

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 9 May 2013. 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 6 June 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA Social Work, full time and work based learning and PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) full time and work based learning. 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	John Taylor (Social worker) Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers	Benjamin Potter Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	50
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Shushma Patel (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Sally Skillett-Moore (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Michelle Spruce (Internal Panel Member) Hazel Willis (Internal Panel Member) Jill Davey (External Panel Member) June Sadd (The College of Social Work) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 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 provide further evidence of the information available to applicants to explain the application process and requirements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The latter requirement is assessed through checks with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. Further information as to the interview day experience was provided to the panel at the visit. The visitors were content that this provides a robust process for assessing an applicant's suitability for admission to the programme. However the visitors were unclear about the information that applicants will receive about the application process prior to applying to the programme. There was also discussion at the visit regarding an issue where current students felt there had not been sufficient information provided to them regarding the fees they would be required to pay, prior to applying. The visitors therefore require further evidence that potential applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information about the interview process and criteria they will be required to meet to make an informed choice around application.

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 provide further evidence of the information available to potential applicants, to include what will be required in terms of occupational health and criminal record checks.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The suitability is assessed through CRB checks, a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. It was confirmed at the visit that the CRB check would be an enhanced CRB check (now the Disclosure and barring service (DBS)). However the documentation and information to students is not always consistent in specifying this. It was also confirmed with the programme team that the students will be required to pay for their enhanced DBS check. The visitors could not identify where the information about these requirements are included on the prospectus webpage, or elsewhere, or where the requirement for the completion of a health

declaration is made clear. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information about entry requirements and what will be required from them to successfully apply to the programme.

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 provide further evidence of the information given to potential applicants around the requirements of placement providers.

Reason: Students are required to attend placements at various stages throughout the programme. In discussions with the programme team, practice placement providers and students, the visitors learned that the placement providers will frequently require students to pass an interview or other application procedures, prior to being accepted on their placement. The panel also noted that students going on placements may need to travel long distances to placements, and incur the costs of this. In discussions at the visit, the programme team also clarified that if a student fails to achieve the required learning outcomes during placement, this may have implications on their progression. This may result in their not having a full summer vacation as they work to demonstrate that they have met all of the criteria necessary to pass. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants are clearly informed of these additional requirements and potential costs of going on placements throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants will be equipped to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of 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: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The entry requirements for the programme specify that students must complete a 'Self-declaration of suitability for social work' form. At the visit, the visitors enquired as to how the information from the self-declarations will feed into the established procedures for dealing with any occupational health issues. The programme team stated that declarations would be followed up with investigations as necessary. They also confirmed that there was an onus on the students to keep the education provider informed if there were any changes to their occupational health throughout the course of the programme. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors were unable to ascertain how the students are made aware of this, or what the formal procedures are for determining which declarations will need to be followed up. They therefore require further evidence that there is a robust process for dealing with the information given in the students' self-declaration of suitability for social work forms and follow up procedures.

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 social work programmes.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to transfer from another social work programme will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the education provider-wide policies in place for mapping credit 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. The visitors were therefore content that robust procedures for applying AP(E)L are in place at education provider level. However, they were unclear about how the programme team utilises this process to ensure that students who are exempted from certain parts of this programme will be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for social work. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the formal processes as articulated at the visit are clearly in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team indicated that equality and diversity and widening participation matters are monitored by the education provider centrally by the admissions team. The visitors also noted from the documentation that training has been undertaken for social work academic staff to ensure equality and diversity in the interviewing process. However, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence as to how the programme team will implement the education provider's overarching equality and diversity policies in relation to students on the programme. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what processes are in place for collecting information on the application and monitoring of the policy. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored on this programme to ensure this standard is being met.

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 reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas across the resources available to students that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. There are various references throughout the documentation to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) where the HCPC should be referenced instead. 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 'Standards of Learning and Training' (Document E p20), the 'HCPC (2009) Code of Conduct and Ethics' (Document D p26) and the HCPC/TCSW Code of Practice (2002) (Appendix A, Course Guide). The 'Course guide', (p2), also refers to HCPC grant aided students. The HCPC do not administer grants for students. All information available to students should be updated to reflect that bursaries are now handled by the NHS Business Services Authority. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed. This document has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document, with other education providers in London, and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors therefore require further evidence that all programme resources and documentation will support student learning in all settings. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met. The visitors will also need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning to determine that the programme can meet this SET.

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 further evidence that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols are in place to obtain consent.

Reason: Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The programme team clarified that they emphasise to students only to share what they feel comfortable with. However, the visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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 provide further information as to the action taken for low attendance.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit, and were made aware that student attendance is mandatory for practice and academic modules. The 'Course guide' states that students are expected to attend lectures on time, and outlines who they should contact if they cannot attend a lecture. However, the visitors could not find a clear statement as to how many lectures students are expected to attend or what attendance is expected in the placement setting. They could also not find information as to what constitutes low attendance, in a placement or the academic setting, or what action will be taken if students fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further

evidence of the attendance policy, what will constitute low attendance in each setting, and what action will be taken in such cases. They also require evidence that this policy is sufficiently communicated to students on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify in the documentation the processes that students will be subject to if there are concerns about their profession-related conduct.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The students are required to sign a 'Statement of professional conduct', and the 'Practice learning guide' demonstrates that students are expected to respect various codes of conduct (however, there are incorrect references to an 'HCPC Code of Practice'). However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professionalism. The visitors were also unclear about how the criteria for the referral of any issue to a disciplinary committee are communicated to all relevant parties. In discussions with the placement providers, it appeared that they were unclear as to the procedures or lines of reporting for concerns around students' profession-related conduct. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with any issues around students' profession-related conduct. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process and what criteria will be used to determine if the formal process must be implemented. In this way, the visitors can determine if this SET is met.

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 further evidence that pinpoints specifically where each of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are met throughout the programme.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach or address each SOP. The visitors noted that several elements of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met. Discussion at the visit also indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors' learning outcomes as part of the post visit process for the education provider or professional body. If changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and where the programme will ensure that students will be able to meet the SOPs for social workers on graduation. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if changes are made which will affect the way in which SOPs are addressed.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence in the curriculum that students completing the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: As evidence for this SET, the programme team referenced the course guide, module descriptors, practice learning guide and definitive guide. Apart from one reference to the HCPC guide for standards of conduct, performance and ethics, stating that it will influence admissions, there did not appear to be any references to where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be addressed in the programme. The visitors were unable to find evidence to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team will ensure that students on the programme understand the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and their implications for the regulation of social workers.

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 programme team must provide further evidence as to the number and range of placements, the duration and timing of placements and how this supports the meeting of learning outcomes in the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation provided prior to the visit including the 'Practice learning guide', and the programme specification. There was information about the number of days students will spend on practice each year and what competencies (mapped against the professional body (PCF) framework, but not the SOPs) are expected to be met, and to what level, in each placement. The programme documentation also stated the type of practice placements that students might get in each placement. However, the information provided (particularly in the Practice learning guide) was fragmented and sometimes inconsistent, and it was difficult for the visitors to gain a clear understanding of the requirements relating to the placements that students must undertake. Discussions at the visit also highlighted that there was a flexible start date for the placements, which was accommodating for placement providers and may enable more places to be available to students. However, this may mean that students are not getting the same experience of doing the placements alongside relevant academic modules and could mean that students have to finish their placement late into the vacation period. This could have implications on their plans, as well as the costs associated with placements and the potential support available from the education provider. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the requirements relating to the number, timing, duration and range of practice placements that students must undertake in order to achieve the programme's learning outcomes. This should include information as to how the education provider ensures that the standards of proficiency are met through the placement experience.

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 evidence as to the formal process for approval and monitoring of placements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the Quality Assurance for Practice Learning (QAPL) framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to approving and monitoring placements. At the visit, the programme team articulated the effective system that is in place for sourcing, approving and auditing new placements, and the procedures for monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are subject to appropriate education provider monitoring and support systems. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placements they currently engage with. This includes information such as the student profiles, experiences on placements, details of placement educators and levels of training. However, no evidence as to the policies or procedures in place to ensure that the education provider is approving and monitoring all placements were provided in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further documentation to demonstrate that there is an effective and robust system in place for the approval and monitoring of all placements.

