Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	18 – 19 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 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 education provider and validating body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - MA Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	40 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derek Milligan (Brunel University)
Secretary	Sally McKinley (Brunel University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Dear (Internal Panel Member) Mihail Danov (Internal Panel Member) Aidan Worsley (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current setting of regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted several instances of unclear or inaccurate references to the HCPC and the setting of professional regulation for social workers in England. For instance, the student handbook (page 21) states that, "Aegrotat awards are not acceptable as a licence for practice…". The reference to a 'licence for practice' is inconsistent with the current terminology for professional registration of social workers in England and could therefore mislead students. The visitors also noted that the programme specification states; "All successful candidates will be required to complete an Assessed and Supported Year in employment with the relevant employer." Such statements may be misinterpreted by students to mean that the ASYE is compulsory, or that it is a requirement for HCPC registration. The report from the Brunel Experts by Experience Committee (BEC) submitted with the documentation also stated on page 5; "There is an Annual Grant from HCPC." This statement is incorrect. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review all references to the HCPC and to the requirements of students following successful completion of the programme, to ensure that the documentation supporting the delivery of the programme is consistently accurate and clear.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the principles behind the policy for allocation of practice placements for students on the programme are clearly articulated and ensure parity of student experience.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence that this standard of education and training (SET) will be met. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. The students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities, and that being placed in a statutory setting was largely down to 'luck'. The students also discussed delayed start dates of some placements, which may result in disadvantage where they cannot complete the placement in time for the Examination Board. The visitors noted from page

28 of the Developing Professional Practice Handbook (First Placement), that students have access to the broad criteria that are used in matching placements to students, and in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard how the practice learning team and placement providers use these criteria in practice with the student profiles. However, from discussion with the students, there was a significant lack of understanding as to the principles underpinning the arrangements for allocation of placements, particularly how fairness is ensured in allocating statutory placements and reasons behind delays to placement start dates. There was also a lack of understanding as to the reasons why students were not able to identify and arrange their own placements. This standard requires the programme to ensure that all parties are prepared for the placement and understand the information around the placements they will be allocated to. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the students are prepared for placement with relevant information of the type of placement experiences they can expect and the ways in which the programme team ensure fairness in the allocation of practice placements.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must further develop the policy around discontinuation of placements, and ensure that this is clearly communicated to students and placement providers.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team tabled some further documentation, including a 'Policy for non-viable / discontinued placements'. The visitors noted that the policy states that in certain circumstances where a placement is discontinued early due to reasons that are not the fault of the student, evidence and practice placement days can be carried forward. The policy outlined that this is dependent on there being no more than 50 days carried over, to ensure that the second placement is feasible. In discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors questioned the reason for the 50 day threshold, and highlighted situations which could arise that would render this figure in the policy potentially problematic or unfair for the student concerned. The programme team indicated at the visit that they would reconsider this policy and its implementation. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the policy applicable to discontinued or non-viable placements is robust and fair, and communicated clearly to the relevant parties in preparation for placements.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to monitor the perception of part time placement tutors for students and ensure the allocation process is implemented fairly and communicated clearly.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information about practice tutors, who support students in placements. The visitors were confident that the support given to students on placements, including support through this role, was meeting this standard. However, in the meeting with students, the fact that some practice tutors were part of the programme team, and some were part time or external tutors, was discussed. It was clear to the visitors that the perception across the students present was that practice tutors varied in their accessibility or availability to students, and part time practice tutors would tend not to be as readily available as those on the academic staff. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard how the practice tutors are allocated and managed to ensure that they have experience relevant to the specific placement, and are able to provide the necessary support to students. The visitors advise the programme team to further communicate this allocation process to students, to ensure that they understand the considerations process and the reasons why a particular practice tutor is allocated to support them. The programme team are also advised to monitor the student perception of practice tutor availability, particularly for externally contracted practice tutors.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that all students are fully aware of the arrangements around access to qualified social workers in non-statutory placements.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence against this standard of education and training (SET). The visitors were confident that the approval and monitoring of placements ensures that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in the placement settings. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. As stated in the condition against SET 5.11, the students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities. The visitors heard one representative of the student group explain how they asked their placement supervisor to seek out and arrange some opportunities to work alongside, or shadow qualified social workers, when on a non-statutory placement. In discussion with the placement providers, the voluntary, private and independent placement provider representatives outlined how they are able to provide students with statutory experience, opportunities to work closely with qualified social workers, and shadowing of qualified social workers where requested. The visitors recommend that the programme team ensure all students are made more aware of the

opportunities and associated arrangements that are available for them to access experience with qualified social workers when in non-statutory placements.

<div align="right">
Christine Stogdon
Patricia Higham
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	18 – 19 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 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 education provider and validating body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 per year inclusive of students from the Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derek Milligan (Brunel University)
Secretary	Sally McKinley (Brunel University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Dear (Internal Panel Member) Mihail Danov (Internal Panel Member) Aidan Worsley (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current setting of regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted several instances of unclear or inaccurate references to the HCPC and the setting of professional regulation for social workers in England. For instance, the student handbook (page 19) states that, "Aegrotat awards are not acceptable as a licence for practice…". The reference to a 'licence for practice' is inconsistent with the current terminology for professional registration of social workers in England and could therefore mislead students. The visitors also noted that the programme specification states; "All successful candidates will be required to complete an Assessed and Supported Year in employment with the relevant employer." Such statements may be misinterpreted by students to mean that the ASYE is compulsory, or that it is a requirement for HCPC registration. The report from the Brunel Experts by Experience Committee (BEC) submitted with the documentation also stated on page 5; "There is an Annual Grant from HCPC." This statement is incorrect. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review all references to the HCPC and to the requirements of students following successful completion of the programme, to ensure that the documentation supporting the delivery of the programme is consistently accurate and clear.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the principles behind the policy for allocation of practice placements for students on the programme are clearly articulated and ensure parity of student experience.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence that this standard of education and training (SET) will be met. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. The students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities, and that being placed in a statutory setting was largely down to 'luck'. The students also discussed delayed start dates of some placements, which may result in disadvantage where they cannot complete the placement in time for the Examination Board. The visitors noted from page

28 of the Developing Professional Practice Handbook (First Placement), that students have access to the broad criteria that are used in matching placements to students, and in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard how the practice learning team and placement providers use these criteria in practice with the student profiles. However, from discussion with the students, there was a significant lack of understanding as to the principles underpinning the arrangements for allocation of placements, particularly how fairness is ensured in allocating statutory placements and reasons behind delays to placement start dates. There was also a lack of understanding as to the reasons why students were not able to identify and arrange their own placements. This standard requires the programme to ensure that all parties are prepared for the placement and understand the information around the placements they will be allocated to. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the students are prepared for placement with relevant information of the type of placement experiences they can expect and the ways in which the programme team ensure fairness in the allocation of practice placements.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must further develop the policy around discontinuation of placements, and ensure that this is clearly communicated to students and placement providers.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team tabled some further documentation, including a 'Policy for non-viable / discontinued placements'. The visitors noted that the policy states that in certain circumstances where a placement is discontinued early due to reasons that are not the fault of the student, evidence and practice placement days can be carried forward. The policy outlined that this is dependent on there being no more than 50 days carried over, to ensure that the second placement is feasible. In discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors questioned the reason for the 50 day threshold, and highlighted situations which could arise that would render this figure in the policy potentially problematic or unfair for the student concerned. The programme team indicated at the visit that they would reconsider this policy and its implementation. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the policy applicable to discontinued or non-viable placements is robust and fair, and communicated clearly to the relevant parties in preparation for placements.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to monitor the perception of part time placement tutors for students and ensure the allocation process is implemented fairly and communicated clearly.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information about practice tutors, who support students in placements. The visitors were confident that the support given to students on placements, including support through this role, was meeting this standard. However, in the meeting with students, the fact that some practice tutors were part of the programme team, and some were part time or external tutors, was discussed. It was clear to the visitors that the perception across the students present was that practice tutors varied in their accessibility or availability to students, and part time practice tutors would tend not to be as readily available as those on the academic staff. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard how the practice tutors are allocated and managed to ensure that they have experience relevant to the specific placement, and are able to provide the necessary support to students. The visitors advise the programme team to further communicate this allocation process to students, to ensure that they understand the considerations process and the reasons why a particular practice tutor is allocated to support them. The programme team are also advised to monitor the student perception of practice tutor availability, particularly for externally contracted practice tutors.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that all students are fully aware of the arrangements around access to qualified social workers in non-statutory placements.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence against this standard of education and training (SET). The visitors were confident that the approval and monitoring of placements ensures that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in the placement settings. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. As stated in the condition against SET 5.11, the students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities. The visitors heard one representative of the student group explain how they asked their placement supervisor to seek out and arrange some opportunities to work alongside, or shadow qualified social workers, when on a non-statutory placement. In discussion with the placement providers, the voluntary, private and independent placement provider representatives outlined how they are able to provide students with statutory experience, opportunities to work closely with qualified social workers, and shadowing of qualified social workers where requested. The visitors recommend that the programme team ensure all students are made more aware of the

opportunities and associated arrangements that are available for them to access experience with qualified social workers when in non-statutory placements.

Christine Stogdon
Patricia Higham

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Brunel University
Programme name	Post Graduate 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	18 – 19 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 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 education provider and validating body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Christine Stogdon (Social worker)
	Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 per year inclusive of students from the MA Social Work programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derek Milligan (Brunel University)
Secretary	Sally McKinley (Brunel University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Dear (Internal Panel Member)
	Mihail Danov (Internal Panel Member)
	Aidan Worsley (External Panel Member)
	Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work)
	Jim Greer (The College of Social Work)
	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current setting of regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted several instances of unclear or inaccurate references to the HCPC and the setting of professional regulation for social workers in England. For instance, the student handbook (page 19) states that, "Aegrotat awards are not acceptable as a licence for practice…". The reference to a 'licence for practice' is inconsistent with the current terminology for professional registration of social workers in England and could therefore mislead students. The visitors also noted that the programme specification states; "All successful candidates will be required to complete an Assessed and Supported Year in employment with the relevant employer." Such statements may be misinterpreted by students to mean that the ASYE is compulsory, or that it is a requirement for HCPC registration. The report from the Brunel Experts by Experience Committee (BEC) submitted with the documentation also stated on page 5; "There is an Annual Grant from HCPC." This statement is incorrect. The visitors therefore require the education provider to review all references to the HCPC and to the requirements of students following successful completion of the programme, to ensure that the documentation supporting the delivery of the programme is consistently accurate and clear.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the principles behind the policy for allocation of practice placements for students on the programme are clearly articulated and ensure parity of student experience.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence that this standard of education and training (SET) will be met. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. The students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities, and that being placed in a statutory setting was largely down to 'luck'. The students also discussed delayed start dates of some placements, which may result in disadvantage where they cannot complete the placement in time for the Examination Board. The visitors noted from page

