Inspector Jane Hutchison - Registrant Inspector
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	Approved with conditions

Language

16. In this document we describe London Metropolitan University as 'the education provider' or 'the university' and we describe the PGCert Approved Mental Health Practice as 'the course'.

Inspection

17. An onsite inspection took place from 6th – 8th September 2022 in London, where London Metropolitan University is based. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

18. These meetings formed the basis of the inspection plan, agreed with the education provider ahead of inspection. The following section provides a summary of these sessions, who participated and the topics that were discussed with the inspection team.

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with 4 students, 1 of whom was a London Metropolitan University student on a MA course within the School of Social Sciences and Professions, and 3 ex-students from the Approved Mental Health Practice course with the East London Mental Health Training Partnership (ELMHTP). Discussions included how well-informed students were about the course, ease of access to resources, support from practice educators and academic staff, placement experiences, assessment and pastoral support.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff from current social work courses in the university who are expected to contribute towards the running of the new course. The inspection team also met with stakeholders from the ELMHTP who are expected to contribute towards course delivery.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in social work courses at the university and representatives who have contributed to the delivery of the Approved Mental Health Practice course with ELMHTP. Discussions included engagement in current provision at the university, experience of teaching and assessment, participation on interview panels and how they are supported to contribute towards course review and development.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners from within the 6 local authorities involved in the ELMHTP, who are committed to working with the university to fund professionals to take part in the course.

Findings

24. In this section we set out the inspectors' findings in relation to whether the education provider has demonstrated that it meets the education and training standards, and that the course will ensure that students who successfully complete the course are able to meet the professional standards.

Standard one: Course admissions

Standard 1.1

25. The university submitted a copy of the business case documentation that had been developed as part of their internal validation processes. Within the documentation, the inspection team were able to review indicative prospectus entries which would be used in the event of course approval. The documentation provided information about the role of the Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP), with details of the professions which are eligible to apply. Applicants will also be provided with information about the structure of the course, including the number of modules, credits and details about taught content and placement expectations. The inspection team also reviewed the wider university admissions policy with which the course will be compliant.

26. The course will be delivered with support from the East London Mental Health Training Partnership (ELMHTP) who have previously delivered the course in the local area. The university intend to replicate some of the processes that have been implemented by ELMHTP and have established relationships with local authority partners in preparation for approval. During the inspection, previous students were able to share their views on course information and preparedness for study prior to commencing their study. All those that the inspection team met with confirmed that course information had been clearly presented and leads within their authority were well equipped to answer questions. The inspection team therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

27. The inspection team reviewed the course specification alongside the business case documentation which outlined proposed entry requirements. The entry requirements listed included minimum academic qualifications required alongside professional experience and registration with an appropriate professional body. The inspection team also noted that there was clear reference to candidates demonstrating that they have the motivation and values consistent with taking on the role of an AMHP and how taking on the role would link with their personal and professional development planning. The university indicated that this competency would be evidenced via a personal statement required at application.

28. As the course is dependent upon employer support and funding, local authority employers will conduct internal selection processes before students are interviewed by

university colleagues. This ensures that students will be well equipped to meet the demands of the course and selection processes. The university will then provide a consistent and equitable interview experience which includes employer representatives and people with lived experience of social work as the final part of the selection process.

29. The inspection team heard that employers expect candidates to complete a 'pre-AMHP' course within their partnership prior to seeking employer support for the post graduate certificate unless they have completed other masters level study within a 5-year period. Where students are not successful with this course, employers will address this internally before suggesting application to the course with the university. The inspection team were satisfied that there is a range of information available in relation to selection and entry criteria which is understood by all and therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

30. As outlined in standard 1.2, the university included reference to prior experience and learning within their admissions criteria, specifically through the requirement of a personal statement which outlines suitability for the role of the AMHP based upon personal and professional experience. The course specification provided by the university also outlined ways in which students might apply for credit where they have prior accredited learning at level 7 in a module, which covers the same learning outcomes and with the same credit volume as an equivalent module on the course. Where a candidate might wish to claim credit based on prior experiential learning (non-accredited), they would be required to complete a detailed portfolio of evidence which would be reviewed by members of the course team. Due to the specialist nature of the course, the education provider acknowledged that such conversations would need to take place with the course lead in advance of application and reviewed on an individual basis. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 1.4

31. The education provider submitted a copy of their Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) policy for review which underpins their approach to ensuring that admissions processes are inclusive, and welcome applicants from a wide range of backgrounds including those relating to age, gender, race, religion, disability and other protected characteristics. The inspection team also heard about the university wide commitment to anti-oppressive and anti-discriminatory practice which has informed admissions processes. The university outlined how admissions data in relation to EDI is regularly scrutinised as part of their commitment to widening participation.

32. The inspection team queried how those involved in selection and admissions are kept up to date with training in relation to EDI. The course team explained that all university staff complete an annual refresher of EDI training and that, as people with lived experience of

social work are employed as associate staff, they also have access to the same training opportunities as academic staff. The inspection team also heard that people with lived experience receive bespoke support from course team staff to enhance their role in different aspects of the course, including admissions.