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 education provider must clarify how the equality and diversity policies will be implemented and monitored in relation to students on practice placements.

Reason: The 'Practice learning guide' was referenced as evidence as to how the programme will meet this SET. The guide, p102, states that "Disabled students will have a full assessment of their support needs before placement and any adjustments will be agreed and incorporated into the learning agreement...". However, the visitors were unable to determine from this guide or the partnership agreement documents, where the education provider would confirm with the practice provider that they have comprehensive equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided, what mechanisms were in place to mitigate risk pertaining to equality and diversity matters in placement situations, and what procedures are in place if something were to go wrong. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider will ensure that equality and diversity policies in place at placement providers will be effectively implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at placement settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff on placements. The 'Partnership agreement form' states that agency signatories agree to "Provide sufficient suitably qualified and experienced staff to practice assess students on the programme". This indicates that the placement provider will determine what is deemed as adequate supervision for assessment. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placement educators available on placements. However, from the documentation, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence of the policies the education provider uses to ensure that there is an adequate number of staff, with the relevant qualifications and experience to support the students in placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly articulates the criteria for practice placement providers, in terms of the requirements for appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and the steps taken by the education provider to check that these criteria are met by each placement provider.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and support social work students.

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 around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, the visitors did not see evidence of formal policies to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implementation in how they ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. The SETs mapping referred to "...LSBU records of Practice Educator training...", though the visitors could find no evidence or further information around this in the documentation. The programme specification (p26) briefly details the various practice educator training that is in place

and what level of qualification is required from the practice educators for each placement. In discussions at the visit, the placement providers emphasised how supportive the programme team were in terms of providing training for practice educators. The visitors acknowledged that there were several training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for placement educators but were unable to see how each placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feed into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

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 around this process and its implications so as to how they ensure that practice educators are appropriately registered. The SETs mapping referred to a register but provided no further information. The programme specification (p26) briefly details what is required from the practice educators for each placement, stating that final placement students will be assessed by qualified social workers. However, first placement students are to be assessed by placement educators who are not HCPC registered. The visitors were subsequently unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The programme team must therefore specify the arrangements that are in place to ensure that the placement educators are sufficiently able to support and assess social work students. To ensure that 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.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that students are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning. At the visit, the programme team outlined the 'Readiness for practice' module which has to be passed by students prior to commencing placements. The visitors heard how this module will ensure that students are equipped with the theoretical foundations for placement settings. However, they were not clear as to how the students will be informed of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. As noted in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1, the information provided to students regarding assessments and learning outcomes has not been updated to reflect links the HCPC's SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the information provided to students will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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 programme team must further evidence how they will ensure that placement educators and placement providers are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The visitors noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the programme team's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the practice placement educators would be sufficiently informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation to support placement educators in placement teaching and assessing. The visitors did not see sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the current documentation, communication and training provided to placement educators will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placements. They therefore require further evidence as to the steps taken to ensure that placement providers and educators will have a sufficient

understanding of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they will ensure that the learning, teaching and supervision on placements will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the module descriptors for assessment of practice learning as evidence for this SET. This documentary evidence does not indicate how the programme team will ensure that all practice experiences will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. At the visit, the programme team articulated the system that is in place for auditing and monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are managed through the appropriate systems at the education provider. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds key information as to the placements they currently engage with. However, no evidence was provided as to the steps the education provider will take, in auditing placements, to ensure that learning and teaching on placements will effectively encourage the expected qualities as detailed in this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the practice learning, teaching and supervision will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment strategy will ensure that a student graduating from the programme will have met all of the SOPs for social workers.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly assess each SOP. The visitors noted that some of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met and assessed. The visitors questioned the placement educators and programme team around the criteria for assessment of students in practice. It was noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the education provider's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the placement educators would be suitably informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and when the programme will assess students to ensure that they will be able to meet each of the SOPs for social workers on completion of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment methods employed will measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme module descriptors prior to the visit. They noted that for several modules, the assessments employed did not appear to measure the learning outcomes as specified in the relevant section of the module descriptor. One example of this can be found in the 'Human growth and development' module (Module descriptors document p18), where the visitors noted that an exam would be used to assess the whole module. The visitors could not determine how the assessment activity in this module will sufficiently measure the learning outcomes outlined, particularly in relation to communication and observation skills. The module descriptors for Social Problems and Social Policy and Social Work Methods include a focus on group work and interviewing skills within the learning outcomes but it is not clear how an exam or essay assess such skills. For this reason, the visitors were unable to determine how this SET will be met. They therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation for the modules to ensure that the assessment methods employed will appropriately measure all of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide information as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment strategy as outlined in the programme documentation. The visitors were satisfied that a robust system for the appointment and use of external examiners was in place. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the internal moderation systems that were in place for ensuring consistency in marking. The 'Validation document' (p31) states that "All scripts are marked and moderated in accordance with University regulations". However, no further information as to the education provider's regulations and their implementation within the programme's marking procedures was provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, to include the arrangements and timings for resits and reassessment, particularly for placements.

Reason: The documentation states that the programme will 'normally' follow the 'University Academic Regulations'. However, no further information was provided as to the education provider's regulations and their implications for progression of students throughout the programme. There are details as to protocols specific to pre-registration social work programmes in the programme specification and course guide. These specify that students will have one attempt at retrieval if they fail the 'Readiness for Practice' module, and will not be permitted to progress to the practice learning if they

have not passed. They also specify that any failed practice elements will need to be reassessed, and that students have a maximum of three placements for the whole programme. However, there is no information as to when academic or practical reassessments will take place, whether this will continue outside the academic year, and how this will fit in with examination boards at the education provider. There is also limited information as to the details of reassessment for students failing placements, such as whether this will be in the same placement setting. As such the visitors could not determine, from the documentation, the requirements for progression and achievement, in practice or academic elements within the programme. They were also not clear about how and when reassessments would be undertaken, and how this will fit in with the education provider's assessment boards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme are clearly specified to students.

Jane McLenachan
Gordon Burrow
John Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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' 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 9 May 2013. 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 6 June 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BA (Hons) Social 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 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	John Taylor (Social worker) Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Gordon Burrow (Chiroprapist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers	Benjamin Potter Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	50
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Shushma Patel (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Sally Skillett-Moore (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Michelle Spruce (Internal Panel Member) Hazel Willis (Internal Panel Member) Jill Davey (External Panel Member) June Sadd (The College of Social Work) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 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 provide further evidence of the information available to applicants to explain the application process and requirements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page for the current MSc Social Work and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The latter requirement is assessed through checks with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. The prospectus page notes that students will be required to attend an interview, but does not detail what this will specifically be assessing and therefore what criteria applicants will have to meet. The visitors could not determine what additional information was provided to applicants wishing to complete the employment based route of the MA. In particular they could not determine information about the additional criteria that they will be required to meet (as specified in the programme specification, p12). The visitors could also not determine where any information was provided to applicants wishing to complete a PG Dip in Social Work and therefore if students could apply to this programme directly. The visitors therefore require further evidence that potential applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information they need around the entry requirements to make an informed decision about applying to the programme.

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 provide further evidence of the information available to potential applicants, to include what will be required in terms of occupational health and criminal record checks.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The suitability is assessed through CRB checks, a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. It was confirmed at the visit that the CRB check would be an enhanced CRB check (now the Disclosure and barring service (DBS)). However the documentation and information to students is not always consistent in specifying this. It was also confirmed with the programme team that the students will be required to pay for their enhanced DBS check. The visitors could not

identify where the information about these requirements are included on the prospectus webpage, or elsewhere, or where the requirement for the completion of a health declaration is made clear. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information about entry requirements and what will be required from them to successfully apply to the programme.

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 provide further evidence of the information given to potential applicants around the requirements of placement providers.