28 of the Developing Professional Practice Handbook (First Placement), that students have access to the broad criteria that are used in matching placements to students, and in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard how the practice learning team and placement providers use these criteria in practice with the student profiles. However, from discussion with the students, there was a significant lack of understanding as to the principles underpinning the arrangements for allocation of placements, particularly how fairness is ensured in allocating statutory placements and reasons behind delays to placement start dates. There was also a lack of understanding as to the reasons why students were not able to identify and arrange their own placements. This standard requires the programme to ensure that all parties are prepared for the placement and understand the information around the placements they will be allocated to. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the students are prepared for placement with relevant information of the type of placement experiences they can expect and the ways in which the programme team ensure fairness in the allocation of practice placements.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must further develop the policy around discontinuation of placements, and ensure that this is clearly communicated to students and placement providers.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team tabled some further documentation, including a 'Policy for non-viable / discontinued placements'. The visitors noted that the policy states that in certain circumstances where a placement is discontinued early due to reasons that are not the fault of the student, evidence and practice placement days can be carried forward. The policy outlined that this is dependent on there being no more than 50 days carried over, to ensure that the second placement is feasible. In discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors questioned the reason for the 50 day threshold, and highlighted situations which could arise that would render this figure in the policy potentially problematic or unfair for the student concerned. The programme team indicated at the visit that they would reconsider this policy and its implementation. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the policy applicable to discontinued or non-viable placements is robust and fair, and communicated clearly to the relevant parties in preparation for placements.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to monitor the perception of part time placement tutors for students and ensure the allocation process is implemented fairly and communicated clearly.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information about practice tutors, who support students in placements. The visitors were confident that the support given to students on placements, including support through this role, was meeting this standard. However, in the meeting with students, the fact that some practice tutors were part of the programme team, and some were part time or external tutors, was discussed. It was clear to the visitors that the perception across the students present was that practice tutors varied in their accessibility or availability to students, and part time practice tutors would tend not to be as readily available as those on the academic staff. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard how the practice tutors are allocated and managed to ensure that they have experience relevant to the specific placement, and are able to provide the necessary support to students. The visitors advise the programme team to further communicate this allocation process to students, to ensure that they understand the considerations process and the reasons why a particular practice tutor is allocated to support them. The programme team are also advised to monitor the student perception of practice tutor availability, particularly for externally contracted practice tutors.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should ensure that all students are fully aware of the arrangements around access to qualified social workers in non-statutory placements.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Developing Professional Practice Handbook as evidence against this standard of education and training (SET). The visitors were confident that the approval and monitoring of placements ensures that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff in the placement settings. However, in discussion with the students at the visit, the visitors heard that students were not clear as to how the programme team allocate placements to students and ensure that there is equity in this allocation process. As stated in the condition against SET 5.11, the students discussed their perception that those who were allocated a placement in a statutory setting were at a significant advantage in accessing learning opportunities. The visitors heard one representative of the student group explain how they asked their placement supervisor to seek out and arrange some opportunities to work alongside, or shadow qualified social workers, when on a non-statutory placement. In discussion with the placement providers, the voluntary, private and independent placement provider representatives outlined how they are able to provide students with statutory experience, opportunities to work closely with qualified social workers, and shadowing of qualified social workers where requested. The visitors recommend that the programme team ensure all students are made more aware of the

opportunities and associated arrangements that are available for them to access experience with qualified social workers when in non-statutory placements.

Christine Stogdon
Patricia Higham

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	City College Norwich
Validating body / Awarding body	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BA (Hons) Applied Social Work
Mode of delivery	Flexible (Top up)
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 5 June 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their endorsement of the programme.

The full time route is a three year programme leading to the award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Work.

The flexible route is a stepped pathway through the programme. The education provider refers to this programme as the 'Top up' pathway. Students apply and complete each academic level in turn. At the end of Level 4 they will exit with a Certificate HE in Social Care Practice. They then are able to re-join Level 5 when they will exit with a Diploma HE in Social Care Practice. Those who wish to continue through to Level 6 are required to complete assessed practice placements and skills days to meet the national standards beforehand. They will complete with a final award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Work. Only students with completed Levels 4, 5 and 6 from City College Norwich will be awarded with the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work.

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work (Full time) programme. 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. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Teresa Rogers (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year inclusive of students from full and flexible (Top up) route
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Erica Towner (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Sally Whittaker (City College Norwich)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Kausar Iqbal (The College of Social Work) Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process for applying accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) to students transferring from other programmes.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to transfer from Diploma HE in Social Care Practice to this programme will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the education provider's policies in place for mapping credits and exemption for modules. Students will also be subject to the programme's selection procedures and an assessment to prove that they have met the required learning outcomes in order to be accepted on the programme. The visitors were therefore content that the education provider has processes in place for applying AP(E)L at all levels of the programme. However, they were unclear from reading the documentation if potential applicants were informed clearly about these AP(E)L processes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the formal processes for AP(E)L, as discussed at the visit, are clearly articulated in programme documentation to be satisfied potential applicants will understand how AP(E)L polices and processes will work.

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

Condition: The programme team need to clarify the person who has overall professional responsibility for the management of the programme and ensure that they are consistently referenced throughout the programme documentation.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit it was clarified that the programme leader is Alison Lamont not Fern Farr. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that Alison Lamont is an HCPC registered social worker. However, from the review of the documentation the visitors could not determine who the programme leader is for this programme. The visitors therefore the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure they reflect Alison Lamont as the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and therefore meet this SET.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From review of the programme documentation and meetings with students and the programme team the visitors learnt that students are not allowed to retake any modules of the programme and if students fail the re-sit they will not be allowed to progress on to the programme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt the education provider's progression policy stipulated students will not be allowed to progress if they failed any of the modules for the programme. However, the visitors could not see if these requirements for progression are made clear to students in the documentation. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revisit their programme documentation to ensure this information is clearly articulated to students so that they are aware of the requirements for progression including arrangements for taking any re-sits.

Graeme Currie
Teresa Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	City College Norwich
Validating body / Awarding body	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BA (Hons) Applied Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 5 June 2014.

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 endorsement of the programme.

The full time route is a three year programme leading to the award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Work.

The flexible route is a stepped pathway through the programme. The education provider refers to this programme as the 'Top up' pathway. Students apply and complete each academic level in turn. At the end of Level 4 they will exit with a Certificate HE in Social Care Practice. They then are able to re-join Level 5 when they will exit with a Diploma HE in Social Care Practice. Those who wish to continue through to Level 6 are required to complete assessed practice placements and skills days to meet the national standards beforehand. They will complete with a final award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Work. Only students with completed Levels 4, 5 and 6 from City College Norwich will be awarded with the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work.

The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work (flexible (top up)). 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. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Teresa Rogers (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year inclusive of students from full and flexible (Top up) route
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Erica Towner (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Sally Whittaker (City College Norwich)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Kausar Iqbal (The College of Social Work)

		Vicki Lawson- Brown (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process for applying accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) to students transferring from other programmes.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to transfer from Diploma HE in Social Care Practice to this programme will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the education provider's policies in place for mapping credits and exemption for modules. Students will also be subject to the programme's selection procedures and an assessment to prove that they have met the required learning outcomes in order to be accepted on the programme. The visitors were therefore content that the education provider has processes in place for applying AP(E)L at all levels of the programme. However, they were unclear from reading the documentation if potential applicants were informed clearly about these AP(E)L processes. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the formal processes for AP(E)L, as discussed at the visit, are clearly articulated in programme documentation to be satisfied potential applicants will understand how AP(E)L polices and processes will work.

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

Condition: The programme team need to clarify the person who has overall professional responsibility for the management of the programme and ensure that they are consistently referenced throughout the programme documentation.

Reason: From documentation and discussion at the visit it was clarified that the programme leader is Alison Lamont not Fern Farr. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that Alison Lamont is an HCPC registered social worker. However, from the review of the documentation the visitors could not determine who the programme leader is for this programme. The visitors therefore the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure they reflect Alison Lamont as the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and therefore meet this SET.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From review of the programme documentation and meetings with students and programme team the visitors learnt that students are not allowed to retake any modules of the programme and if students fail the re-sit they will not be allowed to progress on to the programme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt the education provider's progression policy stipulated students will not be allowed to progress if they failed any of the modules for the programme. However, the visitors could not see if these requirements for progression are made clear to students in the documentation. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revisit their programme documentation to ensure this information is clearly articulated to students so that they are aware of the requirements for progression including arrangements for taking any re-sits.

Graeme Currie
Teresa Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	North East London Mental Health Training Partnership
Validating body / Awarding body	University of East London
Programme name	PG Diploma Approved Mental Health Practice (Higher Specialist Award)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	2 – 3 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 13 May 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 27 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional) Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	15 per intake, once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Dr Alan White (University of East London)
Secretary	Adam Hall (University of East London)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as all teaching for the programme will take place at a new site, the Parkside Centre. The visitors were, however, provided with information regarding the new site of teaching and the facilities available to students and staff.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions information to clarify access to the programme for part time employees.

Reason: From a review of the admissions information provided, the visitors were unsure of the arrangements regarding part time employees applying to the programme, as the Application Pack 2013-14 stated that "if you are a part-time worker…you may be considered for the training programme on a part-time basis, but you must be able to attend the full block weeks of teaching" (page 11). As such, it was not clear what elements of the programme could be studied on a part time basis. At the visit, the visitors asked for clarity around this arrangement, and the programme team informed them that the programme would be taught on a full time basis, but applicants would have the opportunity to complete placements over a longer period of time if they worked on a part time basis within their local authority role, and this would ensure that the programme was accessible to part time workers. The visitors could not see evidence of where the details regarding this option was clearly communicated to applicants, and therefore further evidence is required to ensure that all potential applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions information to ensure that it relates to all applicants who are eligible to apply to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that some of the information related specifically to Social work applicants to the programme, for example in the Application Pack, it states that "all social work candidates that successfully complete the AMHP programme will receive the Post Graduate Diploma" (page 5). Whilst the visitors noted that the current cohort consists of only qualified Social workers, as this programme is also open to Occupational therapists, Practitioner psychologists, and Nurses, the visitors require the education provider to review all documentation, and ensure that the information provided relates to all eligible professions. The visitors also noted reference to the previous regulator for Social workers, the GSCC. The education provider should ensure that the current regulatory requirements for all eligible professions is reflected in the information provided to applicants. Additionally, the visitors noted that "The AMHP training programme counts towards social work post registration requirements" and "other professionals should consult their registration body about their own post registration requirements" (Application Pack, page 6). The visitors require further evidence that the information provided for one profession is equivalent to the information provided for the other professions, and therefore that all applicants, regardless of professional background, are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

A.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The education provider must revisit the information provided to applicants to clarify that AP(E)L does not apply for entry onto this programme.

Reason: From a review of the mapping document provided, the visitors noted under criteria A.3 that "there are no modules that can replace attendance for parts of the AMHP training and completion of assessed assignments". At the visit, the programme team confirmed that AP(E)L does not apply to this programme. From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see where applicants were informed that AP(E)L will not be considered as any entry route onto this programme, and therefore the visitors require further evidence that the AP(E)L requirements of the programme are accurately reflected in the admissions documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for AMHPs.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation, for example in the application pack, the selection board recording sheet and the consortium agreement, as well as references to 'GSCC/HCPC AMHP Competences' (Application pack, front cover). The GSCC no longer exists and therefore references to this body should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of AMHP programme regulation. At times in the documentation, the visitors noted reference to 'competencies'. It was not clear if this referred to the Mental Health Act competencies, or the competencies of the previous regulator. The visitors therefore require that all references to competencies are revised to clarify this for students. The visitors also noted references to the GSCC competencies, which have been replaced by the HCPC criteria, and references to the 'HCPC competencies' in the programme handbook (page 36). The visitors sought clarification with the programme team regarding this, who confirmed that students were being assessed against the HCPC criteria, and the terminology in the documentation is yet to be updated. The visitors therefore require that the programme team review all documentation relating to the programme, to ensure that all references to the GSCC, and GSCC competencies, are updated to the HCPC and HCPC criteria. This will ensure that the resources to support student learning are being effectively used, and students have a clearer understanding of the frameworks of assessment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding the learning outcomes that allow students to 'understand child and adult protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice' (Section 2 criterion 1.8).