33. Following on from engagement in relevant EDI training, the course team explained how questions and tasks used in admissions are set to ensure a fair and equitable experience for all. The course team also explore reasonable adjustments as part of the admissions process by gathering information via application forms, interview booking forms and using intelligence acquired through local authority partners. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard two: Course management and resources

Standard 2.1

34. The education provider outlined their rationale for requesting approval of the course, which was developed as a result of being approached by the consortium of 6 north east London local authorities which form the ELMHTP. Within the business case documentation, the course team outlined how the course would support the university's 'giving back to the city' strategic programme and be a unique route to gaining the AMHP qualification within the London region. The university also explained their plans for delivery from a specific campus so that students would be based in the local area which they will serve.

35. Through course documentation there was a clear outline of projected numbers for the course and the funding arrangements in place. Through meetings with employer partners, the demand for the course was clearly evidenced as was their commitment to both sourcing and providing students for the course. The inspection team heard that each of the 6 local authorities would fund a minimum of 3 students each but anticipate demand for more. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.2

36. The course will sit within the social work department which is part of the School of Social Sciences and Professions. The university provided an organogram of management structures within the team to outline how the course will be managed strategically within the school. The inspection team heard about how the course provider plans to manage the transition of the course leadership from ELMHTP to the university. An existing member of social work staff with a background in mental health has been identified as being course lead in conjunction with the previous course lead from ELMHTP. The university explained that they felt it was important for the university to work with an established member of staff from the course as it has been delivered previously to ensure a smooth transition. The member of university staff identified will support with the implementation of university processes and

procedures. Once the course is established the intention is to recruit a dedicated course leader.

37. Alongside academic leadership from the university, the course will be supported by 6 AMHP leads from local authorities. These leads will form the management board for the course alongside university staff and support with issues such as funding, placement allocation, course delivery and assessment. The university also demonstrated their plans for an extended course team, including associate lecturers with a specialism in AMHP practice as well as staff from the social work team with relevant experience. Whilst the inspection team agreed that the university were able to verbally outline appropriate plans for course management and delivery, they noted the absence of clear documentation which formalised these plans in a way that could be clearly understood. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 2.3

38. The inspection team heard that the university intend to replicate some of the processes previously used to monitor and evaluate the course by ELMHTP. This includes regular written feedback and evaluation from students following taught sessions which are reviewed by the course lead(s), the findings of which are heard within management board meetings. The university also explained how feedback will be sought from colleagues within local boroughs in relation to the performance of students and the outcomes of assessment and moderation of portfolios. Placement experiences will be monitored via Quality Assurance of Placement Learning (QAPL) processes which include an initial, mid and end point review.

39. The university outlined how the Placement Assessment Panel (PAP) is a key forum in which the course team and employers can hold developmental, practice-based discussions about placement related issues and course delivery. Through conversations with key stakeholders, it became apparent that whilst the PAP is embedded within social work courses at the university, there is not clarity about how this would be replicated for the course. Inspectors also observed that much of the evidence available to support quality assurance activities was based upon verbal feedback from staff involved in course delivery rather than a formalised process. As a result, there was not always a consistent understanding of shared practices, and roles within these, from all stakeholders. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full

details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 2.4

40. As outlined with standard 2.2, during initial set up and development, the course will be jointly led by a member of university staff and the previous course lead from the ELMHTP on an associate staff member basis. This plan ensures that a registered AMHP is supported by a member of established university staff to ensure that processes and procedures on the course are robust. Once established, the university will recruit a dedicated course leader who will assume overall responsibility for the course. The inspection team heard that it will be a requirement for the course lead to be an experienced AMHP however, when reviewing the course lead job description this had not been updated to reflect the specialist nature of the course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 2.5

41. The university outlined the experience of the current social work team, highlighting areas in which they could contribute towards delivery of the course. The inspection team were able to review a planned timetable for taught sessions which included input from specialist practitioners with recognised experience and qualifications in the field. Further to this, the input of qualified and experienced partners from the ELMHTP would enhance course delivery. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

42. As outlined in standard 2.5, the inspection team were able to review a proposed timetable for delivery of the course which included details of proposed tutors as well as topics for delivery. The background and experience of those involved in delivery was recognised as appropriate by the inspection team, however it was noted that not all external practitioners had been confirmed or contracted for delivery. The inspection team agreed that a condition in relation to providing evidence to confirm all professionals listed had committed to delivery of specialist sessions would be appropriate. Full details of the condition can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 2.7

43. The university outlined their organisational commitment to staff development through the 'centre for professional and educational development' which runs regular research,

pedagogic and higher education development programmes. Documentary evidence also outlined the range of training and research activities that the staff team are involved in which are specific to their own professional development, as well as involvement in university priorities such as decolonisation of the curriculum and unconscious bias training. During meetings with the course team, the inspection team also heard about plans for an exchange programme where university staff could observe AMHP's in practice with AMHP leads playing a part in the delivery of some teaching sessions and course development activities.