Reason: Students are required to attend placements at various stages throughout the programme. In discussions with the programme team, practice placement providers and students, the visitors learned that the placement providers will frequently require students to pass an interview or other application procedures, prior to being accepted on their placement. The panel also noted that students going on placements may need to travel long distances to placements, and incur the costs of this. In discussions at the visit, the programme team also clarified that if a student fails to achieve the required learning outcomes during placement, this may have implications on their progression. This may result in their not having a full summer vacation as they work to demonstrate that they have met all of the criteria necessary to pass. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants are clearly informed of these additional requirements and potential costs of going on placements throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants will be equipped to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of 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: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The entry requirements for the programme specify that students must complete a 'Self-declaration of suitability for social work' form. At the visit, the visitors enquired as to how the information from the self-declarations will feed into the established procedures for dealing with any occupational health issues. The programme team stated that declarations would be followed up with investigations as necessary. They also confirmed that there was an onus on the students to keep the education provider informed if there were any changes to their occupational health throughout the course of the programme. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors were unable to ascertain how the students are made aware of this, or what the formal procedures are for determining which declarations will need to be followed up. They therefore require further evidence that there is a robust process for dealing with the information given in the students' self-declaration of suitability for social work forms and follow up procedures.

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 social work programmes.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to transfer from another social work programme will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the education provider-wide policies in place for mapping credit 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. The visitors were therefore content that robust procedures for applying AP(E)L are in place at education provider level. However, they were unclear about how the programme team utilises this process to ensure that students who are exempted from certain parts of this programme will be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for social work. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the formal processes as articulated at the visit are clearly in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team indicated that equality and diversity and widening participation matters are monitored by the education provider centrally by the admissions team. The visitors also noted from the documentation that training has been undertaken for social work academic staff to ensure equality and diversity in the interviewing process. However, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence as to how the programme team will implement the education provider's overarching equality and diversity policies in relation to students on the programme. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what process is in place for collecting information on the application and monitoring of the policy. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored to ensure this standard is being met.

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 reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas across the resources available to students that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. There are various references throughout the documentation to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) where the HCPC should be referenced instead. 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 'Standards of Learning and Training' (Document E, p20), the 'HCPC (2009) Code of Conduct and Ethics' (Validation document, p26) and the HCPC/TCSW Code of Practice (2002) (Appendix A, Course Guide). At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed. This document has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors therefore require further evidence that all programme resources and documentation will support student learning in all settings. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning to determine that the visitors can meet this SET.

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 further evidence that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols are in place to obtain consent.

Reason: Through documentation and discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The programme team clarified that they emphasise to students only to share what they feel comfortable with. However, the visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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 provide further information as to the action taken for low attendance.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit, and were made aware that student attendance is mandatory for practice and academic modules. The programme's 'Course guide' states that students are expected to attend all lectures, and that an attendance level of 100% has been set for the programme. However, the 'Course guide' states that where attendance falls below 80%, the student may be required to retake a module "...if their academic performance is deemed to have been adversely affected by their low attendance". The visitors were unclear as to how this policy is implemented, and how it is determined whether a student's academic performance has been adversely affected. The documentation is clear around attendance at skills days and the processes in place for students who fall ill. On p31 of the 'Course guide' it states that absence of more than three placement days would later

need to be made up to make the full 100 placement days. However, the main attendance information in the 'Course guide' does not distinguish between the attendance requirements for theory modules and placements. The visitors articulated that this variance in information could be misleading to students; they could understand that an attendance of 80% on placement would be satisfactory. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what will constitute low attendance in each setting, and what action will be taken in such cases. They also require evidence that this policy is sufficiently communicated to students on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify in the documentation the processes that students will be subject to if there are concerns about their profession-related conduct.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The students are required to sign a 'Statement of professional conduct', and the 'Practice learning guide' demonstrates that students are expected to respect various codes of conduct (however, there are incorrect references to an 'HCPC Code of Practice'). However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professionalism. The visitors were also unclear about how the criteria for the referral of any issue to a disciplinary committee are communicated to all relevant parties. In discussions with the placement providers, it appeared that they were unclear as to the procedures or lines of reporting for concerns around students' profession-related conduct. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with any issues around students' profession-related conduct. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process and what criteria will be used to determine if the formal process must be implemented. In this way, the visitors can determine if this SET is met.

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 further evidence that pinpoints specifically where each of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are met throughout the programme.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach or address each SOP. The visitors noted that several elements of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met. Discussion at the visit also indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors' learning outcomes as part of the post visit process for the education provider or professional body. If changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and where the programme will

ensure that students will be able to meet the SOPs for social workers on graduation. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if changes are made which will affect the way in which SOPs are addressed.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence in the curriculum that students completing the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: As evidence for this SET, the programme team referenced the course guide, module descriptors, practice learning guide and definitive guide. Apart from one reference to the HCPC guide for standards of conduct, performance and ethics, stating that it will influence admissions, there did not appear to be any references to where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be addressed in the programme. The visitors were unable to find evidence to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team will ensure that students on the programme understand the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and their implications for the regulation of social workers.

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 programme team must provide further evidence as to the number and range of placements, the duration and timing of placements and how this supports the meeting of learning outcomes in the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation provided prior to the visit including the 'Practice learning guide', and the programme specification. There was information about the number of days students will spend on practice each year and what competencies (mapped against the professional body (PCF) framework, but not the SOPs) are expected to be met, and to what level, in each placement. The programme documentation also stated the type of practice placements that students might get in each placement. However, the information provided (particularly in the Practice learning guide) was fragmented and sometimes inconsistent, and it was difficult for the visitors to gain a clear understanding of the requirements relating to the placements that students must undertake. Discussions at the visit also highlighted that there was a flexible start date for the placements, which was accommodating for placement providers and may enable more places to be available to students. However, this may mean that students are not getting the same experience of doing the placements alongside relevant academic modules and could mean that students have to finish their placement late into the vacation period. This could have implications on their plans, as well as the costs associated with placements and the potential support available from the education provider. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the requirements relating to the number, timing, duration and range of practice placements that students must undertake in order to achieve the programme's learning outcomes. This should include information as to how the

education provider ensures that the standards of proficiency are met through the placement experience.

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 evidence as to the formal process for approval and monitoring of placements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the Quality Assurance for Practice Learning (QAPL) framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to approving and monitoring placements. At the visit, the programme team articulated the effective system that is in place for sourcing, approving and auditing new placements, and the procedures for monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are subject to appropriate education provider monitoring and support systems. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placements they currently engage with. This includes information such as the student profiles, experiences on placements, details of placement educators and levels of training. However, no evidence as to the policies or procedures in place to ensure that the education provider is approving and monitoring all placements were provided in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further documentation to demonstrate that there is an effective and robust system in place for the approval and monitoring of all placements.

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 education provider must clarify how the equality and diversity policies will be implemented and monitored in relation to students on practice placements.

Reason: The 'Practice learning guide' was referenced as evidence as to how the programme will meet this SET. The guide, p102, states that "Disabled students will have a full assessment of their support needs before placement and any adjustments will be agreed and incorporated into the learning agreement...". However, the visitors were unable to determine from this guide or the partnership agreement documents, where the education provider would confirm with the practice provider that they have comprehensive equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided, what mechanisms were in place to mitigate risk pertaining to equality and diversity matters in placement situations, and what procedures are in place if something were to go wrong. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider will ensure that equality and diversity policies in place at placement providers will be effectively implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at placement settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff on placements. The 'Partnership agreement form' states that agency signatories agree to "Provide sufficient suitably qualified and experienced staff to practice assess students on the programme". This indicates that the placement provider will determine what is deemed as adequate supervision for assessment. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placement educators available on placements. However, from the documentation, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence of the policies the education provider uses to ensure that there is an adequate number of staff, with the relevant qualifications and experience to support the students in placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly articulates the criteria for practice placement providers, in terms of the requirements for appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and the steps taken by the education provider to check that these criteria are met by each placement provider.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and support social work students.