Reason: From a review of the section 2 criteria mapping document, under criterion 1.8 the visitors were informed of training that the students complete regarding "legislation and children and adults" within the curriculum. This criterion relates specifically to child and adult protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice, and in discussion with the students at the visit, whilst they could identify learning regarding legislation, they could not identify how they were taught about procedures in relation to AMHP practice. From a review of the module descriptors, it also was not clear how the related learning outcomes ensured that this criterion would be met. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that as well as the information provided in the mapping document, students would be expected to have prior knowledge of this area through their working roles within the local authorities in the partnership. However, as this criterion requires students to understand child and adult protection procedures specifically in relation to AMHP practice, the visitors felt that further evidence was required to demonstrate where within the curriculum this learning takes place, and how the learning outcomes ensure that upon successful completion of the programme, students are able to meet all criteria in section 2.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the competencies set out in section 2 of the criteria

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding how student knowledge regarding child and adult protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice, (Section 2 criterion 1.8) is assessed on the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see where students were taught about child and adult protection procedures within the curriculum, and therefore how criterion 1.8 was being assessed within the programme. When the visitors asked the students how this was assessed, some students referred to the law assessment, whilst others indicated that it was not explicitly assessed. From a review of the documentation regarding the law assessment, the visitors could not see evidence that knowledge regarding child and adult protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice would be sufficiently assessed through this. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates where section 2 criterion 1.8 is assessed within the curriculum, and therefore that the assessment strategy and design ensures that upon successful completion of the programme, students are able to meet all criteria in section 2.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continues to monitor and evaluate the timing of assessments, to ensure that students continue to be given sufficient time to prepare for assessments.

Reason: From the information provided the visitors were satisfied that the mechanisms in place will ensure that appropriate standards are maintained in the assessment of students, and that this standard can be met by the programme. However, in discussion with the students, the visitors noted some concerns in regards to the timing of assessments. These concerns relate specifically to the period of the programme when the students return to work in their roles at the local authority, as conflict between expectations of usual workload and assessment requirements can arise. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the programme team continue to monitor the assessment timetable. In this way the team may be better able to ensure that students have the appropriate time to complete an assessment when they return to work, and have to undertake the assessment alongside their full workload.

Sheila Skelton
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Ruskin College
Validating body / Awarding body	The Open University
Programme name	BA (Honours) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work 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 endorsement of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	30 Full time once per year 6 Part time once per year
Chair	Alison Coleman (University of Salford)
Secretary	Guy Langton (Ruskin College)
Members of the joint panel	Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure potential applicants of the programme are given a complete range of information in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided and discussion at the visit included information about the admissions policies for the programme. Open days were highlighted as the main way to provide detailed information about the programme and the application process. The visitors did not receive any documentation regarding the open days prior to the visit. During discussions with the programme team the visitors highlighted the importance of providing full information about the programme so applicants are able to make informed decisions. This included information about:
- the application process requirements;
- the enhanced disclosure and barring service and medical clearance;
- the interview day, the written tests and group work to be completed; and
- all costs associated with travel, particularly in regards to placement.

The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the above information is communicated to potential applicants, to ensure that they are able to make an informed decision regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy outlined in their 'College Admission Policy', which is a generic college wide policy. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicant through this process. However, there is little information about it in the admissions information in relation to this programme. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors were also unable determine how the programme team actively monitor the AP(E)L process against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers, and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, the presentation on the open day given to potential applicants refers to an HCPC bursary on the slides. HCPC does not have any involvement with bursaries; these are set by the Department of Health. The visitors also noted on the 'social work student offer letter 2014' the Health and Care Professions Council were referred to as the 'Health and Care Practitioner'. Also, the visitors noted the programme handbook (page 28) states that the programme is 'accredited' by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation, and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as the statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation, and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought from students when they were required to participate as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. The visitors were made aware that during induction week, students were encouraged to develop 'ground rules' which they must abide to whilst on the programme. The education provider submitted the ground rule as evidence to meet this standard. However, the visitors were unable to determine within the 'ground rule' where consent was discussed and what protocols were in place for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved when students participated as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. The visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **3 be able to maintain fitness to practise**
    - 3.2 understand the importance of maintaining their own health and wellbeing
    - 3.3 understand both the need to keep skills and knowledge up to date and the importance of career- long learning
- **4 be able to exercise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**
    - 4.5 be able to make and receive referrals appropriately
- **9 be able to work appropriately with others**
    - 9.5 be able to support the development of networks, groups and communities to meet the needs and outcomes
- **15 be able to establish and maintain a safe practise environment**
    - 15.2 be aware of applicable health and safety legislations and any relevant safety policies and procedures in force at the workplace, such as incident reporting, and be able to act in accordance with these

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above standards of proficiency. Although the education provider completed a standard of proficiency mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above SOPs were being taught within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards of proficiency, specifically SOPs 3.2, 3.3, 4.5, 9.5, and 15.2 are addressed within the curriculum.

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

Condition: The programme team must provider further evidence on first year placement educators and how they ensure that those from the private voluntary sector have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and support social work students**.**

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that educators from the private voluntary sectors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this standard, the education provider referenced the submission document in their SETs mapping document. The visitors had the opportunity to meet with the practice educators from local authorities who explained how it applied to the local authority settings. Unfortunately there were no representatives at the meeting from the private voluntary sector and the visitors were unclear how the submission document ensured this standard is met in relation to those from the private voluntary sector. As a result, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures practice educators from private voluntary sectors have relevant knowledge, skills and experience and how these individuals were supported to supervise social work students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information on how they ensure that practice educators are appropriately registered. The visitors were given a list of practice educators used by the education provider, however their registration status was not always clear. The visitors were subsequently unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they were appropriately registered. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the requirements for registration or other arrangements for placement educators at each placement, and the processes in place for ensuring these are implemented and monitored.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **3 be able to maintain fitness to practise**
  - 3.2 understand the importance of maintaining their own health and wellbeing
  - 3.3 understand both the need to keep skills and knowledge up to date and the importance of career- long learning
- **4 be able to exercise as an autonomous professional, exercising their own professional judgement**
  - 4.5 be able to make and receive referrals appropriately
- **9 be able to work appropriately with others**
  - 9.5 be able to support the development of networks, groups and communities to meet the needs and outcomes
- **15 be able to establish and maintain a safe practise environment**
  - 15.2 be aware of applicable health and safety legislations and any relevant safety policies and procedures in force at the workplace, such as incident reporting, and be able to act in accordance with these

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the assessment of the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above standards of proficiency (SOPs). Although the education provider completed a standard of proficiency mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above SOPs were being taught and assessed within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning

outcomes ensure all standards of proficiency, specifically SOPs 3.2, 3.3, 4.5, 9.5, and 15.2 are assessed within the curriculum.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did not state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). The visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

<div align="right">

Beverley Blythe
Patricia Higham

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University Campus Suffolk
Validating body / Awarding body	University of Essex University of East Anglia
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 18 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 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 education provider and validating body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Christine Stogdon (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	70 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Bridget Penhale (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University Campus Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Erica Joslyn (Internal Panel Member) Andrew Revitt (Internal Panel Member) Cheryl Finaylson (External Panel Member) Peter Martin (External Panel Member) Laurence Daly (External Panel Member) Robin Mutter (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information provided to applicants to make clear that upon successful completion of the programme, the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a social worker with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the information available on the website for applicants, which gives an overview of the programme. Here it states that the programme "…prepares students to register with HCPC…", and that "From the 1 August 2012 qualified social workers will be registered with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and may use the protected title of Social Worker." However the visitors could not find any clear statement within the information given to applicants outlining that the programme will only give eligibility to apply to the HCPC register, and that registration will be subject to HCPC requirements. The visitors therefore require that the admissions information is updated to reflect this. This will ensure that applicants are given all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

Christine Stogdon
David Childs

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	11 – 12 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 15 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 18 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional)
	Robert Goemans (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	19 per year
First approved intake	May 2014
Chair	Phil Mandy (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Shoshana Ormonde (University of Brighton)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 48 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two criteria.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme is recommended for approval. Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the follow up actions that are taken if students do not attend either the practice or taught elements of the programme, specifically regarding what would trigger procedures for poor attendance, and how students are informed of this.

Reason: From a review of the course handbook, the visitors noted that "students are required to attend ALL teaching, tutorial and practice learning sessions" (page 61), and a register is kept to monitor attendance in taught sessions. However, it was not clear from the documentation, or in discussions at the visit, the follow up actions that are taken if a student has poor attendance on the programme. As such, the visitors could not see if students were required to inform the programme or placement team if they were not able to attend sessions, how students were made aware of the follow up process, and any consequences of missing practice or taught elements for the student. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process in place if student attendance falls below the requirement of 100 per cent that is stated in the course handbook, and how students are informed of this process.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, with regards to the process that would be followed if a student were failing placement.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team and the placement team at the visit, the visitors were given examples of actions that would be taken if a student was failing their placement. This included the tutor visiting the placement, and various discussions that would take place between the programme team, placement team and student. However, from a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of a formal process in place that the programme team would follow, if a student were failing their placement. As such, the visitors could not see where the requirements for student progression within placement, and in particular what would prevent a student progressing on placement, were clearly specified. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the requirements for student progression on placement, how students are informed of the process that is followed if they do not pass their placement, and how students are made aware of the options available to them in this case.

Recommendations

D.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including a minimum requirement for the amount of supervision that students should receive on placement.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that student supervision on placement encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct and therefore that this standard is met. However, in discussion with the students and the placement team at the visit, the visitors noted that there were differences in the amount of supervision, and how often students were supervised, between the various local authorities in the partnership. Whilst the visitors appreciate that there is a need for flexibility in regards to how students are supervised on placement on a programme of this nature, the visitors would like to recommend that the programme team consider including a minimum requirement for the amount of supervision that students should receive on placement. This will ensure that going forward, all parties, including students, have a clear understanding of the education provider's expectations regarding supervision, and therefore that this standard continues to be met.