44. In addition to the development opportunities for staff employed by the university, the course team were also able to outline how they will monitor the continuous professional development (CPD) activities of AMHP's supporting course delivery. A requirement for a practicing AMHP is that 18 hours annually of additional CPD must be undertaken and recorded. Partners from local authorities who will sit on the management board confirmed that this will be reviewed through an annual appraisal cycle and shared with the university course team. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.8

45. Documentary evidence outlined the role of the academic tutor within the university with the course team confirming that all students would have a personal academic tutor allocated to them upon commencing the course. The named academic tutor from the university will remain with students for the duration of the course and lead regular group tutorials. In addition to the role of the academic tutor, the university outlined the provision of academic mentors who are available to provide more bespoke support to students based upon individual needs.

46. The university explained that all practice educators and placement partners for the course would have access to teaching and learning materials for the course to enable them to support students effectively. A workshop for practice educators outlines their role prior to students commencing placement and a further 2 workshops during the course allow practice educators to review assessment guidance and expectations. The provision of a bespoke handbook also ensures a consistent approach to delivery for students on the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.9

47. The inspection team were able to review documentary evidence such as module specifications, assessment guidance and reading lists. The inspection team agreed that the literature recommended to support students was appropriate and heard that all students on the course will be provided with a copy of the Jones Mental Health Act manual to support their studies. In addition, library services confirmed that academic liaison librarians would

support students to access appropriate literature online to further support required learning on the course.

48. As outlined in standard 2.8, employer partners and practice educators are supported to understand their role for students on placement. During meetings with students and practice educators, the inspection team heard that there are regular supervision opportunities in place where students are supported to apply theory to practice on a regular basis. Practice educators who have an established relationship with the university outlined that they can access resources from the university effectively to support their role, and students recognised the importance of the relationship with their practice educator was essential in developing their practice-based skills. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.10

49. During the inspection, the university provided a demonstration of their virtual learning environment which will be in place for the course. The inspection team observed that students would be able to access all relevant course material virtually including reading lists, module specifications, assessments and learning outcomes as well as updated weekly course materials. In addition to key documents, the university also explained that recordings of all taught sessions will be added to the platform so that students can access these post teaching. The course leader from the university confirmed that training and support is available to students regarding use of the platform where required.

50. As referenced in standard 2.9, the course is supported by library services within the university including academic liaison librarians who are subject specialists. Library services confirmed that staff can develop bespoke tutorials around use of online databases and referencing which are recorded so that these can be accessed at all times. In addition to online support, students will also benefit from longer opening hours to library buildings so that study can be balanced with the work-based nature of the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.11

51. The inspection team met with representatives from student support services who outlined provision of support in relation to disability advice, counselling and student welfare. The university outlined how students' needs are assessed both upon joining the university where needs are disclosed, and throughout their course should difficulties arise. Students with identified needs receive an individual needs assessment report which is made available to both students and key course staff. This can also be shared with placement providers with appropriate consent and disability services confirmed that they have experience of doing so for other courses within the university.

52. In addition to the 1:1 support available for students, the university also explained that there are several support groups for students from under-represented backgrounds and for those with specific difficulties. An app has also been introduced to provide 24/7 peer support for students to promote positive emotional wellbeing. It was confirmed that, despite the shorter, work-based nature of the course, all students will have access to the same level of resource whilst studying with the university. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.12

53. As evidenced in previous standards, students have access to a range of 1:1 support to develop their academic skills and to support student welfare. Academic tutors are seen as a key link between university and placement for students and the university outlined their plans for a joined up approach between university tutors, practice educators and students throughout placements. Employer partners who had been involved in previous delivery of the course highlighted that this approach was welcomed as it had been seen as a missing part of provision for them historically.

54. Further to the support highlighted in standard 2.11, the course team also outlined additional opportunities for support for students with specific consideration for those who may not have accessed academic study for some time. The course team recognised that early intervention to equip students with the skills for study was imperative and explained this could be provided through a combination of referral to their academic mentor programme or via direct support from the course lead. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.13

55. The inspection team were able to establish that student complaint processes are highlighted via a range of means including course handbook, induction planning, university website, the virtual learning environment and the practice educator handbook. The inspection team therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.14

56. All stakeholders involved in the inspection articulated their understanding that attendance for the course is mandatory and that the intensity of the course demands such a commitment from all students. There was recognition that extenuating circumstances might occur and plans had been developed to address any missed sessions via additional workshops and tasks and recordings being available on the virtual learning environment. Where attendance has fallen below a certain point, the course team acknowledged that completion of the award would not be possible and as a result individual conversations would occur regarding next steps.