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 around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, the visitors did not see evidence of formal policies to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implementation in how they ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. The SETs mapping referred to "...LSBU records of Practice Educator training...", though the visitors could find no evidence or further information around this in the documentation. The programme specification (p26) briefly details the various practice educator training that is in place and what level of qualification is required from the practice educators for each placement. In discussions at the visit, the placement providers emphasised how supportive the programme team were in terms of providing training for practice educators. The visitors acknowledged that there were several training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for placement educators but were unable to see how each placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feed into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

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 around this process and its implications so as to how they ensure that practice educators are appropriately registered. The SETs mapping referred to a register but provided no further information. The programme specification (p26) briefly details what is required from the practice educators for each placement, stating that final placement students will be assessed by qualified social workers. However, first placement students are to be assessed by placement educators who are not HCPC registered. The visitors were subsequently unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The programme team must therefore specify the arrangements that are in place to ensure that the placement educators are sufficiently able to support and assess social work students. To ensure that 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.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that students are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning. At the visit, the programme team outlined the 'Readiness for practice' module which has to be passed by students prior to commencing placements. The visitors heard how this module will ensure that students are equipped with the theoretical foundations for placement settings. However, they were not clear as to how the students will be informed of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. As noted in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1, the information provided to students regarding assessments and learning outcomes has not been updated to reflect links the HCPC's SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the information provided to students will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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 programme team must further evidence how they will ensure that placement educators and placement providers are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The visitors noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the programme team's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the practice placement educators would be sufficiently informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of

drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation to support placement educators in placement teaching and assessing. The visitors did not see sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the current documentation, communication and training provided to placement educators will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placements. They therefore require further evidence as to the steps taken to ensure that placement providers and educators will have a sufficient understanding of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they will ensure that the learning, teaching and supervision on placements will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the module descriptors for assessment of practice learning as evidence for this SET. This documentary evidence does not indicate how the programme team will ensure that all practice experiences will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. At the visit, the programme team articulated the system that is in place for auditing and monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are managed through the appropriate systems at the education provider. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds key information as to the placements they currently engage with. However, no evidence was provided as to the steps the education provider will take, in auditing placements, to ensure that learning and teaching on placements will effectively encourage the expected qualities as detailed in this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the practice learning, teaching and supervision will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment strategy will ensure that a student graduating from the programme will have met all of the SOPs for social workers.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly assess each SOP. The visitors noted that some of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met and assessed. The visitors questioned the placement educators and programme team around the criteria for assessment of students in practice. It was noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the education provider's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the placement educators would be suitably informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and when the programme will assess students to ensure that they will be able to meet each of the SOPs for social workers on completion of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment methods employed will measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme module descriptors prior to the visit. They noted that for several modules, the assessments employed did not appear to measure the learning outcomes as specified in the relevant section of the module descriptor. One example of this can be found in the 'Human growth and development' module (Module descriptors document p8), where the visitors noted that a child observation presentation would be used to assess the whole module. The visitors could not determine how the assessment activity in this module will sufficiently measure the learning outcomes outlined in respect of the full human lifespan. For this reason, the visitors were unable to determine how this SET will be met. They therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation for the modules to ensure that the assessment methods employed will appropriately measure all of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide information as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment strategy as outlined in the programme documentation. The visitors were satisfied that a robust system for the appointment and use of external examiners was in place. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the internal moderation systems that were in place for ensuring consistency in marking. The 'Validation document' (p31) states that "All scripts are marked and moderated in accordance with University regulations". However, no further information as to the education provider's regulations and their implementation within the programme's marking procedures was provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, to include the arrangements and timings for resits and reassessment, particularly for placements.

Reason: The documentation states that the programme will 'normally' follow the 'University Academic Regulations'. However, no further information was provided as to the education provider's regulations and their implications for progression of students throughout the programme. There are details as to protocols specific to pre-registration social work programmes in the programme specification and course guide. These specify that students will have one attempt at retrieval if they fail the 'Readiness for

Practice' module, and will not be permitted to progress to the practice learning if they have not passed. They also specify that any failed practice elements will need to be reassessed, and that students have a maximum of three placements for the whole programme. However, there is no information as to when academic or practical reassessments will take place, whether this will continue outside the academic year, and how this will fit in with examination boards at the education provider. There is also limited information as to the details of reassessment for students failing placements, such as whether this will be in the same placement setting. As such the visitors could not determine, from the documentation, the requirements for progression and achievement, in practice or academic elements within the programme. They were also not clear about how and when reassessments would be undertaken, and how this will fit in with the education provider's assessment boards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme are clearly specified to students.

Jane McLenachan
Gordon Burrow
John Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London South Bank University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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' 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 9 May 2013. 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 6 June 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BA (Hons) Social 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 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	John Taylor (Social worker) Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Gordon Burrow (Chiroprapist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers	Benjamin Potter Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	50
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Shushma Patel (London South Bank University)
Secretary	Sally Skillett-Moore (London South Bank University)
Members of the joint panel	Michelle Spruce (Internal Panel Member) Hazel Willis (Internal Panel Member) Jill Davey (External Panel Member) June Sadd (The College of Social Work) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 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 provide further evidence of the information available to applicants to explain the application process and requirements of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page for the current MSc Social Work and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The latter requirement is assessed through checks with the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. The prospectus page notes that students will be required to attend an interview, but does not detail what this will specifically be assessing and therefore what criteria applicants will have to meet. The visitors could not determine what additional information was provided to applicants wishing to complete the employment based route of the MA. In particular they could not determine information about the additional criteria that they will be required to meet (as specified in the programme specification, p12). The visitors could also not determine where any information was provided to applicants wishing to complete a PG Dip in Social Work and therefore if students could apply to this programme directly. The visitors therefore require further evidence that potential applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information they need around the entry requirements to make an informed decision about applying to the programme.

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 provide further evidence of the information available to potential applicants, to include what will be required in terms of occupational health and criminal record checks.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and were made aware of the entry requirements for the applicants to the programme. The programme team provided links to the prospectus page and to the education provider's generic admissions pages, but did not submit any further evidence of information provided to applicants. The programme specification states that applicants will need to meet academic entry criteria, as well as demonstrating a general suitability for social work. The suitability is assessed through CRB checks, a self certification for medical fitness to practice, an interview and written tests. It was confirmed at the visit that the CRB check would be an enhanced CRB check (now the Disclosure and barring service (DBS)). However the documentation and information to students is not always consistent in specifying this. It was also confirmed with the programme team that the students will be required to pay for their enhanced DBS check. The visitors could not

identify where the information about these requirements are included on the prospectus webpage, or elsewhere, or where the requirement for the completion of a health declaration is made clear. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants to the programme will be given sufficient information about entry requirements and what will be required from them to successfully apply to the programme.

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 provide further evidence of the information given to potential applicants around the requirements of placement providers.

Reason: Students are required to attend placements at various stages throughout the programme. In discussions with the programme team, practice placement providers and students, the visitors learned that the placement providers will frequently require students to pass an interview or other application procedures, prior to being accepted on their placement. The panel also noted that students going on placements may need to travel long distances to placements, and incur the costs of this. In discussions at the visit, the programme team also clarified that if a student fails to achieve the required learning outcomes during placement, this may have implications on their progression. This may result in their not having a full summer vacation as they work to demonstrate that they have met all of the criteria necessary to pass. The visitors therefore require further evidence that applicants are clearly informed of these additional requirements and potential costs of going on placements throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants will be equipped to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of 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: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The entry requirements for the programme specify that students must complete a 'Self-declaration of suitability for social work' form. At the visit, the visitors enquired as to how the information from the self-declarations will feed into the established procedures for dealing with any occupational health issues. The programme team stated that declarations would be followed up with investigations as necessary. They also confirmed that there was an onus on the students to keep the education provider informed if there were any changes to their occupational health throughout the course of the programme. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors were unable to ascertain how the students are made aware of this, or what the formal procedures are for determining which declarations will need to be followed up. They therefore require further evidence that there is a robust process for dealing with the information given in the students' self-declaration of suitability for social work forms and follow up procedures.

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 social work programmes.

Reason: The programme documentation states that students wishing to transfer from another social work programme will be considered on a case by case basis. The programme team expanded on this at the visit, explaining the education provider-wide policies in place for mapping credit 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. The visitors were therefore content that robust procedures for applying AP(E)L are in place at education provider level. However, they were unclear about how the programme team utilises this process to ensure that students who are exempted from certain parts of this programme will be able to meet all of the standards of proficiency for social work. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the formal processes as articulated at the visit are clearly in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team indicated that equality and diversity and widening participation matters are monitored by the education provider centrally by the admissions team. The visitors also noted from the documentation that training has been undertaken for social work academic staff to ensure equality and diversity in the interviewing process. However, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence as to how the programme team will implement the education provider's overarching equality and diversity policies in relation to students on the programme. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what process is in place for collecting information on the application and monitoring of the policy. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored to ensure this standard is being met.