David Abrahart
Robert Goemans

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme name	BA (Hons) 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

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. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 31 March 2014.The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work 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 also considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the MA in Social Work Full time programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Barnicki (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Hazel Currie (Prosthetist / Orthotist)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	55
First approved intake	July 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	May 2014
Chair	Julia Hubbard (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Rob Gray (University of East Anglia)
Members of the joint panel	Aidan Worsley (The College of Social Work) Roseann Connolly (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that they currently do not have a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not**.**

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did state that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). However, the visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification document) to be

updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Michael Branicki
Dorothy Smith
Hazel Currie

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East Anglia
Programme name	MA 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

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. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 31 March 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work 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 also considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) in Social Work Full time programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Barnicki (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Hazel Currie (Prosthetist/ Orthotist)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	81
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	May 2014
Chair	Julia Hubbard (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Rob Gray (University of East Anglia)
Members of the joint panel	Aidan Worsley (The College of Social Work) Roseann Connolly (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that they currently do not have a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not**.**

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit did stated that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC (SETs mapping document SET 6.9). However, the visitors noted this was not clearly articulated anywhere in the programme documentation and were therefore not satisfied that this SET was met. This SET requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation (such as the programme specification

document) to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Michael Branicki
Dorothy Smith
Hazel Currie

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme name	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	25 – 26 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes, 'MA in Social Work' and 'Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)'. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with a chair (from the school of healthcare, that the HCPC was satisfied was independent of the programmes being reviewed) 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. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker in England) Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	50
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Janet Holt (University of Leeds)
Secretary	Deborah Schofield (University of Leeds)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) William Penson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. The visitors highlighted that since September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students have changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary structure and allocation will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In particular, the visitors were unable to locate where potential applicants could find information specifically related to the bursaries available for the BA Honours in Social Work at Leeds University. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the admissions procedures for implementing occupational health requirements.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was a process in place that set out the health requirements of the university. However, the visitors were unable to locate the health declaration form as highlighted in the information made available to students. In meetings with the programme team it was mentioned that students were required to fill out a health declaration form however this was not provided in the documentation that the visitors received. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how health requirements are implemented and monitored for this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The visitors heard that the School of Healthcare, in which the BA Honours in Social Work sits within, is currently under review and it is possible that there may not be a future for the programme. Further to this, in discussions with current students it was stated that students felt anxious about their future on the programme and the viability to complete their studies at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that this poses a risk to the current and future delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require

further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the education providers business plan and that current students will be fully supported throughout the duration of their studies and up to graduation at the University of Leeds.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of effective communication to students and practice educators to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: Throughout meetings with the students and practice educators the visitors heard that both parties felt that communication from programme management was limited and sometimes withheld. It was specifically noted that students felt feedback given in staff-student liaison meetings was not taken forward nor was feedback provided on the outcomes. In addition to this, students were of the understanding that if the review decided to discontinue the social work provision, they would be moved to Huddersfield or Bradford campus but still graduate under the University of Leeds. However after speaking to the programme team is was stated that this was not the case and that all students would complete their degree at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that effective communication is vital to successful programmes management, including ensuring that important information has been heard. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the communication systems used between students, staff and practice educators to ensure effective programme management.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information of any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. It was also noted that the programme had recently lost their law teaching provision. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. In addition to this, it was unclear if the previous law provision had been suitably replaced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. And that the teaching provision for law modules will be adequately covered.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they ensure continuing professional and research development for staff.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to

enable them to deliver an effective programme. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that a number of staff engaged in various research projects and further education. However, from this meeting the visitors were not able to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors noted it is important for the programme curriculum to ensure the teaching staff are up to date academically and professionally. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence the current involvement of staff in professional and research development to show that they will continue to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas in the documentation that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. For example page 11 of the 'Practice Educator Award' module handbook states "…in line with the GSCC revised wording for paragraph 49 of the PQ requirements." Similarly there are also references to documents and guidelines attributed to the HCPC, which are either incorrect or have not been updated since the change in regulatory body from the GSCC to the HCPC. For example the 'Practice Learning Funding Agreement' states that "The Health and Care professions Council (HCPC) administers funding for practice learning to Universities and teaching institutions offering the social work degree." The HCPC does not provide funding for practice learning. The visitors also noted inconsistencies in the information provided to students on their assessment. For example page 9 of 'HECS 5295M Professional Practice 4' states that students will complete a 4000 word essay. In contrast to this, page 58 of the same document states that students will complete a 3000 word essay.
The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to receive accurate information about their programme through documentation and their practice educators. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and practice placement educators have a clear understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved in the 20 day placement 'HECS 1114 Professional practice 1'.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team the visitors heard the rationale and justification for students undertaking a 20 day placement. When asked about the learning outcomes the visitors also heard that, from this particular placement, students were expected to understand the role of the social worker in relation to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). However, in a meeting with students it was stated that students were unaware of any learning outcomes for the placement and were of the understanding that the placement was not connected to the SOPs. Students also stated that their practice educators were unaware of any learning outcomes associated with the placement. There were no placement educators present in the practice educator meeting who currently provided this specific placement. In the absence of any practice educators who provided placements for the 'HECS 1114 Professional practice 1' the visitors could not be certain that this standard has been met. The visitors were satisfied with the learning outcomes in place, however, were concerned that this information was not being adequately communicated to both students and practice educators. The visitors noted that it is important that students and practice placement educators were aware of the learning outcomes attached to each specific placement. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for the 20 day placement 'HECS 1114 Professional practice 1'**.**

David Childs
Gary Hickman
Sarah Johnson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	25 – 26 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes, 'BA Honours Social Work' and 'Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)'. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with a chair (from the school of healthcare, that the HCPC was satisfied was independent of the programmes being reviewed) 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. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker in England) Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Janet Holt (University of Leeds)
Secretary	Deborah Schofield (University of Leeds)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) William Penson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. The visitors highlighted that since September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students have changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary structure and allocation will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In particular, the visitors were unable to locate where potential applicants could find information specifically related to the bursaries available for the MA in Social Work at Leeds University. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The visitors heard that the School of Healthcare, in which the MA in Social Work sits within, is currently under review and it is possible that there may not be a future for the programme. Further to this, in discussions with current students it was stated that students felt anxious about their future on the programme and the viability to complete their studies at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that this poses a risk to the current and future delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the education providers business plan and that current students will be fully supported throughout the duration of their studies and up to graduation at the University of Leeds.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of effective communication to students and practice educators to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: Throughout meetings with the students and practice educators the visitors heard that both parties felt that communication from programme management was limited and sometimes withheld. It was specifically noted that students felt feedback given in staff-student liaison meetings was not taken forward nor was feedback provided on the outcomes. In addition to this, students were of the understanding that if

the review decided to discontinue the social work provision, they would be moved to Huddersfield or Bradford campus but still graduate under the University of Leeds. However after speaking to the programme team is was stated that this was not the case and that all students would complete their degree at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that effective communication is vital to successful programmes management, including ensuring that important information has been heard. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the communication systems used between students, staff and practice educators to ensure effective programme management.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information of any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. It was also noted that the programme had recently lost their law teaching provision. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. In addition to this, it was unclear if the previous law provision had been suitably replaced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. And that the teaching provision for law modules will be adequately covered.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they ensure continuing professional and research development for staff.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that a number of staff engaged in various research projects and further education. However, from this meeting the visitors were not able to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors noted it is important for the programme curriculum to ensure the teaching staff are up to date academically and professionally. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence the current involvement of staff in professional and research development to show that they will continue to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas in the documentation that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. For example page 11 of the 'Practice Educator Award' module handbook states "…in line with the GSCC revised wording for paragraph 49 of the PQ requirements." Similarly there are also references to documents and guidelines attributed to the HCPC, which are either incorrect or have not been updated since the change in regulatory body from the GSCC to the HCPC. For example the 'Practice Learning Funding Agreement' states that "The Health and Care professions Council (HCPC) administers funding for practice learning to Universities and teaching institutions offering the social work degree." The HCPC does not provide funding for practice learning.
The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to receive accurate information about their programme through their practice educators. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and practice placement educators have a clear understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved in the 20 day placement 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1'**.**

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team the visitors heard the rationale and justification for students undertaking a 20 day placement. When asked about the learning outcomes the visitors also heard that, from this particular placement, students were expected to understand the role of the social worker in relation to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). However, in a meeting with students it was stated that students were unaware of any learning outcomes for the placement and were of the understanding that the placement was not connected to the SOPs. Students also stated that their practice educators were unaware of any learning outcomes associated with the placement. There were no placement educators present in the practice educator meeting who currently provided this specific placement. In the absence of any practice educators who provided placements for the 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1' the visitors could not be certain

that this standard has been met. The visitors were satisfied with the learning outcomes in place, however, were concerned that this information was not being adequately communicated to both students and practice educators. The visitors noted that it is important that students and practice placement educators were aware of the learning outcomes attached to each specific placement. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for the 20 days placement 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1'.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure that prospective students understand that registration with the HCPC is not automatic upon completion of the programme.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there were inconsistencies in the wording used to inform current and prospective students of the process of applying for HCPC registration. For example page 65 and 66 of the MA validation document uses the title "Masters in Social Work with Professional Registration to Practice Social Work." The visitors note that this could imply to students that they are automatically registered with the HCPC on completion of the programme and is consequently misleading information. The visitors therefore require that the education provider revisits the programme documentation to ensure that prospective and current students understand that completion of the course does not provide automatic registration.

David Childs
Gary Hickman
Sarah Johnson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Leeds
Programme name	Post Graduate 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	25 – 26 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes, 'MA in Social Work' and BA Honours in Social Work'. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with a chair (from the school of healthcare, that the HCPC was satisfied was independent of the programmes being reviewed) 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. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker in England) Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Janet Holt (University of Leeds)
Secretary	Deborah Schofield (University of Leeds)
Members of the joint panel	Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) William Penson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme. Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme 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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. The visitors highlighted that since September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students have changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary structure and allocation will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In particular, the visitors were unable to locate where potential applicants could find information specifically related to the bursaries available for the Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) at Leeds University. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: The visitors heard that the School of Healthcare, in which the Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) sits within, is currently under review and it is possible that there may not be a future for the programme. Further to this, in discussions with current students it was stated that students felt anxious about their future on the programme and the viability to complete their studies at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that this poses a risk to the current and future delivery of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the programme has a secure place in the education providers business plan and that current students will be fully supported throughout the duration of their studies and up to graduation at the University of Leeds.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of effective communication to students and practice educators to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: Throughout meetings with the students and practice educators the visitors heard that both parties felt that communication from programme management was limited and sometimes withheld. It was specifically noted that students felt feedback

given in staff-student liaison meetings was not taken forward nor was feedback provided on the outcomes. In addition to this, students were of the understanding that if the review decided to discontinue the social work provision, they would be moved to Huddersfield or Bradford campus but still graduate under the University of Leeds. However after speaking to the programme team is was stated that this was not the case and that all students would complete their degree at the University of Leeds. The visitors consider that effective communication is vital to successful programmes management, including ensuring that important information has been heard. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the communication systems used between students, staff and practice educators to ensure effective programme management.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information of any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. It was also noted that the programme had recently lost their law teaching provision. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. In addition to this, it was unclear if the previous law provision had been suitably replaced. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area. And that the teaching provision for law modules will be adequately covered.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how they ensure continuing professional and research development for staff.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that a number of staff engaged in various research projects and further education. However, from this meeting the visitors were not able to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors noted it is important for the programme curriculum to ensure the teaching staff are up to date academically and professionally. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence the current involvement of staff in professional and research development to show that they will continue to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas in the documentation that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. For example page 11 of the 'Practice Educator Award' module handbook states "…in line with the GSCC revised wording for paragraph 49 of the PQ requirements." Similarly there are also references to documents and guidelines attributed to the HCPC, which are either incorrect or have not been updated since the change in regulatory body from the GSCC to the HCPC. For example the 'Practice Learning Funding Agreement' states that "The Health and Care professions Council (HCPC) administers funding for practice learning to Universities and teaching institutions offering the social work degree." The HCPC does not provide funding for practice learning.
The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to receive accurate information about their programme through their practice educators. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