57. Monitoring of attendance is managed through a range of means including online systems and liaison between the university and placement providers. As students are supported to access the course by their employer, there is also a shared discussion between key stakeholders where attendance issues arise. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.15

58. The university provided documentary evidence to highlight how people with lived experience are incorporated into course design and delivery through their dedicated group named 'BeSpoke'. A handbook has been developed to support members in their role and the university has acknowledged the contributions of the group by making them associate members of staff. Members are able to contribute towards course development days, interviews and assessment of student portfolios. On other courses within the university, members of 'BeSpoke' have also contributed towards teaching and role play scenario's and whilst this has not yet been secured for this course, there was a commitment to this from both the course team and individual members.

59. During a meeting with 'BeSpoke' members, the inspection team heard that those who have worked with the university for some time felt valued in their role. The addition of a dedicated member of staff to work with the group has been welcomed and it is hoped that this will support further development of their role. Representatives who have taught on previous iterations of the course were keen to share their experience and welcomed the opportunity for further training and networking opportunities by joining the university. The desire for additional training and group networking opportunities was echoed by established members who were eager to share their views and expertise on the development of a new course within the school. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Curriculum

Standard 3.1

60. The course learning outcomes were made available to the inspection team through the course handbook and further expanded upon within individual module specifications. Appendices to the course handbook included a learning outcome form which allows students the opportunity to evidence the ways in which they have met specific outcomes, and an observation form which allows practice educators to link areas of observed practice to required outcomes. Practice educators also have further information relating to desired outcomes within their own handbook. During meetings with students and key stakeholders, all were able to articulate their understanding of learning outcomes successfully. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

61. The university outlined how the addition of the course would support their overarching ethos to give back to the city and had been developed to follow principles of anti-oppressive, non-discriminatory practice. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence which highlighted how the programme outline and teaching sessions match with the intent of the course as highlighted in relevant guidance. Within the timetable outline, the addition of specialist staff supports the development of key knowledge and there was a recognition that the academic and professional background of staff within the university would complement course delivery. As with standard 2.6, inspectors agreed that it was imperative that the university provide evidence that participation of specialist speakers and lecturers had been confirmed, and so agreed the condition applied to 2.6 was relevant to this standard also. Full details of the condition can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 3.3

62. The course provider outlined how the structure of the course had been designed in a way that would support the integration of theory and practice. Interspersing taught content with periods of placement ensures that students can apply new knowledge directly to their practice on an ongoing basis. Course tutors are also able to scaffold learning that takes place on placement and provide a supportive structure for students to debrief in a group setting and share common experiences and any disparities following placement. In addition to the course structure practice educators recognised that the integration of theory into practice is a key responsibility within their role. Students from other courses within the university highlighted the significance of the relationship with their practice educator in ensuring they regularly adapt their approach based upon recognised theory. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

63. Within the proposed programme overview, the inspection team observed that specific sessions focused upon exploring the role of the AMHP within the current climate. This includes sessions relating to current legislation, the law and the future of the Mental Health Act. The inspection team also observed that literature listed within the course reading list was relevant and up to date, something that is supported by the use of specialist staff comprising of current and practising AMHP's.

64. Documentary evidence provided by the university also included details about staff development to ensure their practice remains current, and the quality assurance and monitoring mechanisms in place ensure all stakeholders have the opportunity to contribute towards course development. The course will also be subject to the university's review cycle

which allows for modifications to be proposed to ensure course content remains accurate and up to date. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

65. Within the course handbook, students are made aware of the requirement to maintain the professional standards of their registered profession in their role as an AMHP. The university outlines the necessary code of conduct for the course and has embedded conduct issues into taught content. Within the course handbook, students are also made aware of university fitness to practice procedures and how these are managed by the university. The selection process is robust and ensures appropriate checks of registration are incorporated into this.

66. During meetings with students who have studied on previous versions of the course, it was noted that all maintained their professional identity and were able to articulate how their professional background contributes to their role as an AMHP. Partners from the local authority also agreed that the course has delivered a good quality of AMHP in their experience and the plans for the university to enhance delivery will further support the calibre of staff obtaining the qualification. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.6

67. Reference to the autonomous and reflective thinking is seen throughout the course handbook and module specifications with particular emphasis seen within assessment guidance. Students have the opportunity to reflect upon their practice and decision-making during group and 1:1 tutorials throughout the course and also through the relationship with practice educators. During meetings with practice educators and students, the inspection team heard how there is a focus on students steering discussions within supervision as they progress through the course, and this is highlighted within course material. A specific example of autonomous thinking was given by a previous student who reflected upon a time when they had to stand by a decision made within practice, providing justification for their reasons for doing so. Other students were also able to provide reflections upon their own journey to developing autonomous thinking during the course with all feeling well prepared for practice upon completion. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

68. Evidence-based practice can be seen throughout learning outcomes for the course and is specifically highlighted within two of the three module specifications seen within documentary evidence. There are further examples of students using evidence-based practice through assignment briefs, and the reading list supplied to the inspection team also showed that there was relevant literature included which supported the development of

this skill. The added resource of academic liaison librarians supports students to recognise the skill required to interrogate evidence, and added resources seen through the virtual learning environment guide students' own development. Staff involved in course delivery highlighted how students are regularly required to reflect upon evidence relating to AMHP practice, write up their thoughts and discuss these with peers, academics and professionals to enable them to explore their thoughts and interpretations. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

69. Documentary evidence highlighted a diverse range of teaching methods being used across the course with delivery from a range of suitably qualified professionals. The current programme outline does not include current university staff in proposed delivery, however the course team provided evidence of staff research and professional backgrounds which demonstrated how their expertise could enhance the current course model. It had been suggested that university staff could first observe teaching on the course for their own professional development before becoming more involved in course delivery.