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 reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. They noted areas across the resources available to students that were inaccurate, inconsistent or were not reflective of the current setting of regulation for social workers in England. There are various references throughout the documentation to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) where the HCPC should be referenced instead. 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 'Standards of Learning and Training' (Document E, p20), the 'HCPC (2009) Code of Conduct and Ethics' (Validation document, p26) and the HCPC/TCSW Code of Practice (2002) (Appendix A, Course Guide). At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed. This document has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors therefore require further evidence that all programme resources and documentation will support student learning in all settings. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning to determine that the visitors can meet this SET.

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 further evidence that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols are in place to obtain consent.

Reason: Through documentation and discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The programme team clarified that they emphasise to students only to share what they feel comfortable with. However, the visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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 provide further information as to the action taken for low attendance.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit, and were made aware that student attendance is mandatory for practice and academic modules. The programme's 'Course guide' states that students are expected to attend all lectures, and that an attendance level of 100% has been set for the programme. However, the 'Course guide' states that where attendance falls below 80%, the student may be required to retake a module "...if their academic performance is deemed to have been adversely affected by their low attendance". The visitors were unclear as to how this policy is implemented, and how it is determined whether a student's academic performance has been adversely affected. The documentation is clear around attendance at skills days and the processes in place for students who fall ill. On p31 of the 'Course guide' it states that absence of more than three placement days would later

need to be made up to make the full 100 placement days. However, the main attendance information in the 'Course guide' does not distinguish between the attendance requirements for theory modules and placements. The visitors articulated that this variance in information could be misleading to students; they could understand that an attendance of 80% on placement would be satisfactory. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what will constitute low attendance in each setting, and what action will be taken in such cases. They also require evidence that this policy is sufficiently communicated to students on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify in the documentation the processes that students will be subject to if there are concerns about their profession-related conduct.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. The students are required to sign a 'Statement of professional conduct', and the 'Practice learning guide' demonstrates that students are expected to respect various codes of conduct (however, there are incorrect references to an 'HCPC Code of Practice'). However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professionalism. The visitors were also unclear about how the criteria for the referral of any issue to a disciplinary committee are communicated to all relevant parties. In discussions with the placement providers, it appeared that they were unclear as to the procedures or lines of reporting for concerns around students' profession-related conduct. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with any issues around students' profession-related conduct. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process and what criteria will be used to determine if the formal process must be implemented. In this way, the visitors can determine if this SET is met.

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 further evidence that pinpoints specifically where each of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are met throughout the programme.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach or address each SOP. The visitors noted that several elements of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met. Discussion at the visit also indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors' learning outcomes as part of the post visit process for the education provider or professional body. If changes are to be made to the descriptors the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the learning outcomes or how the programme ensures students can meet the SOPs upon completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and where the programme will

ensure that students will be able to meet the SOPs for social workers on graduation. The visitors also require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if changes are made which will affect the way in which SOPs are addressed.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence in the curriculum that students completing the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: As evidence for this SET, the programme team referenced the course guide, module descriptors, practice learning guide and definitive guide. Apart from one reference to the HCPC guide for standards of conduct, performance and ethics, stating that it will influence admissions, there did not appear to be any references to where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be addressed in the programme. The visitors were unable to find evidence to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team will ensure that students on the programme understand the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and their implications for the regulation of social workers.

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 programme team must provide further evidence as to the number and range of placements, the duration and timing of placements and how this supports the meeting of learning outcomes in the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation provided prior to the visit including the 'Practice learning guide', and the programme specification. There was information about the number of days students will spend on practice each year and what competencies (mapped against the professional body (PCF) framework, but not the SOPs) are expected to be met, and to what level, in each placement. The programme documentation also stated the type of practice placements that students might get in each placement. However, the information provided (particularly in the Practice learning guide) was fragmented and sometimes inconsistent, and it was difficult for the visitors to gain a clear understanding of the requirements relating to the placements that students must undertake. Discussions at the visit also highlighted that there was a flexible start date for the placements, which was accommodating for placement providers and may enable more places to be available to students. However, this may mean that students are not getting the same experience of doing the placements alongside relevant academic modules and could mean that students have to finish their placement late into the vacation period. This could have implications on their plans, as well as the costs associated with placements and the potential support available from the education provider. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clearly articulate the requirements relating to the number, timing, duration and range of practice placements that students must undertake in order to achieve the programme's learning outcomes. This should include information as to how the

education provider ensures that the standards of proficiency are met through the placement experience.

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 evidence as to the formal process for approval and monitoring of placements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the Quality Assurance for Practice Learning (QAPL) framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to approving and monitoring placements. At the visit, the programme team articulated the effective system that is in place for sourcing, approving and auditing new placements, and the procedures for monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are subject to appropriate education provider monitoring and support systems. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placements they currently engage with. This includes information such as the student profiles, experiences on placements, details of placement educators and levels of training. However, no evidence as to the policies or procedures in place to ensure that the education provider is approving and monitoring all placements were provided in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further documentation to demonstrate that there is an effective and robust system in place for the approval and monitoring of all placements.

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 education provider must clarify how the equality and diversity policies will be implemented and monitored in relation to students on practice placements.

Reason: The 'Practice learning guide' was referenced as evidence as to how the programme will meet this SET. The guide, p102, states that "Disabled students will have a full assessment of their support needs before placement and any adjustments will be agreed and incorporated into the learning agreement...". However, the visitors were unable to determine from this guide or the partnership agreement documents, where the education provider would confirm with the practice provider that they have comprehensive equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided, what mechanisms were in place to mitigate risk pertaining to equality and diversity matters in placement situations, and what procedures are in place if something were to go wrong. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the education provider will ensure that equality and diversity policies in place at placement providers will be effectively implemented and monitored.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at placement settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff on placements. The 'Partnership agreement form' states that agency signatories agree to "Provide sufficient suitably qualified and experienced staff to practice assess students on the programme". This indicates that the placement provider will determine what is deemed as adequate supervision for assessment. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that they have a database which holds information as to the placement educators available on placements. However, from the documentation, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence of the policies the education provider uses to ensure that there is an adequate number of staff, with the relevant qualifications and experience to support the students in placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly articulates the criteria for practice placement providers, in terms of the requirements for appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and the steps taken by the education provider to check that these criteria are met by each placement provider.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and support social work students.

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 around this process and its implications as to how they ensure that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, the visitors did not see evidence of formal policies to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that a 'Partnership agreement form' and the QAPL framework were used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this process and its implementation in how they ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. The SETs mapping referred to "...LSBU records of Practice Educator training...", though the visitors could find no evidence or further information around this in the documentation. The programme specification (p26) briefly details the various practice educator training that is in place and what level of qualification is required from the practice educators for each placement. In discussions at the visit, the placement providers emphasised how supportive the programme team were in terms of providing training for practice educators. The visitors acknowledged that there were several training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for placement educators but were unable to see how each placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feed into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to their processes to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