5.11 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.**

Condition: The education provider must clarify the mechanisms in place that ensure students and practice placement educators have a clear understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved in the 20 day placement 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1'**.**

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit and discussions with the programme team the visitors heard the rationale and justification for students undertaking a 20 day placement. When asked about the learning outcomes the visitors also heard that, from this particular placement, students were expected to understand the role of the social worker in relation to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs). However, in a meeting with students it was stated that students were unaware of any learning outcomes for the placement and were of the understanding that the placement was not connected to the SOPs. Students also stated that their practice educators were unaware of any learning outcomes associated with the placement. There were no placement educators present in the practice educator meeting who currently provided this specific placement. In the absence of any practice educators who provided placements for the 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1' the visitors could not be certain

that this standard has been met. The visitors were satisfied with the learning outcomes in place, however, were concerned that this information was not being adequately communicated to both students and practice educators. The visitors noted that it is important that students and practice placement educators were aware of the learning outcomes attached to each specific placement. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for the 20 days placement 'HECS 5295 Professional practice 1'.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure that prospective students understand that registration with the HCPC is not automatic upon completion of the programme.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there were inconsistencies in the wording used to inform current and prospective students of the process of applying for HCPC registration. For example page 65 and 66 of the MA validation document uses the title "Masters in Social Work with Professional Registration to Practice Social Work." The visitors note that this could imply to students that they are automatically registered with the HCPC on completion of the programme and is consequently misleading information. The visitors therefore require that the education provider revisits the programme documentation to ensure that prospective and current students understand that completion of the course does not provide automatic registration.

David Childs
Gary Hickman
Sarah Johnson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	25 – 26 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work 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 also considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the MSc Social Work programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	51 per year
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	May 2014
Chair	David Franklin (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Kirsty Mitchell (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent, where students participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document provided, the visitors were directed to a 'Consent to undertake simulation activities and/or use images for University publicity, promotion, teaching and learning' form, as evidence of meeting this standard. On review of this form, the visitors noted that the section requiring completion by the student/individual only referred to permission for an individuals' image to be used, rather than for providing consent to participate in role play activities when acting as service users. The visitors also could not see how students were told about the risk of emotional distress through participating in role plays, and any impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students on the programme are able to give informed consent to participate in role play activities, when they are acting as service users.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the attendance requirements are clearly identified, and students are aware of the action taken for low attendance in taught elements of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the attendance requirement for both the university and the placement setting was 100 per cent, and that tutors would contact the student if more than three lectures were missed. In discussion with the students, whilst they were very clear that this was the case for the placement setting, some indicated that they believed that the requirement for attendance for taught elements of the programme was 80 per cent. Furthermore, the students did not demonstrate an awareness of the action taken for non-attendance, and suggested that the approach was not always consistent across the programme. In the student handbook provided, the visitors noted that students were "..expected to attend regularly and punctually" (page 11), but there was not an explicit statement that the requirement is 100 per cent, or of any actions taken when lectures are missed. Whilst the visitors noted that the practice placement handbook states the requirement of "..100% attendance both in University and Practice settings" (subsection eight), the visitors could not see how students were informed of any consequences of missing university based elements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students are informed of the procedures that are in place regarding non-attendance to taught elements of the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was information provided regarding aegrotat awards, but they could not determine where there was a clear statement indicating that they do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation, to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was information provided regarding the appointment of external examiners, but the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence of where it clearly specifies the requirement 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 the Register.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The education provider should re-consider when key information regarding the programme, for example information regarding bursary arrangements, and all costs associated with the programme, is provided to potential applicants.

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied that applicants to the programme are given sufficient information to allow them to make an informed choice regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, and therefore that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that a lot of information regarding the programme is not provided to potential applicants until they attend an interview, for example, the letter applicants receive including Frequently Asked Questions (section nine). The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider providing more detailed information regarding the programme, in particular regarding funding arrangements and all costs associated with the programme, to applicants at an earlier stage. In this way potential applicants may be better placed to make a decision regarding whether to apply to the programme.

<div align="right">
Vicki Lawson-Brown
Dorothy Smith
Gail Stephenson
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	25 – 26 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work 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 also considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the BSc (Hons) Social Work programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gail Stephenson (Orthoptist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	26 per year
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	May 2014
Chair	David Franklin (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Kirsty Mitchell (University of Portsmouth)
Members of the joint panel	Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before approval of the programme is confirmed.

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

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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent, where students participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: From a review of the SETs mapping document provided, the visitors were directed to a 'Consent to undertake simulation activities and/or use images for University publicity, promotion, teaching and learning' form, as evidence of meeting this standard. On review of this form, the visitors noted that the section requiring completion by the student/individual only referred to permission for an individuals' image to be used, rather than for providing consent to participate in role play activities when acting as service users. The visitors also could not see how students were told about the risk of emotional distress through participating in role plays, and any impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students on the programme are able to give informed consent to participate in role play activities, when they are acting as service users.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the attendance requirements are clearly identified, and students are aware of the action taken for low attendance in taught elements of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the attendance requirement for both the university and the placement setting was 100 per cent, and that tutors would contact the student if more than three lectures were missed. In discussion with the students, whilst they were very clear that this was the case for the placement setting, some indicated that they believed that the requirement for attendance for taught elements of the programme was 80 per cent. Furthermore, the students did not demonstrate an awareness of the action taken for non-attendance, and suggested that the approach was not always consistent across the programme. In the student handbook provided, the visitors noted that students were "..expected to attend regularly and punctually" (page 11), but there was not an explicit statement that the requirement is 100 per cent, or of any actions taken when lectures are missed. Whilst the visitors noted that the practice placement handbook states the requirement of "..100% attendance both in University and Practice settings" (subsection eight), the visitors could not see how students were informed of any consequences of missing university based elements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students are informed of the procedures that are in place regarding non-attendance to taught elements of the programme.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was information provided regarding aegrotat awards, but they could not determine where there was a clear statement indicating that they do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation, to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was information provided regarding the appointment of external examiners, but the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence of where it clearly specifies the requirement 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 the Register.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The education provider should re-consider when key information regarding the programme, for example information regarding bursary arrangements, and all costs associated with the programme, is provided to potential applicants.

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied that applicants to the programme are given sufficient information to allow them to make an informed choice regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, and therefore that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that a lot of information regarding the programme is not provided to potential applicants until they attend an interview, for example, the letter applicants receive including Frequently Asked Questions (section nine). The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider providing more detailed information regarding the programme, in particular regarding funding arrangements and all costs associated with the programme, to applicants at an earlier stage. In this way potential applicants may be better placed to make a decision regarding whether to apply to the programme.

Vicki Lawson-Brown
Dorothy Smith
Gail Stephenson

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	Hearing Aid Aptitude Test
Mode of delivery	Distance learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispensers
Date of visit	12 - 13 February 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Hearing aid dispenser' 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 31 March 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 May 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 5 June 2014.

Introduction

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

The visit also assessed whether a number of standards under SET 5 (Practice placements) were applicable to the programme as a result of entry requirements for prior qualifications and experience as an audiologist working in the NHS.

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort two times per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	June 2014
Chair	The HCPC panel chaired the two day event
Secretary	No secretary was made available

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review the practice placement handbook prior to the visit. Due to the nature of the programme the documentation does not exist. The programme does not include any practice placements.

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and therefore external examiners' reports have not been produced.

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

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

The HCPC did not meet with the placements providers and educators / mentors due to the nature of the programme. The programme does not include any practice placements so there are no placement providers or educators / mentors to meet with.

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation because it is a distance learning programme and does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of SETs are not applicable to this education programme and they are not required to be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 33 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eleven SETs. The visitors agreed that 13 of the SETs are not applicable to this 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how students are provided information about the programme.

Reason: In the documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how students and potential applicants will be provided information they require to make an informed choice whether to take up a place on the programme or otherwise. The visitors were unable to see clearly articulated information about:
- detailed admission criteria;
- programme fees;
- the DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) during admissions;
- admission health checks;
- programme assessment methods;
- duration of the programme; and
- how the programme will be delivered.

During the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme team will revisit and produce detailed programme documentation including a student/programme handbook and advertising materials clearly articulating the information students and potential applicants need to make an informed choice. To assess whether this standard is met the visitors need to see revised programme documentation and the advertising materials.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions procedures to apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Reason: In the entry criteria for this programme the visitors noted that required evidence for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English was "GCSE or O'Level English Language grade C or above (or equivalent); or an IELTS [International English Language Testing System] score of 6.5 or equivalent" (Admissions Policy-Hearing Aid Aptitude Test, page 4). It was not clear if, or what score is required for each of the components of IELTS for entry to the programme. During the programme team meeting, the programme leader said, they will revisit the admission criteria to update this section. The visitors require the education provider to submit the revisited programme documentation to clearly state the English language requirements needed for entry to the programme, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the selection and entry criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit gave examples of entry criteria for applicants to the programme as being authenticated copies of audiological qualifications. Equivalent qualifications to those suggested in the examples will be considered on a case by case basis and compared to the requirements of the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers. The entry criteria further gives examples for appropriate completed clinical placements, CPD evidence and curriculum vitae. The visitors were satisfied with the entry criteria for those individuals practising as an audiologist. The visitors had concerns around specific groups of applicants (international applicants and applicants without recent audiological qualifications which included a complete IRCP) applying to the programme. The visitors noted students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no direct contact taught curriculum or practice placement elements. The visitors therefore expressed concern that not all applicants would be able to meet all of the clinical competencies that HCPC require from hearing aid dispensers. Discussion with the programme team indicated they had been considering making entry criteria for applicants more robust and may include an Individual Record of Clinical Practice (IRCP) however had not determined details. The visitors need further information about the entry criteria, particularly for international applicants and for applicants without recent audiological qualifications which included a complete IRCP. In this way the visitors can be assured the programme will consistently apply appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards for this programme and will ensure that potential applicants will have appropriate and sufficient experience of working in a clinical environment.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme committees and management structure, indicating the roles and responsibilities of the programme team members and how the roles interlink.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted the programme team also manage other audiology programmes and therefore has management structures in place. The visitors were unable to determine the programme specific structures for effective management. In discussion with the students it was clear they understood the roles and responsibilities of various members of the programme team, and who the main points of contact were when they needed support. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors determined the programme management structure was not documented, and as such the visitors could not be assured that future students and staff of the programme would have a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the roles and lines of responsibility of the programme team and committee structures, to ensure that the programme continues to be effectively managed.

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

Condition: The programme team must submit further evidence of how they support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme especially for students with physical sensory impairment.