70. Within the proposed model, the inspection team found examples of sessions with practising AMHP's, people with lived experience of social work and psychologists. Further to this there was a variety of learning experiences outlined such as role play, group workshops and group tutorials to cater for different learning styles. The course team also outlined plans for simulation events using facilities such as court rooms which are available on campus. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Practice placements

Standard 4.1

71. Following review of documentation and through meetings with key stakeholders, the inspection team were assured that practice placements are integral to course delivery. Practice learning is embedded within at least 50% of the course, an equivalent of 37 days. Placements are allocated in between taught blocks to ensure that students can consistently apply and reflect upon theory in a supportive manner. Expectations and learning outcomes for placements are clear and this is supported by the outline of AMHP competencies, which are explored within the learning agreement meeting at the start of placement and reviewed at the mid and end point meeting. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.2

72. As outlined within standard 4.1, all students are expected to complete a minimum of 37 days of placement during the course. The partnership model with ELMHTP ensures that there is always adequate placement provision with AMHP leads on the management board working collaboratively to place students. The inspection team queried whether students

will be placed in a different local authority than the one in which they work for placement. Leads from the local authority explained that this had been usual practice historically however due to the pandemic, some adjustments were made which meant students stayed in their home authority. Learning from this had led both employers and the university to reflect upon best practice with there being an agreement that working in a different team within the same authority can be beneficial, as students do not need to learn new computer systems or be set up with alternative login details during placement. It was confirmed within the partnership that negotiation would always be available in relation to placement should students benefit from an entirely different local authority experience.

73. The university outlined their experience in working with different placement providers for other courses within the social work department. The inspection team were able to review documentation which provides practical information from the university in relation to placement and it was agreed that this would be replicated for the new course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.3

74. As many students work within the local authority in which they are employed, they are subject to the same policies and processes as within their substantive post. Despite this, the university provided an outline of how they will quality assure placements, taking guidance and structures from established social work courses. This will include placement audit forms to be completed by a member of university staff prior to placements commencing. Once placements are agreed, employers will be expected to sign agreements which set out clear expectations for both employer and student for the placement duration. The university also added that course team staff or academic tutors will attend placement agreement and review meetings to ensure that they are appropriate. Furthermore, any new placement partners will be agreed by the management board prior to student allocation. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

75. As outlined in standard 4.3, the university have established quality assurance mechanisms in place for placements which are used on other courses within the department. These are managed by a placement officer who will also support with processes on the new course. These mechanisms have been effective in gathering feedback from placement leads, practice educators and students and have allowed issues to be addressed should they occur. Whilst there has been discussion between AMHP leads regarding the implementation of these policies, there is not yet formalised documentation in place that recognises the differences for the new course. As with standard 2.3, the inspection team felt that there was some reliance upon verbal agreement at this stage and that there needed to be clarity in relation to timescales for quality assurance and details of people responsible. Therefore, it was agreed that the condition in relation to standard 2.3

was also appropriate in this instance. Full details of the condition can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.5

76. The university provided a range of documentation to evidence how they ensure appropriate EDI policies are implemented across the course and through wider university networks. Whilst there is reference to policies relating to EDI within placement agreement meetings and employers confirmed individual organisations have policies in place, there was not currently a mechanism to check these nor a schedule for reviewing their effectiveness. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.6

77. The local authorities currently involved in the partnership ensure that all students are placed either within a dedicated AMHP team or in a neighbourhood mental health team that has an AMHP working within it. This is further supported by students having ongoing access to the AMHP lead for their local authority (who also sits on the management board) as well as a practice educator who holds a current warrant as an AMHP. All placements offer regular opportunities for shadowing and all decisions are ratified by a qualified member of staff. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

78. The university provided evidence of its current practice educator programme for social work courses which largely recruits from the geographical area in which students are placed. For practice educators who have not completed training through the university, a detailed CV which details qualifications and professional registration is required. As practice educators for the course may come from different professional backgrounds, the university outlined the provision of annual training to enable them to support students. This is seen as a requirement for all practice educators, even if the training has been completed previously as it allows for sharing of course updates and a refresh of knowledge. This is supplemented by workshops which take place throughout the course so that key information relevant to the course can be shared.