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 around this process and its implications so as to how they ensure that practice educators are appropriately registered. The SETs mapping referred to a register but provided no further information. The programme specification (p26) briefly details what is required from the practice educators for each placement, stating that final placement students will be assessed by qualified social workers. However, first placement students are to be assessed by placement educators who are not HCPC registered. The visitors were subsequently unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The programme team must therefore specify the arrangements that are in place to ensure that the placement educators are sufficiently able to support and assess social work students. To ensure that 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.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that students are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation; either the pan-London document or, if this is not complete, a contingency set of documentation to support placement learning. At the visit, the programme team outlined the 'Readiness for practice' module which has to be passed by students prior to commencing placements. The visitors heard how this module will ensure that students are equipped with the theoretical foundations for placement settings. However, they were not clear as to how the students will be informed of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. As noted in the conditions against SET 4.1 and 6.1, the information provided to students regarding assessments and learning outcomes has not been updated to reflect links the HCPC's SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the information provided to students will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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 programme team must further evidence how they will ensure that placement educators and placement providers are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the 'Practice learning guide' as evidence that this SET will be met. At the visit, the 'Practice learning guide' was discussed with the programme team and it was highlighted that it has not been effectively updated to reflect changes to the programme and in places is incomplete. The visitors noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the programme team's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the practice placement educators would be sufficiently informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment. The programme team clarified that they are in the process of

drafting a pan-London practice learning document and hope to have it ready by the end of this academic year. The visitors will need to see appropriate documentation to support placement educators in placement teaching and assessing. The visitors did not see sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the current documentation, communication and training provided to placement educators will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placements. They therefore require further evidence as to the steps taken to ensure that placement providers and educators will have a sufficient understanding of placement timings and durations, expectations for professional conduct, learning outcomes, assessments and lines of responsibility.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they will ensure that the learning, teaching and supervision on placements will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the module descriptors for assessment of practice learning as evidence for this SET. This documentary evidence does not indicate how the programme team will ensure that all practice experiences will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. At the visit, the programme team articulated the system that is in place for auditing and monitoring placements. It was confirmed that all placement opportunities are managed through the appropriate systems at the education provider. The programme team also confirmed that they have a database which holds key information as to the placements they currently engage with. However, no evidence was provided as to the steps the education provider will take, in auditing placements, to ensure that learning and teaching on placements will effectively encourage the expected qualities as detailed in this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the practice learning, teaching and supervision will encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment strategy will ensure that a student graduating from the programme will have met all of the SOPs for social workers.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted with the documentation referenced a large number of different modules within the programme against each SOP. Due to the number of references given, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly assess each SOP. The visitors noted that some of the documentation still referred to the previous regulator's frameworks, and they therefore need to be updated to explicitly reflect how and when the SOPs will be met and assessed. The visitors questioned the placement educators and programme team around the criteria for assessment of students in practice. It was noted that the practice elements of the programme are pass or fail, as decided by the practice placement educator, in liaison with the education provider's link tutor. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how the placement educators would be suitably informed as to the criteria for passing students so as to make this assessment.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how and when the programme will assess students to ensure that they will be able to meet each of the SOPs for social workers on completion of the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment methods employed will measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme module descriptors prior to the visit. They noted that for several modules, the assessments employed did not appear to measure the learning outcomes as specified in the relevant section of the module descriptor. One example of this can be found in the 'Human growth and development' module (Module descriptors document p8), where the visitors noted that a child observation presentation would be used to assess the whole module. The visitors could not determine how the assessment activity in this module will sufficiently measure the learning outcomes outlined in respect of the full human lifespan. For this reason, the visitors were unable to determine how this SET will be met. They therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation for the modules to ensure that the assessment methods employed will appropriately measure all of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide information as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment strategy as outlined in the programme documentation. The visitors were satisfied that a robust system for the appointment and use of external examiners was in place. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the internal moderation systems that were in place for ensuring consistency in marking. The 'Validation document' (p31) states that "All scripts are marked and moderated in accordance with University regulations". However, no further information as to the education provider's regulations and their implementation within the programme's marking procedures was provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, to include the arrangements and timings for resits and reassessment, particularly for placements.

Reason: The documentation states that the programme will 'normally' follow the 'University Academic Regulations'. However, no further information was provided as to the education provider's regulations and their implications for progression of students throughout the programme. There are details as to protocols specific to pre-registration social work programmes in the programme specification and course guide. These specify that students will have one attempt at retrieval if they fail the 'Readiness for

Practice' module, and will not be permitted to progress to the practice learning if they have not passed. They also specify that any failed practice elements will need to be reassessed, and that students have a maximum of three placements for the whole programme. However, there is no information as to when academic or practical reassessments will take place, whether this will continue outside the academic year, and how this will fit in with examination boards at the education provider. There is also limited information as to the details of reassessment for students failing placements, such as whether this will be in the same placement setting. As such the visitors could not determine, from the documentation, the requirements for progression and achievement, in practice or academic elements within the programme. They were also not clear about how and when reassessments would be undertaken, and how this will fit in with the education provider's assessment boards. The visitors therefore require further evidence that requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme are clearly specified to students.

Jane McLenachan
Gordon Burrow
John Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 April 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and 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 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Teri Rogers (Social worker) Peter Branston (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	130
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Lyndsey McPhail (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Louise Manley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Claire Stansbie (Internal Panel Member) Rick Fothergill (Internal Panel Member) Edd Graham-Hyde (Internal Panel Member) Ali Gardner (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 2 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 clarify the information provided to potential applicants, particularly around additional potential costs of placements, in order to ensure they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The programme team provided 'fact sheets' for the programme which provide potential applicants with information. In discussion with the students and the programme team, the visitors heard that the travel costs of some placements are not covered by the NHS Bursaries available to students, and that these costs will need to be covered by the students. Some of the students also stated that they were not informed of the possible travel requirements or financial implications of going on placements prior to joining the programme. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that some of this information may be covered in presentations at the interview day. However, they did not see sufficient evidence that all applicants to the programme are informed of the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the possible distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is being met.

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 provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for student attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation that 100% attendance is expected for both practice and academic modules. The education provider uses the electronic Student Attendance Monitoring (SAM) system to monitor student attendance for the academic modules. However, in discussions at the visit, students highlighted several instances where the system has not reported correctly. The visitors also heard that some staff did not use the SAM system, that some used a paper register to monitor attendance, and some did not monitor attendance at lectures at all. The student handbook states that where students' attendance falls below 100%, this '...may be taken into consideration by the Assessment Board (and may affect student progression and the award of marks)'. The practice learning document states that days absent in placement must be made up, and outlines the stages at which an absence will need to be escalated to the tutor, or supported with a medical note. However, there is no information as to what will trigger the procedures for low attendance, in placement or in

academic settings, or what specific action will be taken if students fail to attend. In order to ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that there is an effective mechanism for recording student attendance. They also require further evidence of what will constitute low attendance in each setting, what specific action will be taken in such cases and how this policy is communicated to students on the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators in support of practice learning, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the relevant modules' documents, and the materials available to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being covered.

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators around assessment of practice, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the assessment strategy, and documents to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being assessed.

Beverley Blythe
Peter Branston
Teri Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 April 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Teri Rogers (Social worker) Peter Branston (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	100
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Lyndsey McPhail (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Louise Manley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Claire Stansbie (Internal Panel Member) Rick Fothergill (Internal Panel Member) Edd Graham-Hyde (Internal Panel Member) Ali Gardner (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 3 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 clarify the information provided to potential applicants, particularly around additional potential costs of placements, in order to ensure they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The programme team provided 'fact sheets' for the programme which provide potential applicants with information. In discussion with the students and the programme team, the visitors heard that the travel costs of some placements are not covered by the NHS Bursaries available to students, and that these costs will need to be covered by the students. Some of the students also stated that they were not informed of the possible travel requirements or financial implications of going on placements prior to joining the programme. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that some of this information may be covered in presentations at the interview day. However, they did not see sufficient evidence that all applicants to the programme are informed of the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the possible distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is being met.

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 provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for student attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation that 100% attendance is expected for both practice and academic modules. The education provider uses the electronic Student Attendance Monitoring (SAM) system to monitor student attendance for the academic modules. However, in discussions at the visit, students highlighted several instances where the system has not reported correctly. The visitors also heard that some staff did not use the SAM system, that some used a paper register to monitor attendance, and some did not monitor attendance at lectures at all. The student handbook states that where students' attendance falls below 100%, this '...may be taken into consideration by the Assessment Board (and may affect student progression and the award of marks)'. The practice learning document states that days absent in placement must be made up, and outlines the stages at which an absence will need to be escalated to the tutor, or supported with a medical note. However, there is no information as to what will trigger the procedures for low attendance, in placement or in

academic settings, or what specific action will be taken if students fail to attend. In order to ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that there is an effective mechanism for recording student attendance. They also require further evidence of what will constitute low attendance in each setting, what specific action will be taken in such cases and how this policy is communicated to students on the programme.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team must provide further information around the implementation and content for action learning sets, and how they will ensure the effective delivery of the curriculum for the affected modules.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit and were made aware that action learning sets will be a key teaching and learning approach for the delivery of several modules. At the visit, the programme team further explained the details of the action learning sets, including the proposed number of students for each group, and some ideas for the tasks and themes. The visitors heard that three modules in the first year and two modules in the second year will use the action learning sets. There will be themed weeks to ensure greater cohesion of learning across the modules. However, the visitors did not see a finalised plan for the content that will be covered through the action learning sets, or how the teaching and learning will be implemented. As they will constitute a large proportion of the delivery of the programme's curriculum, the visitors require further evidence that there is a clear plan for the implementation and content of the action learning sets. The visitors will need to see further evidence that this learning and teaching technique will ensure the effective delivery of the curriculum, in order to be content that this SET will be met throughout the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators in support of practice learning, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the relevant modules' documents, and the materials available to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being covered.