Reason: In the documentation provided before the visit, the visitors noted that there are resources in place to support learning and teaching activities on this programme. The visitors also noted that the programme had no direct contact taught curriculum as the programme was delivered online. The visitors could not determine how students with physical sensory impairment will be supported throughout the programme. During discussion with the programme team, it was indicated that all recorded presentations will be subtitled and uploaded to the online portal. However, from review of the documentation, it was not clear how these students will be supported. Therefore, the visitors required further evidence of how they support required learning and teaching activities of the programme especially students with physical or sensory impairment.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students will be made aware of the education provider's support policies.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine how students will be made aware of the different support policies and procedures the education provider has and the support available to them. During the programme team meeting, it was discussed that online inductions will be held to make sure students were aware about the different polices and support available for students. The visitors considered this important to be clearly stated for students within the programme documentation including admission materials. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show how students will be made aware about the education provider's support policies.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated in the programme documentation for students.

Reason: From a review of programme documentations, the visitors noted that the education provider has an institution wide student complaints process. The visitors were satisfied that this process ensures that students concerns and complaints are dealt with. However, from a review of the documentation submitted for this programme, the visitors were unable to find reference to the student complaints process. The visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the complaints process is clearly articulated to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements for this programme. The SETs mapping document stated under standard 3.15 "Due to the nature of the programme (distance learning) access to online teaching material cannot be monitored." During discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted this standard is applicable to the

programme and therefore the programme team must identify where students' attendance is mandatory and put procedures and mechanisms in place to monitor it effectively. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied this standard was met. Therefore, visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a formal process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted for the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of how the programme deals with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The visitors noted that students on the programme will undertake assessments and the education provider has a role in identifying any concerns about students' conduct and help addressing it. During discussions with programme team, it was highlighted the education provider does have a formal process for dealing with concerns about students' conduct that is applicable to this programme and this will be included in the programme documentation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit the revised documentation to evidence the formal process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme curriculum consisted of leaning outcomes and that the programme had no taught curriculum with any formal teaching or learning approaches in place. The visitors noted that the programme has one module "HAAT v2" with six other subsections covering a range of competencies. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against the range of competencies based on prior learning and experience. During discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the subsections within the module have their own learning outcomes which are not mapped in the module "HAAT v2". The visitors were unable to determine what the leaning outcomes for the whole curriculum were and rationale behind those specific learning outcomes. The visitors were also unable to determine how the learning outcomes will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency. Therefore, visitors will need further evidence of how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the assessment methods employed measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: This condition is linked with condition under SET 4.1. From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear that the programme consisted of learning outcomes with no formal teaching or learning approaches in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against the range of competencies based on prior learning and experience and the programme had no taught curriculum. The programme has one module "HAAT v2" with six other subsections covering a range of competencies. During discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the subsections within the module have their own learning outcomes which are not mapped in the module "HAAT v2". The visitors were therefore unable to identify all the learning outcomes and assessment methods within the programme and were therefore not able to determine if all the standards of proficiency were covered and assessed. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to show that assessment methods clearly assess all the learning outcomes and demonstrate that all the standards of proficiency are assessed within the programme and that those who successfully complete the programme can practise safely and effectively.

Standards of education and training not applicable to the programme

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme. The visitors therefore recommend standard 5.1 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.2 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.3 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.4 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.5 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.6 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.7 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.8 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.9 is not applicable to the programme.

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider

has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.10 is not applicable to the programme.

5.11 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.**

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.11 is not applicable to the programme.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.12 is not applicable to the programme.

5.13 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.

Reason: Prior to the visit the programme team submitted documentation for the programme. This included a SETs mapping document in which the education provider has made the case that standards under SET 5 are not applicable to the programme because the programme does not include practice placements. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated this programme is designed for those audiology applicants who wish to gain the required additional knowledge to be able to practice as hearing aid dispensers. The visitors have set conditions on the admission procedures for the programme to ensure there are robust admissions procedures in place for this programme. The visitors were satisfied that if the programme meets all conditions in this report, practice placements would not need to be integral to this programme, and therefore recommend standard 5.13 is not applicable to the programme.

<div align="right">

Elizabeth Ross
Derek Adrian-Harris

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	20 – 21 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered MA Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decision on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Alan Murphy (Social worker) Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	David Blackwell (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Margaret Young (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) Jane Heyes (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no recognised protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must submit information about interprofessional learning in the programme.

Reason: From documentation submitted and discussion with the programme team it was clear the education provider needed clarification about this standard. This standard refers to areas of the curriculum which are taught across different professions. Where this occurs, education providers must make sure each profession is able to learn the skills and knowledge specific to them. HCPC appreciate that it may not be possible for programmes to offer interprofessional learning, as a result it is not a requirement. In light of this clarification the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate whether interprofessional learning takes place on the programme and if it does, how profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to the protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply

for registration with HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiners for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

David Childs
Alan Murphy
Linda Mutema

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sunderland
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	20 – 21 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 28 April 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2013.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered BA (Hons) Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decision on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker)
	Alan Murphy (Social worker)
	Linda Mutema (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	David Blackwell (University of Sunderland)
Secretary	Margaret Young (University of Sunderland)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work)
	Jane Heyes (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work. This is a new programme and so does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no recognised protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: The education provider must submit information about interprofessional learning in the programme.

Reason: From documentation submitted and discussion with the programme team it was clear the education provider needed clarification about this standard. This standard refers to areas of the curriculum which are taught across different professions. Where this occurs, education providers must make sure each profession is able to learn the skills and knowledge specific to them. HCPC appreciate that it may not be possible for programmes to offer interprofessional learning, as a result it is not a requirement. In light of this clarification the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate whether interprofessional learning takes place on the programme and if it does, how profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to the protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply

for registration with HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiners for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

David Childs
Alan Murphy
Linda Mutema

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of West London
Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	30 – 31 January 2014

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 March 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 March 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	41 per year
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	May 2014
Chair	Michael Lavalette (Liverpool Hope University)
Secretary	Judith Spurrett (University of West London)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met the programme can be approved.

 The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven SETs.

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.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the information provided to applicants, to ensure that the entry requirements of the programme, and any requirements of HCPC registration, are accurately reflected.

Reason: From a review of the admissions information provided on the education provider website, the visitors noted a requirement for 200 UCAS points was stated. This entry requirement has since changed to 280 UCAS points. There were also references to the previous regulator, the GSCC, on the website. The visitors therefore require that the website is fully reviewed and updated, to ensure that the information provided to applicants is correct, and accurate when referring to the regulator. The visitors also noted in the prospectus, a statement informing students that "as a newly qualified social worker [they] will need to undertake an assessed and supported year before being fully registered" (page 2). This is not an HCPC requirement for registration. This should be amended to ensure that applicants are given accurate information regarding the requirements of the professional regulator. The education provider must revisit the information provided to applicants to ensure that they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme, including the roles and lines of responsibility; and how all members of the programme team are effectively supported.

Reason: At the visit, the HCPC Panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the management structure in place for the programme, specifically regarding the arrangements for operational management of the programme. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine if there are effective systems in place to manage the programme and to ensure all staff members are given appropriate supervision and support to carry out their roles effectively. The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly articulates the management structure of the programme; the roles and lines of responsibility; and how all members of the programme team are effectively supported. This will enable the visitors to determine that the programme is effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided and in discussion with the senior management team at the visit, the visitors noted that plans to recruit an

additional staff member had been agreed. However, from discussions at the visit, it was not clear when this recruitment would take place. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how, following the recruitment to this post, there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Additionally, the visitors were made aware of changes to the role of the field leader, and that this role was now to be shared with another role. It was not clear if this change is temporary or permanent, and what the impact of this change is on the support available for the programme team. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that all staff have the opportunity to develop and maintain their professional skills, and therefore that the programme for staff development in place is effective.

Reason: In discussion with the senior team and the programme team at the visit, the visitors were made aware of policies in place to offer opportunities for further study and continuing professional development. However, the visitors could not see evidence of how staff members were able to utilise the opportunities to keep their professional skills up to date due to the issues regarding staff resourcing, as discussed previously under SET 3.5. The visitors therefore require further evidence that staff are able to access the programme for staff development, and that staff resourcing for the programme will not prevent them from doing so. This will ensure that the programme team are able to develop their professional skills, and therefore continue to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all programme documentation is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted references to the "Health and care professional council" (page 6, Course Handbook, page 4, Prospectus, and page 2, Programme Specification). The visitors also noted a reference to the "HCPC Code of Ethics" (Course Handbook, page 6) which should be the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Finally, the visitors noted in the Course Handbook that "on completion of this course students will be able to register with the HCPC". This needs amending to reflect that upon completion of the programme, students will be 'eligible to apply for registration' with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC, and HCPC requirements.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards, that they do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy, to ensure that this standard is met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence of the documentation where it clearly specifies the requirement 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 the Register.

Recommendation

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider highlight the support that is available to students who have identified learning needs, in the interim period between assessment and receiving formal support.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there is a system of academic and pastoral student support in place, and therefore that this standard is met. In discussion with the student group regarding learning needs such as dyslexia, some students indicated that they were not aware of interim support that is available while their learning needs are being assessed by the student support services, for example proof-reading and mitigating circumstances in regards to the submission of assessments. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the programme team consider steps to signpost students to the support that is available for them in this interim period.

Michael Branicki
David Childs

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England or 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 2 May 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) and BA (Hons) in Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Aidan Worsley (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 Full time once per year (MA in Social Work and Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	John Robinson (University of York)
Secretary	Samantha McDermott (University of York)
Members of the joint panel	Lee Sobo-Allen (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 41 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 SETs.

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 two 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to bursaries and costs associated with practice placements and fees.

Reason: It was noted that students will be required to pay a fee top up of £2250 for the MA programme. Although the visitors were advised that this would be communicated to students, they were not provided any evidence that stated this clearly to students at the admissions stage. From the documentation provided the visitors could see that potential applicants were directed to a link which would advise them on the current NHS bursaries available. The documentation also mentioned that applicants may be eligible to receive a bursary for travel related expenses whilst on placement. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information on the recent changes to bursary arrangements and how the University of York planned to allocate the bursaries they received. The visitors also heard that not all students had a clear understanding of the new bursary arrangements when they came onto the programme. In addition to this, it became clear that there were variants in the arrangements from placements providers with relation to travel costs on placement. The visitors heard that some placement providers will cover the cost of travel within placement where others do not. The visitors consider that cost implications may be an important factor in the decision making process for potential applicants. For this reason the visitors require further evidence of how potential applicants will be provided with information around funding and cost implications to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how selection and entry criteria are applied to students being offered a place through clearing.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were satisfied with the selection and entry criteria. In the meeting with practice educators it was stated that some applicants had been offered a place on the programme through clearing. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that that, due to the practicalities of clearing, these students did not follow the same selection process and were not required to attend a face to face interview. The visitors understand that the clearing process places restrictions on the practicalities in place for selection. However, the visitors were unable to identify an alternative procedure for ensuring that applicants offered a place through clearing meet the academic and professional entry standards as highlighted in the admissions documentation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the procedure for applying selection and entry criteria to those applying to the programme through clearing.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process for applying accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and how this is specific to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to apply through the AP(E)L route will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the institution wide policies in place for mapping credit and exemption for modules. They also explained that students will be subject to the programme's selection procedures and an assessment to prove that they have met the required learning outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear how the programme team utilises this process to map students' prior learning to the learning outcomes specific to the programme. The visitors therefore require specific evidence to show how the prior learning of students transferring onto the programme through the AP(E)L route are mapped against the learning outcomes specific to this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area and were therefore unable to determine the quality of teaching. For this reason, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example page 12 of the 'MA Social Work Handbook' states that "The MA in Social Work and the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work are validated by the HCPC." The HCPC does not validate social work programmes. The HCPC approves programmes. In addition to this, page 24 of the First Placement Handbook states that "It is a requirement of both HCPC and TCSW that service users and carers are directly involved in both the learning and the assessment processes for the student." It is not yet a requirement of the HCPC for service users and carers to be involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education

provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: Further evidence must be provided to show how the programme reflects the relevant curriculum guidance and external reference frameworks.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that page eight of the programme specification mentions the 'QAA Subject Benchmark Statement for Social Work' as a point of reference as a relevant external reference point. The SETs mapping also directed the visitors to the Social Work PCF Delivery and Assessment Mapping. However, the visitors could not find through the programme documentation any further references or mapping to the 2008 QAA benchmark statements for Social Work. The visitors therefore could not determine from the documentation how these external frameworks are reflected in the programme or how the programme team worked to include the benchmarks within the curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the social work profession and qualification.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to find and secure a suitable number of placements for current and future students.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted there has been a significant struggle to recruit a suitable number of placements for all students. This is highlighted as a high "(Red)" risk in the Medium-Term Planning document, page 8. The visitors also heard that students had felt the need to seek their own placements as they were aware of the restricted availability. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that 15 additional placements had recently been secured through Leeds City Council as a response to the current availability of placements. However the visitors were unable to determine if the current number of placements was sufficient for the number of current and potential students on the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that the number of placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the quality assurance measures in place for overseas placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The

Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme team quality assures the overseas placements and ensures these overseas placements provide students with a safe and supportive environment. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no pre-placement quality assurance mechanism and so could not determine how the programme team ensured the placements would be safe and supportive. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that the overseas placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the approval and monitoring systems for overseas placements

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme approves and monitors the overseas placements and ensures these overseas placements before they are used. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no clear approval and monitoring process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placements, have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at the overseas practice placement settings. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine if there are a suitable number of qualified practice educators in overseas placements. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures there is an

adequate number for appropriately qualified and experienced staff for overseas placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators undertake appropriate initial and refresher practice placement educator training. Including preparation to deliver both formative and summative assessment to ensure consistency across all programme placements. The visitors were unable to discuss this with the programme team due to time constraints at the visit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that practice educators based overseas undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and regular refresher training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure overseas practice placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed if not.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From documentation provided and discussion at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine, how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators are appropriately registered or agrees other arrangements if they are not. The visitors were concerned that if

registration status was not reviewed, other arrangements could not be agreed to ensure practice educators have the experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that the practice educators at overseas placements are HCPC registered.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal procedures in place for regular and effective communication with overseas practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures regular and effective collaboration with overseas placements. The programme team discussed the communication they undertake with both overseas placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting placements once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors could not determine a clear system of communication which considers the specific and differing requirements of each placement setting, and were therefore unclear on the partnership and ongoing relationship with overseas placement providers. Therefore the visitors require further information about the systems in place, such as documentary evidence, to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the overseas practice placement educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document prior to the visit and were satisfied that, from this document, the SOPs were mapped suitably. However, In conversation with students and practice educators it was highlighted that not all parties were aware of the SOPs and the requirements to meet them upon completion of the programme. The visitors consider that a clear understanding of the SOPs and their purpose is vital to safe and effective practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the SOPs are communicated effectively to students and practice educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to clarify the assessment process used for students in overseas placements.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current processes used to assess students against the learning outcomes whilst on placement in the UK. The documentation provided did not mention any differences between the assessment of students if they undertook either a UK or an overseas placement. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was suggested that students in overseas placements would be assessed differently to those undertaking placements in the UK. Due to the contrast in information the visitors were unclear if students in overseas placement would or would not be assessed differently to those in placements within the UK. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to clarify if alternative assessments are used in overseas placement settings, and if so, how these assessments ensure that those who successfully complete the programme achieve the SOPs for social workers in England.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how the assessment measures of overseas placements ensure fitness to practice

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received documentation outlining the assessment methods and how these ensure fitness to practice. The visitors were satisfied with the documentation provided however could not locate any information in relation to assessment of overseas placements. In the meeting with the programme team it was mentioned that the placements in Peru and Uganda use a different process and there was a placement report to evidence this. However the visitors were not provided with evidence of this different process or the placement report. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process used to ensure that the assessment methods used in overseas placements ensure fitness to practise.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team review the current process for room bookings and allocations.

Reason: The visitors were shown a presentation which highlighted the current resources available to students including some of the teaching rooms. The visitors heard the students felt their learning was sometimes restricted due to the size of rooms allocated to lectures and seminars. They noted that, during group activities, the students could find it difficult to hear their peers when in a large room. The visitors heard that there was also potential for combining the BA (Hons) in Social Work and MA in Social Work lectures and seminars. To limit the room size problem, the visitors recommend the education provider review the current room allocation system with particular regard to the potential expansion of student numbers in lectures.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider ensures that students are aware of the implications if they choose not to disclose learning needs before starting the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with documentation which evidenced the current equality and diversity policies in place for practice educators. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the policy ensured equality and diversity within placements. However, the practice educators noted that some students' needs had not been adequately assessed prior to their placement, thus restricting them from having any appropriate adjustments made. Students were therefore undergoing assessments for their learning needs alongside their placement. To prevent students experiencing a similar barrier the visitors recommend that the education provider encourages potential applicants to declare any learning needs before starting the programme. And, where relevant, undertake appropriate assessments.

Beverley Blythe
Anthony Power
Aidan Worsley

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England or 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 2 May 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MA in Social Work and Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Aidan Worsley (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 Full time once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	John Robinson (University of York)
Secretary	Samantha McDermott (University of York)
Members of the joint panel	Lee Sobo-Allen (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 41 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 SETs.

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 two 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to bursaries and costs associated with practice placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could see that potential applicants were directed to a link which would advise them on the current NHS bursaries available. The documentation also mentioned that applicants may be eligible to receive a bursary for travel related expenses whilst on placement. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information on the recent changes to bursary arrangements and how the University of York planned to allocate the bursaries they received. The visitors also heard that not all students had a clear understanding of the new bursary arrangements when they came onto the programme. In addition to this, it became clear that there were variants in the arrangements from placements providers with relation to travel costs on placement. The visitors heard that some placement providers will cover the cost of travel within placement where others do not. The visitors consider that cost implications may be an important factor in the decision making process for potential applicants. For this reason the visitors require further evidence of how potential applicants will be provided with information around funding and cost implications to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how selection and entry criteria are applied to students being offered a place through clearing.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were satisfied with the selection and entry criteria. In the meeting with practice educators it was stated that some applicants had been offered a place on the programme through clearing. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that that, due to the practicalities of clearing, these students did not follow the same selection process and were not required to attend a face to face interview. The visitors understand that the clearing process places restrictions on the practicalities in place for selection. However, the visitors were unable to identify an alternative procedure for ensuring that applicants offered a place through clearing meet the academic and professional entry standards as highlighted in the admissions documentation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the procedure for applying selection and entry criteria to those applying to the programme through clearing.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process for applying accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and how this is specific to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to apply through the AP(E)L route will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the institution wide policies in place for mapping credit and exemption for modules. They also explained that students will be subject to the programme's selection procedures and an assessment to prove that they have met the required learning outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear how the programme team utilises this process to map students' prior learning to the learning outcomes specific to the programme. The visitors therefore require specific evidence to show how the prior learning of students transferring onto the programme through the AP(E)L route are mapped against the learning outcomes specific to this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area and were therefore unable to determine the quality of teaching. For this reason, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example page 22 of the 'BA Social Work Handbook' states that "Social work students are on a professional programme that is validated by the HCPC." The HCPC does not validate social work programmes. The HCPC approves programmes. In addition to this, page 24 of the First Placement Handbook states that "It is a requirement of both HCPC and TCSW that service users and carers are directly involved in both the learning and the assessment processes for the student." It is not yet a requirement of the HCPC for service users and carers to be involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: Further evidence must be provided to show how the programme reflects the relevant curriculum guidance and external reference frameworks.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that page two of the programme specification states one of the educational aims of the programme is "To enable students to achieve the learning outcomes associated with the QAA benchmark statement and the Department of Health requirements." The SETs mapping also directed the visitors to the Social Work PCF Delivery and Assessment Mapping. However, the visitors could not find through the programme documentation any further references or mapping to the 2008 QAA benchmark statements for Social Work. The visitors therefore could not determine from the documentation how these external frameworks are reflected in the programme or how the programme team worked to include the benchmarks within the curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the social work profession and qualification.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to find and secure a suitable number of placements for current and future students.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted there has been a significant struggle to recruit a suitable number of placements for all students. This is highlighted as a high "(Red)" risk in the Medium-Term Planning document, page 8. The visitors also heard that students had felt the need to seek their own placements as they were aware of the restricted availability. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that 15 additional placements had recently been secured through Leeds City Council as a response to the current availability of placements. However the visitors were unable to determine if the current number of placements was sufficient for the number of current and potential students on the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that the number of placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the quality assurance measures in place for overseas placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme team quality assures the overseas placements and

ensures these overseas placements provide students with a safe and supportive environment. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no pre-placement quality assurance mechanism and so could not determine how the programme team ensured the placements would be safe and supportive. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that the overseas placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the approval and monitoring systems for overseas placements

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme approves and monitors the overseas placements and ensures these overseas placements before they are used. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no clear approval and monitoring process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placements, have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at the overseas practice placement settings. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine if there are a suitable number of qualified practice educators in overseas placements. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number for appropriately qualified and experienced staff for overseas placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators undertake appropriate initial and refresher practice placement educator training, including preparation to deliver both formative and summative assessment to ensure consistency across all programme placements. The visitors were unable to discuss this with the programme team due to time constraints at the visit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that practice educators based overseas undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and regular refresher training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure overseas practice placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed if not..

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From documentation provided and discussion at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine, how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators are appropriately registered or agrees other arrangements if they are not. The visitors were concerned that if registration status was not reviewed, other arrangements could not be agreed to ensure practice educators have the experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education

provider ensures that the practice educators at overseas placements are HCPC registered.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal procedures in place for regular and effective communication with overseas practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures regular and effective collaboration with overseas placements. The programme team discussed the communication they undertake with both overseas placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting placements once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors could not determine a clear system of communication which considers the specific and differing requirements of each placement setting, and were therefore unclear on the partnership and ongoing relationship with overseas placement providers. Therefore the visitors require further information about the systems in place, such as documentary evidence, to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the overseas practice placement educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document prior to the visit and were satisfied that, from this document, the SOPs were mapped suitably. However, In conversation with students and practice educators it was highlighted that not all parties were aware of the SOPs and the requirements to meet them upon completion of the programme. The visitors consider that a clear understanding of the SOPs and their purpose is vital to safe and effective practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the SOPs are communicated effectively to students and practice educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to clarify the assessment process used for students in overseas placements.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current processes used to assess students against the learning outcomes whilst on placement in the UK. The documentation provided did not mention any differences between the assessment of students if they undertook either a UK or an overseas placement. However, in a meeting with the

programme team it was suggested that students in overseas placements would be assessed differently to those undertaking placements in the UK. Due to the contrast in information the visitors were unclear if students in overseas placement would or would not be assessed differently to those in placements within the UK. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to clarify if alternative assessments are used in overseas placement settings, and if so, how these assessments ensure that those who successfully complete the programme achieve the SOPs for social workers in England.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how the assessment measures of overseas placements ensure fitness to practice

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received documentation outlining the assessment methods and how these ensure fitness to practice. The visitors were satisfied with the documentation provided however could not locate any information in relation to assessment of overseas placements. In the meeting with the programme team it was mentioned that the placements in Peru and Uganda use a different process and there was a placement report to evidence this. However the visitors were not provided with evidence of this different process or the placement report. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process used to ensure that the assessment methods used in overseas placements ensure fitness to practise.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team review the current process for room bookings and allocations.