79. In addition to the training outlined above, stakeholders explained that all AMHP's within local authorities are subject to an annual appraisal cycle which requires practising AMHP's to evidence an additional 18 hours of continuing professional development to enable them to maintain their warrant. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

80. As outlined in standard 4.7, all practice educators on the course are required to attend annual training to ensure their knowledge remains current. The inspection team heard that many practice educators on the course have completed their initial training with LMU before training to be an AMHP, followed by an AMHP practice educator, 2 years post qualification. The university outlined its aspiration to maintain ongoing study development opportunities with practitioners to allow them to use credits to top up their qualification to a master's degree at a later date. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

81. Documentary evidence provided by the university outlined how all practice educators must provide details of their registration to enable them to work with students, with the relevant professional bodies listed within course documentation. Further to this, all local authorities involved in the partnership provide a further layer of assurance by maintaining records of practicing AMHP's following annual appraisal cycles. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

82. Through review of documentary evidence and discussion with key stakeholders, the inspection team heard details about the development of the management advisory board and plans for collaborative working. Representatives from the ELMHTP explained how previous versions of the course had lacked regular engagement from academic staff, however there was agreement from all members of the board that this would be a positive step following course approval.

83. Whilst there was a shared agreement that delivery of the course from the education provider would be a positive move and enhance provision for students, the inspection team noted that there was not currently a memorandum of understanding or terms of reference in place which detailed the remit of different stakeholders or their responsibilities within the course. The inspection team also heard about potential plans for growth of the course in the coming years, however it was unclear how this would be managed in the absence of detailed documentation which outlined the expectations for employers subscribing to the course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.11

84. The range of course documentation seen throughout the inspection provided clear guidance for students, placement providers and practice educators about the requirements for placement. The first two weeks of the course are also dedicated to induction which includes reference to placement and guidance on where to find important information whilst on placement. The course provider has ensured that information is bespoke to different roles and details of key contacts and lines of communication are established at the onset.

85. Placement expectations are further explored during the placement learning agreement meetings where students are notified of placement expectations, code of conduct, portfolio requirements, record keeping and key policies and procedures. Students continuously review these themes through supervision and can give feedback on their experience through regular feedback forms. The addition of the AMHP lead within local authorities also ensures that students have a named professional to approach should they experience placement difficulties which cannot be managed by their practice educator.

86. During meetings with stakeholders, there was further recognition of the pre-AMHP course being of added value to students undertaking the course as placement expectations are explored in detail through this. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met but felt that a recommendation in relation to clarifying the desirability or requirement of the pre-qualification would be helpful for prospective candidates. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.12

87. During placement, all students receive regular supervision through their practice educator who focuses upon professional autonomy and the development of responsibility, and increased risk-based decision making, throughout placement. Students were positive about this relationship and reported feeling that the tasks they were encouraged to take on were developmentally appropriate whilst under the supervision of an experienced AMHP. The position of safe and effective practice in relation to risk is highlighted through the course handbook and taught sessions, and further developed through assessments on the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

88. As outlined in standard 4.12, all students are subject to regular supervision on placement which encourages reflection and professional discussion about their role. Students are continuously encouraged to apply theory into their practice and all objectives in placement are linked to the overall AMHP competencies. The university further complements placement learning through their focus upon promoting awareness of diversity, unconscious bias and anti-oppressive practice which supports students to consider

the rights and needs of people with lived experience who they encounter during practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Assessment

Standard 5.1

89. The assessment strategy for the course is robust and includes a range of methods such as report writing, case study analysis, observations and formal examinations. Assessment topics include working with service users and their families, review of legislation, mental health act assessment reports, preparation for tribunals and scrutiny of legal documentation. The inspection team agreed that the methods and topics were appropriate to meet the demands of the role and therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

90. The university confirmed that they will have academic oversight of all assessments and that they have appropriate online systems which will support timely and effective feedback for students. All assessments will be double marked by a combination of practitioners within the partnership as well as university staff and less experienced staff will be paired with more experienced markers. All those involved in marking are to be provided with an assessor form which details the areas in which feedback should be given, this is supplemented with additional guidance to ensure that feedback is detailed. Marking will be overseen by the course leads to ensure consistency and a practice assessment panel will review placement judgements and portfolios.

91. Inspectors agreed that the approach outlined by the university was appropriate, however, as outlined in previous standards, there was not a memorandum of understanding or similar agreement in place which outlined the expectation of practitioners involved in the course in relation to marking and assessment. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 5.3

92. Details of assessments provided within documentary evidence demonstrated that there is a clear link between real life practice issues within assessments which will develop the skills required to practice as an AMHP. The inspection team noted that the addition of a law exam within the assessment strategy was essential, as in-depth knowledge of the law is integral to the AMHP role. All assessments are closely linked to the AMHP competencies and there is a clear understanding of the need to maintain these post qualification. There is also

a clear link between assessments and the development of autonomy and decision making. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

93. The university provided evidence of how a series of formative and summative assessments had been devised that link closely to the learning outcomes of the course. Both students and staff within placements can access details of assessment activities through module specifications and also understand the rationale for the assessment design. The weighting of different assessments is also detailed within the module specifications as is the expected preparation time. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