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators around assessment of practice, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the assessment strategy, and documents to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being assessed.

Beverley Blythe
Peter Branston
Teri Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 April 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social Work and MA 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 education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Teri Rogers (Social worker) Peter Branston (Educational psychologist)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	100
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Lyndsey McPhail (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Louise Manley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Claire Stansbie (Internal Panel Member) Rick Fothergill (Internal Panel Member) Edd Graham-Hyde (Internal Panel Member) Ali Gardner (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 3 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 clarify the information provided to potential applicants, particularly around additional potential costs of placements, in order to ensure they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The programme team provided 'fact sheets' for the programme which provide potential applicants with information. In discussion with the students and the programme team, the visitors heard that the travel costs of some placements are not covered by the NHS Bursaries available to students, and that these costs will need to be covered by the students. Some of the students also stated that they were not informed of the possible travel requirements or financial implications of going on placements prior to joining the programme. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that some of this information may be covered in presentations at the interview day. However, they did not see sufficient evidence that all applicants to the programme are informed of the logistical arrangements associated with placements, including information about the potential distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional costs associated with attending placement. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising material, to clearly highlight to potential applicants the possible distances students may be required to travel when attending placements and any additional personal costs associated with attending placements. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is being met.

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 provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for student attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors were made aware from the documentation that 100% attendance is expected for both practice and academic modules. The education provider uses the electronic Student Attendance Monitoring (SAM) system to monitor student attendance for the academic modules. However, in discussions at the visit, students highlighted several instances where the system has not reported correctly. The visitors also heard that some staff did not use the SAM system, that some used a paper register to monitor attendance, and some did not monitor attendance at lectures at all. The student handbook states that where students' attendance falls below 100%, this '...may be taken into consideration by the Assessment Board (and may affect student progression and the award of marks)'. The practice learning document states that days absent in placement must be made up, and outlines the stages at which an absence will need to be escalated to the tutor, or supported with a medical note. However, there is no information as to what will trigger the procedures for low attendance, in placement or in

academic settings, or what specific action will be taken if students fail to attend. In order to ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence that there is an effective mechanism for recording student attendance. They also require further evidence of what will constitute low attendance in each setting, what specific action will be taken in such cases and how this policy is communicated to students on the programme.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The programme team must provide further information around the implementation and content for action learning sets, and how they will ensure the effective delivery of the curriculum for the affected modules.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit and were made aware that action learning sets will be a key teaching and learning approach for the delivery of several modules. At the visit, the programme team further explained the details of the action learning sets, including the proposed number of students for each group, and some ideas for the tasks and themes. The visitors heard that three modules in the first year and two modules in the second year will use the action learning sets. There will be themed weeks to ensure greater cohesion of learning across the modules. However, the visitors did not see a finalised plan for the content that will be covered through the action learning sets, or how the teaching and learning will be implemented. As they will constitute a large proportion of the delivery of the programme's curriculum, the visitors require further evidence that there is a clear plan for the implementation and content of the action learning sets. The visitors will need to see further evidence that this learning and teaching technique will ensure the effective delivery of the curriculum, in order to be content that this SET will be met throughout the programme.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators in support of practice learning, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the relevant modules' documents, and the materials available to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being covered.

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.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students and placement educators around assessment of practice, to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. The visitors were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. However, they noted that the practice learning document has a heavy focus on achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework, but is not overtly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how the achievement of the standards of proficiency was more implicit in the practice learning documentation. They considered that this SET could be further demonstrated if the documents supporting practice placements were to more explicitly reflect the importance of achievement of the SOPs in practice. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers revisiting the assessment strategy, and documents to support students and practice educators in placements, to further highlight where the HCPC's SOPs are being assessed.

Beverley Blythe
Peter Branston
Teri Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	17 – 18 April 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 27 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA Social Work and Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). 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. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	40
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Roger Kay (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Roger Whiteley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Kath Morris (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 8 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 clarify the information provided to potential applicants, particularly around timescales associated with placements, in order to ensure they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit. The programme team provided links to the webpage, a copy of the presentation given at open days, a leaflet for interview days and a copy of the funding presentation given at interview days. The web link provided contained references to the previous regulator, though it was noted at the visit that the website has now been updated. In discussion with the students and the programme team, the visitors heard that students on the programme are not guaranteed to be on placements by the end of the academic year and may therefore need to continue into the summer in order to get their full placement experience. If a placement is not allocated within the set timeframes, this could delay the student's assessment into the next academic year and may affect progression. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that this information is covered in presentations at the interview day. However, they did not see sufficient evidence that all applicants to the programme are informed of this aspect of placements, and they could also not see from the presentation and the website information submitted, where applicants are informed as to the requirement of an enhanced DBS check or health declaration. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation, including all advertising materials, to ensure all information is accurate and up to date, and to highlight to potential applicants the potential issues associated with securing and attending placements. In this way, the visitors can ensure that this standard is being met.

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 must provide evidence that the named person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is registered as a social worker, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: It was noted from the documentation that not all of the staff teaching on the programme are HCPC registered social workers, and in particular that the programme lead was not registered. At the visit, the senior team confirmed that there are currently several staff in the process of becoming registered, and that they expect those who are eligible to register, to do so over the next year. In order to confirm that this SET is being met, the visitors require evidence that the named person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is registered as a social worker, unless other arrangements are agreed. If this person is not registered with the HCPC, further detail as to their qualifications and experience, and the support that they will receive for the role will be required.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the panel with final programme documentation following any changes made as a result of the internal review process.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and resources available to support students through the programme prior to the visit. The visitors noted that the programme was reviewed by an internal panel on the 5 March 2013. During the HCPC's visit, the visitors heard that there would be amendments made to the programme documentation in response to issues raised through the internal review process. They also learned that the programme team were, at the time of the visit, still seeking 'derogations' from the education provider's regulations in relation to compensation and progression throughout the programme. If the derogations are not permitted, this would need to be reflected in changes to the resources supporting students through the programme. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors will need to review any revised programme documentation in order to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used, and that the SETs continue to be met following any changes. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation, highlighting where changes have been made.

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 ensure that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment of student performance in practice placements is objective, consistent and ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support students and practice educators in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against

these frameworks at each level. As practice educators will be responsible for assessing students in practice, the visitors therefore need further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore met the learning outcomes. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the assessment criteria for the level which students are required to meet on each placement block are clearly communicated to practice educators and students. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there will be effective and rigorous monitoring mechanisms to ensure consistent and appropriate standards in the assessment of placements.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment procedures as outlined in the programme documentation. They were satisfied that there are both internal and external moderation processes being carried out for the assessments taking place at the education provider. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the moderation systems that were in place for ensuring the appropriate standards of assessment of practice placements. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the personal tutor is able to pick up issues on placements, and will collaborate with the placement provider to help provide consistency in placement experiences. The visitors also noted that the 'second opinion process' can be initiated where concerns about a placement performance exist. However, as specified in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors did not see evidence as to clear guidance for criteria in assessing placements. They were therefore unable to determine how the programme team will apply monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure parity of assessment in placements and meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place will ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met in placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how the staff will be enabled to apply assessment criteria consistently when assessing students' achievement in practice placements.

Reason: As outlined in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support practice educators in assessing student achievement in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against these frameworks at each level. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the requirements for student achievement were clearly specified for the practice elements of the programme. For this reason, the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore achieved the learning outcomes. They therefore require the

programme team to revisit the documentation supporting practice placement assessment to ensure that assessors will be fully enabled to measure all of the learning outcomes effectively and consistently.