Reason: The visitors were shown a presentation which highlighted the current resources available to students including some of the teaching rooms. The visitors heard the students felt their learning was sometimes restricted due to the size of rooms allocated to lectures and seminars. They noted that, during group activities, the students could find it difficult to hear their peers when in a large room. The visitors heard that there was also potential for combining the BA (Hons) in Social Work and MA in Social Work lectures and seminars. To limit the room size problem, the visitors recommend the education provider review the current room allocation system with particular regard to the potential expansion of student numbers in lectures.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider ensures that students are aware of the implications if they choose not to disclose learning needs before starting the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with documentation which evidenced the current equality and diversity policies in place for practice educators. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the policy ensured equality and diversity within placements. However, the practice educators noted that some students' needs had not been adequately assessed prior to their placement, thus restricting them from having any appropriate adjustments made. Students were therefore undergoing assessments for their learning needs alongside their placement. To prevent students experiencing a similar barrier the visitors recommend that the education provider encourages potential applicants to declare any learning needs before starting the programme. And, where relevant, undertake appropriate assessments.

Beverley Blythe
Anthony Power
Aidan Worsley

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of York
Programme name	Postgraduate 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	6 – 7 March 2014

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England or 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 2 May 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 May 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MA in Social Work and BA (Hons) in Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Aidan Worsley (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 Full time once per year (MA in Social Work and Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	John Robinson (University of York)
Secretary	Samantha McDermott (University of York)
Members of the joint panel	Lee Sobo-Allen (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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 a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 41 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 SETs.

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 two 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 standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to bursaries and costs associated with practice placements and fees.

Reason: It was noted that students will be required to pay a fee top up of £2250 for the MA programme. Although the visitors were advised that this would be communicated to students, they were not provided any evidence that stated this clearly to students at the admissions stage. From the documentation provided the visitors could see that potential applicants were directed to a link which would advise them on the current NHS bursaries available. The documentation also mentioned that applicants may be eligible to receive a bursary for travel related expenses whilst on placement. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information on the recent changes to bursary arrangements and how the University of York planned to allocate the bursaries they received. The visitors also heard that not all students had a clear understanding of the new bursary arrangements when they came onto the programme. In addition to this, it became clear that there were variants in the arrangements from placements providers with relation to travel costs on placement. The visitors heard that some placement providers will cover the cost of travel within placement where others do not. The visitors consider that cost implications may be an important factor in the decision making process for potential applicants. For this reason the visitors require further evidence of how potential applicants will be provided with information around funding and cost implications to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how selection and entry criteria are applied to students being offered a place through clearing.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitors were satisfied with the selection and entry criteria. In the meeting with practice educators it was stated that some applicants had been offered a place on the programme through clearing. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that that, due to the practicalities of clearing, these students did not follow the same selection process and were not required to attend a face to face interview. The visitors understand that the clearing process places restrictions on the practicalities in place for selection. However, the visitors were unable to identify an alternative procedure for ensuring that applicants offered a place through clearing meet the academic and professional entry standards as highlighted in the admissions documentation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the procedure for applying selection and entry criteria to those applying to the programme through clearing.

2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process for applying accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and how this is specific to the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to apply through the AP(E)L route will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the institution wide policies in place for mapping credit and exemption for modules. They also explained that students will be subject to the programme's selection procedures and an assessment to prove that they have met the required learning outcomes. However, the visitors were unclear how the programme team utilises this process to map students' prior learning to the learning outcomes specific to the programme. The visitors therefore require specific evidence to show how the prior learning of students transferring onto the programme through the AP(E)L route are mapped against the learning outcomes specific to this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about any external contributors to the programme. Specifically, the education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure the quality of teaching from guest lecturers.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that current permanent staff to the programme had the relevant knowledge and expertise to deliver their subject areas. However, from meetings with students and the programme team it became clear that, from time to time, guest lecturers and external contributors taught on the programme. The visitors were unable to locate any information that enabled them to determine whether external contributors had the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area and were therefore unable to determine the quality of teaching. For this reason, the visitors require further evidence to show that any external contributors to the programme have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver their subject area.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. For example page 12 of the 'MA Social Work Handbook' states that "The MA in Social Work and the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work are validated by the HCPC." The HCPC does not validate social work programmes. The HCPC Approves programmes. In addition to this, page 24 of the First Placement Handbook states that "It is a requirement of both HCPC and TCSW that service users and carers are directly involved in both the learning and the assessment processes for the student." It is not yet a requirement of the HCPC for service users and carers to be involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education

provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: Further evidence must be provided to show how the programme reflects the relevant curriculum guidance and external reference frameworks.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that page eight of the programme specification mentions the 'QAA Subject Benchmark Statement for Social Work' as a point of reference as a relevant external reference point. The SETs mapping also directed the visitors to the Social Work PCF Delivery and Assessment Mapping. However, the visitors could not find through the programme documentation any further references or mapping to the 2008 QAA benchmark statements for Social Work. The visitors therefore could not determine from the documentation how these external frameworks are reflected in the programme or how the programme team worked to include the benchmarks within the curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the social work profession and qualification.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to find and secure a suitable number of placements for current and future students.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted there has been a significant struggle to recruit a suitable number of placements for all students. This is highlighted as a high "(Red)" risk in the Medium-Term Planning document, page eight. The visitors also heard that students had felt the need to seek their own placements as they were aware of the restricted availability. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that 15 additional placements had recently been secured through Leeds City Council as a response to the current availability of placements. However the visitors were unable to determine if the current number of placements was sufficient for the number of current and potential students on the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that the number of placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the quality assurance measures in place for overseas placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The

Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme team quality assures the overseas placements and ensures these overseas placements provide students with a safe and supportive environment. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no pre-placement quality assurance mechanism and so could not determine how the programme team ensured the placements would be safe and supportive. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that the overseas placements provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on the approval and monitoring systems for overseas placements

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were given information that the Peru placement was 70 days and counted towards the students overall practice days. The Uganda placement was 20 days in duration and would count towards the students overall practice days. The documentation and discussions with the practice educators did not detail how the programme approves and monitors the overseas placements and ensures these overseas placements before they are used. The programme team did discuss the support they provide to students for both placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting students once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors considered there to be no clear approval and monitoring process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placements, have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at the overseas practice placement settings. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine if there are a suitable number of qualified practice educators in overseas placements. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures there is an

adequate number for appropriately qualified and experienced staff for overseas placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas such as in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard specific details of one practice educator in Peru. However no further information was provided of what processes, such as pre-placement quality assurance mechanisms, are in place that allows the education provider to determine that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this reason the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that overseas practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure that overseas practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From the documentation the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators undertake appropriate initial and refresher practice placement educator training. Including preparation to deliver both formative and summative assessment to ensure consistency across all programme placements. The visitors were unable to discuss this with the programme team due to time constraints at the visit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that practice educators based overseas undertake appropriate practice placement educator training and regular refresher training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure overseas practice placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed if not.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. From documentation provided and discussion at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine, how the education provider ensures overseas practice educators are appropriately registered or agrees other arrangements if they are not. The visitors were concerned that if

registration status was not reviewed, other arrangements could not be agreed to ensure practice educators have the experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that the practice educators at overseas placements are HCPC registered.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal procedures in place for regular and effective communication with overseas practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted that students had the opportunity to take up placements overseas in Peru and Uganda. However, the documentation did not detail how the education provider ensures regular and effective collaboration with overseas placements. The programme team discussed the communication they undertake with both overseas placements, such as sending placement materials in advance and contacting placements once a month as well as mid-placement visit or phone call via Skype. However, the visitors could not determine a clear system of communication which considers the specific and differing requirements of each placement setting, and were therefore unclear on the partnership and ongoing relationship with overseas placement providers. Therefore the visitors require further information about the systems in place, such as documentary evidence, to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the overseas practice placement educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document prior to the visit and were satisfied that, from this document, the SOPs were mapped suitably. However, In conversation with students and practice educators it was highlighted that not all parties were aware of the SOPs and the requirements to meet them upon completion of the programme. The visitors consider that a clear understanding of the SOPs and their purpose is vital to safe and effective practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the SOPs are communicated effectively to students and practice educators.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to clarify the assessment process used for students in overseas placements.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied with the current processes used to assess students against the learning outcomes whilst on placement in the UK. The documentation provided did not mention any differences between the assessment of students if they undertook either a UK or an overseas placement. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was suggested that students in overseas placements would be assessed differently to those undertaking placements in the UK. Due to the contrast in information the visitors were unclear if students in overseas placement would or would not be assessed differently to those in placements within the UK. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to clarify if alternative assessments are used in overseas placement settings, and if so, how these assessments ensure that those who successfully complete the programme achieve the SOPs for social workers in England.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how the assessment measures of overseas placements ensure fitness to practice

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received documentation outlining the assessment methods and how these ensure fitness to practice. The visitors were satisfied with the documentation provided however could not locate any information in relation to assessment of overseas placements. In the meeting with the programme team it was mentioned that the placements in Peru and Uganda use a different process and there was a placement report to evidence this. However the visitors were not provided with evidence of this different process or the placement report. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process used to ensure that the assessment methods used in overseas placements ensure fitness to practise.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team review the current process for room bookings and allocations.

Reason: The visitors were shown a presentation which highlighted the current resources available to students including some of the teaching rooms. The visitors heard the students felt their learning was sometimes restricted due to the size of rooms allocated to lectures and seminars. They noted that, during group activities, the students could find it difficult to hear their peers when in a large room. The visitors heard that there was also potential for combining the BA (Hons) in Social Work and MA in Social Work lectures and seminars. To limit the room size problem, the visitors recommend the education provider review the current room allocation system with particular regard to the potential expansion of student numbers in lectures.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider ensures that students are aware of the implications if they choose not to disclose learning needs before starting the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with documentation which evidenced the current equality and diversity policies in place for practice educators. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the policy ensured equality and diversity within placements. However, the practice educators noted that some students' needs had not been adequately assessed prior to their placement, thus restricting them from having any appropriate adjustments made. Students were therefore undergoing assessments for their learning needs alongside their placement. To prevent students experiencing a similar barrier the visitors recommend that the education provider encourages potential applicants to declare any learning needs before starting the programme. And, where relevant, undertake appropriate assessments.

<div align="right">
Beverley Blythe
Anthony Power
Aidan Worsley
</div>