94. The university will ensure that marking of assessments is objective by operating an anonymised marking system. Assessor forms and guidance ensures that there is consistency in the approach to marking and this has been replicated through observation forms which are used to inform performance on placement. The university has established networks which will be extended to the course where practitioners and academics can share best practice, and regular workshops which will be delivered via the university will ensure that knowledge in relation to observation and assessment is regularly updated. As with standards 4.10 and 5.2, the inspection team felt that it is necessary for the university to develop documentation which outlines the expectation of all involved in marking assessments and providing feedback which all involved in the course commit to. It was therefore agreed that the condition linked to these standards was also applicable to standard 5.5. Full details of the condition can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Standard 5.6

95. The university outlined how the course will be subject to wider institutional monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards. This will be further supported at a course level where the university will implement the practice of holding post assessment forums with all stakeholders to review observations of assessments and obtain feedback. This will then feed into the development and review of course delivery and the assessment strategy to ensure it remains fit for purpose. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

96. The inspection team were able to review the programme specification for the course which provided a clear outline of module progression, credit structure and learning outcomes covered. This was supported by an in-depth breakdown of the assessment strategy provided by the university in a presentation to the inspection team. During meetings with students who have previously completed the course, there was an in-depth

awareness of progression both for academic and placement-based assessment. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

97. Assessment regulations within the programme specification specified that 60 credits from all modules are required to gain the award and an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for recognition as an AMHP. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.9

98. Information in relation to the right of appeal for students is contained within the course handbook and programme specification. The university provided full details of their appeals policy within documentary evidence which is also linked on the website. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.10

99. Documentation provided by the university outlined the provision of an external examiner employed for their social work courses with appropriate registration. There is the intention to recruit an external examiner who is also a qualified AMHP to the course, however they are not yet in post. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions](#) section of this report.

Proposed outcome

The inspection team recommend that the course be approved with conditions. These will be monitored for completion.

Conditions

Conditions for approval are set if there are areas of a course that do not currently meet our standards. Conditions must be met by the education provider within the agreed timescales.

Having considered whether approval with conditions or a refusal of approval was an appropriate course of action, the inspection team are proposing the following conditions for this course at this time.

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 2.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates who is included in the course team, along with job titles and lines of responsibility.	16/03/2023	Paragraph 37
2	Standards 2.3, 4.4	The education provider will provide evidence of a formalised process that details quality assurance activities for the course along with assurance that these have been shared and understood by all stakeholders involved in delivery.	16/03/2023	Paragraph 39 Paragraph 75
3	Standard 2.4	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that a job description has been developed for the course lead which is bespoke to the needs of the course.	Within 3 months of the regulator decision.	Paragraph 40
4	Standards 2.6, 3.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates a firm commitment from specialist staff who are involved in course delivery.	16/03/2023	Paragraph 42 Paragraph 61
5	Standard 4.5	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that policies required by placement providers are checked, agreed and reviewed by university staff.	16/03/2023	Paragraph 76

6	Standard 4.10, 5.2, 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates a formalised agreement, that includes processes in relation to the remit and expectations of all stakeholders involved in the management and delivery of the course.	16/03/2023	Paragraph 83 Paragraph 91 Paragraph 94
7	Standard 5.10	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates an appropriately qualified external examiner has been appointed.	Within 3 months of the regulator decision.	Paragraph 99

Recommendations

In addition to the conditions above, the inspectors identified the following recommendations for the education provider. These recommendations highlight areas that the education provider may wish to consider. The recommendations do not affect any decision relating to course approval.

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	Standard 4.11	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider formalising the expectation of the pre-AMHP course within admissions processes.	Paragraph 86

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Table breakdown of standards met during preapproval and inspection.

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
Admissions			
1.1 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 course.	☒	☐	☐
1.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards.	☒	☐	☐
1.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.	☒	☐	☐
1.4 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.	☒	☐	☐
Course management and resources			
2.1 The course must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.	☒	☐	☐
2.2 The course must be effectively managed.	☐	☒	☐
2.3 The course must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.	☐	☒	☐
2.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the course	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of an appropriate professional register.			
2.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective course.	☒	☐	☐
2.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.	☐	☒	☐
2.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.	☒	☐	☐
2.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.	☒	☐	☐
2.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the course.	☒	☐	☐
2.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.	☒	☐	☐
2.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.	☒	☐	☐
2.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.	☒	☐	☐
2.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
2.14 Throughout the duration of the course, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.	☒	☐	☐
2.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the course.	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum			
3.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the course meet the criteria in part 2.	☒	☐	☐
3.2 The course must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.	☐	☒	☐
3.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.	☒	☐	☐
3.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of Social Work England's professional standards and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP.	☒	☐	☐
3.6 The delivery of the course must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.	☒	☐	☐
3.7 The delivery of the course must encourage evidence-based practice.	☒	☐	☐
3.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
Practice placements			
4.1 Practice placements must be integral to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.	☒	☐	☐
4.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.	☒	☐	☐
4.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.	☐	☒	☐
4.5 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.	☐	☒	☐
4.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff at the practice placement setting.	☐	☐	☐
4.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.	☒	☐	☐
4.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.	☒	☐	☐
4.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.	☒	☐	☐
4.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
4.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of: – the learning outcomes to be achieved; – the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained; – expectations of professional conduct; – the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and – communication and lines of responsibility.	☒	☐	☒
4.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.	☒	☐	☐
4.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.	☒	☐	☐
Assessment			
5.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the course has met the competencies set out in part 2 of the criteria.	☒	☐	☐
5.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.	☐	☒	☐
5.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not met - Condition applied	Recommendation given
the education setting and practice placement setting.			
5.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.	☒	☐	☐
5.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective practice as an AMHP.	☐	☒	☐
5.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.	☒	☐	☐
5.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.	☒	☐	☐
5.8 Assessment regulations must clearly specify that any requirements for an aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.	☒	☐	☐
5.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.	☒	☐	☐
5.10 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.	☐	☒	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions.

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure education providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the [education and training standards](#).

Inspectors will undertake the conditions review and make recommendations to Social Work England's decision maker.

This section of the report will be completed when the conditions review is completed.

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1	2.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates who is included in the course team, along with job titles and lines of responsibility.	
2	Standards 2.3, 4.4	The education provider will provide evidence of a formalised process that details quality assurance activities for the course along with assurance that these have been shared and understood by all stakeholders involved in delivery.	
3	Standard 2.4	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that a job description has been developed for the course lead which is bespoke to the needs of the course.	
4	Standards 2.6, 3.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates a firm commitment from specialist staff who are involved in course delivery.	
5	Standard 4.5	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that policies required by placement providers are checked, agreed and reviewed by university staff.	
6	Standard 4.10, 5.2, 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates a formalised agreement, that includes processes in relation to the remit and expectations of all stakeholders involved in the management and delivery of the course.	

7	Standard 5.10	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates an appropriately qualified external examiner has been appointed.	
---	---------------	---	--

Findings

In relation to the condition set against standard 2.2, the course provider submitted a copy of an organogram which detailed job roles and lines of accountability, a selection of CV's for members of the course team and a timetable for the course which outlined taught sessions along with details of staff involved in delivery. The inspection team agreed that the evidence provided confirmed that an suitably qualified course team was in place and that there were appropriate management structures in place. The inspection team agreed that the condition was now met.

In relation to the condition set against standards 2.3 and 4.4, the course provider submitted a range of documentation which demonstrated how quality assurance activities for the course would be managed. The course provider explained that the proposed processes had been based upon the systems in place for already established undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that were running within the university. Documentation provided assured the inspection team that both students and Practice Educators (P.E's) would be required to complete specific quality assurance documentation relating to placement. In addition, there was evidence of the expectations of all placement providers involved in offering provision to students on the course to ensure consistency of experience. The course provider explained that monthly meetings with AMHP leads and training leads for the 5 boroughs involved in the delivery of the course provided opportunity for processes and expectations to be shared and agreed. The inspection team agreed that this condition was now met.

In relation to the condition set against standard 2.4, the course provider submitted a copy of the job description for the course lead. Following review of the job description, the inspection team agreed that it was comprehensive and outlined the appropriate qualification required to undertake the role alongside details of necessary experience. There was also clarity provided in relation to the expectations of the role including academic leadership, oversight of quality assurance activity, admissions and recruitment and course management. The inspection team agreed that this condition was now met.

In relation to the condition set against standards 2.6 and 3.2, the course provider submitted a copy of their programme timetable which included details of specialist staff who had been commissioned to support with the delivery of the course. The course provider indicated only one change to the proposed timetable with all other partners having confirmed their

commitment to support. As a result, the inspection team agreed that this condition was now met.

In relation to the condition applied against standard 4.5, the inspection team were able to review copies of an updated new placement agreement form and an adapted new placement audit form. Within the documentation provided, there was detail provided of the requirement for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies, access arrangements, provision of equipment for students and a complaints procedure. All placement forms have oversight from a university representative and overall responsibility for quality assurance and checks of placement agreements, via an annual audit, remain the responsibility of the university. As a result, the inspection team agreed that this condition was now met.

In relation to the condition set against standards 4.10, 5.2 and 5.5, the course provider submitted a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that had been developed and agreed with all partner agencies involved in delivery. Within the MoU, the university outlined the nature of cooperation for agencies which described the intention to collaborate on the management and delivery of the Postgraduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Practice. This included the responsibilities of the partner agency in relation to course fees, supervision, practice education and representation at the management board for the course. The inspection team were satisfied that the condition was now met.

In relation to the condition applied against standard 5.10, the course provider submitted details, including a CV, of the appointed External Examiner (EE) for the course. The inspection team were satisfied that the appointed EE was appropriately qualified and on the register and therefore agreed that the condition was now met.

Regulator decision

Approved.