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 clearly specify in assessment regulations 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 from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiners meet the requirement of the HCPC. However, this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme are included in the assessment regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

Joanna Jackson
Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	17 – 18 April 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 27 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) and 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. 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 programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Roger Kay (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Roger Whiteley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Kath Morris (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the panel with final programme documentation following any changes made as a result of the internal review process.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and resources available to support students through the programme prior to the visit. The visitors noted that the programme was reviewed by an internal panel on the 5 March 2013. During the HCPC's visit, the visitors heard that there would be amendments made to the programme documentation in response to issues raised through the internal review process. They also learned that the programme team were, at the time of the visit, still seeking 'derogations' from the education provider's regulations in relation to compensation and progression throughout the programme. If the derogations are not permitted, this would need to be reflected in changes to the resources supporting students through the programme. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors will need to review any revised programme documentation in order to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used, and that the SETs continue to be met following any changes. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation, highlighting where changes have been made.

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 ensure that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment of student performance in practice placements is objective, consistent and ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support students and practice educators in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of

proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against these frameworks at each level. As practice educators will be responsible for assessing students in practice, the visitors therefore need further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore met the learning outcomes. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the assessment criteria for the level which students are required to meet on each placement block are clearly communicated to practice educators and students. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there will be effective and rigorous monitoring mechanisms to ensure consistent and appropriate standards in the assessment of placements.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment procedures as outlined in the programme documentation. They were satisfied that there are both internal and external moderation processes being carried out for the assessments taking place at the education provider. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the moderation systems that were in place for ensuring the appropriate standards of assessment of practice placements. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the personal tutor is able to pick up issues on placements, and will collaborate with the placement provider to help provide consistency in placement experiences. The visitors also noted that the 'second opinion process' can be initiated where concerns about a placement performance exist. However, as specified in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors did not see evidence as to clear guidance for criteria in assessing placements. They were therefore unable to determine how the programme team will apply monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure parity of assessment in placements and meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place will ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met in placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how the staff will be enabled to apply assessment criteria consistently when assessing students' achievement in practice placements.

Reason: As outlined in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support practice educators in assessing student achievement in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against these frameworks at each level. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the requirements for student achievement were clearly specified for the practice elements of the programme. For this

reason, the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore achieved the learning outcomes. They therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation supporting practice placement assessment to ensure that assessors will be fully enabled to measure all of the learning outcomes effectively and consistently.

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 clearly specify in assessment regulations 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 from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiners meet the requirement of the HCPC. However, this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme are included in the assessment regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

Joanna Jackson
Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Chester
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	17 – 18 April 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 27 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA Social Work and 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. 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 programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Roger Kay (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Roger Whiteley (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Kath Morris (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the panel with final programme documentation following any changes made as a result of the internal review process.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation and resources available to support students through the programme prior to the visit. The visitors noted that the programme was reviewed by an internal panel on the 5 March 2013. During the HCPC's visit, the visitors heard that there would be amendments made to the programme documentation in response to issues raised through the internal review process. They also learned that the programme team were, at the time of the visit, still seeking 'derogations' from the education provider's regulations in relation to compensation and progression throughout the programme. If the derogations are not permitted, this would need to be reflected in changes to the resources supporting students through the programme. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors will need to review any revised programme documentation in order to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used, and that the SETs continue to be met following any changes. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation, highlighting where changes have been made.

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 ensure that a formal system is in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the assessment of student performance in practice placements is objective, consistent and ensures fitness to practise.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support students and practice educators in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of

proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against these frameworks at each level. As practice educators will be responsible for assessing students in practice, the visitors therefore need further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore met the learning outcomes. The visitors also require further evidence as to how the assessment criteria for the level which students are required to meet on each placement block are clearly communicated to practice educators and students. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether this SET has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there will be effective and rigorous monitoring mechanisms to ensure consistent and appropriate standards in the assessment of placements.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment procedures as outlined in the programme documentation. They were satisfied that there are both internal and external moderation processes being carried out for the assessments taking place at the education provider. However, they were unable to determine from the documentation provided, the moderation systems that were in place for ensuring the appropriate standards of assessment of practice placements. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the personal tutor is able to pick up issues on placements, and will collaborate with the placement provider to help provide consistency in placement experiences. The visitors also noted that the 'second opinion process' can be initiated where concerns about a placement performance exist. However, as specified in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors did not see evidence as to clear guidance for criteria in assessing placements. They were therefore unable to determine how the programme team will apply monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure parity of assessment in placements and meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place will ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met in placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how the staff will be enabled to apply assessment criteria consistently when assessing students' achievement in practice placements.

Reason: As outlined in the condition for SET 6.5, the visitors were provided with the documents that would be used to support practice educators in assessing student achievement in the placement setting. The 'practice report' document will be used in the practice setting to map evidence to the standards of proficiency and the professional body's capabilities framework. However, through discussions with the placement providers and programme team, the visitors did not see evidence of clear guidance for practice educators as to the criteria for assessing against these frameworks at each level. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the requirements for student achievement were clearly specified for the practice elements of the programme. For this

reason, the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team will ensure that students have demonstrated the SOPs and capabilities at the required level in each placement, and therefore achieved the learning outcomes. They therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation supporting practice placement assessment to ensure that assessors will be fully enabled to measure all of the learning outcomes effectively and consistently.

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 clearly specify in assessment regulations 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 from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were happy that the current external examiners meet the requirement of the HCPC. However, this standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme are included in the assessment regulations, to ensure that this standard is met.

Joanna Jackson
Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker
Relevant modality / domain	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 March 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme - 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	70 (Inclusive of Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only))
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Phil Padfield (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Sue Knight (University of Manchester)
Members of the joint panel	Jonathan Dickens (External Panel Member) Jane Heyes (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work) Nigel Haydon (Observer) (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 2 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 programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. For example, the information pack for applicants on page 9 states 'the ECDL is a HCPC precondition for registration as a Social Worker, students are responsible for the ECDL'. This is an incorrect statement as HCPC does not require the European Computer Driving License (ECDL) as a precondition for registration. The same document on page 10 states 'The award (Postgraduate Diploma or MA in Social Work) will qualify students to register with the General Social Care Council a competent to practice social worker'. This reference to the previous regulatory body is misleading as the social work profession (in England) came onto the HCPC Register on 1 August 2012. The programme specification document page 9 refers 30 days of professional skill development and the 170 days of practice learning as requirements of HCPC which is incorrect. HCPC does not require specific number of practice learning days. On another occasion, the Social Work Placements Collaboration Agreement states 'We are now required by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) to have a written agreement contract in place with all of our placement providers'. This statement is incorrect as the HCPC requires the education provider to have appropriate policies and procedures in place to manage placements, but does not have specific requirements about what these policies must be. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. Such incorrect statements could create confusion and mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators are prepared for placements including information about an understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors noted that both groups were involved with the programme team in developing and evaluating the programme. It was also made clear

that they were provided information to prepare them for supervising students on placements. However, the visitors were unclear what information practice placement educators are given about the specific learning outcomes that students need to achieve while on placement. The visitors were also unclear about how these learning outcomes relate to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers (in England) and how practice placement educators were aware of this. Therefore, visitors require further evidence from the education provider to demonstrate how practice placement educators are made aware of the specific learning outcomes students need to achieve while on placement. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how these learning outcomes are related to the SOPs. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard is met.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how practice placement educators are prepared to supervise students on placement and ensure that they adhere to the expectations of professional conduct.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors noted that both groups were involved with the programme team in developing and evaluating the programme. It was also made clear that they were provided information to prepare them for supervising students on placements. However, the visitors were unclear as to how placement educators were prepared to ensure that students adhere to the expectations of professional conduct while on placement. In particular the visitors could not determine how practice placement educators were prepared to ensure that students understand the application of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). Therefore, the visitors require further evidence from the education provider to demonstrate how practice placement educators are made aware of the professional expectations that students must adhere to and how these expectations reflect the SCPEs. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard is met.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the Social Worker (in England) part of the Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of social work specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors also noted that the modules descriptors provided evidence to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider reviewing the programme documentation to further emphasise the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the students, and from reviewing programme documentation, the visitors noted that HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be taught and assessed. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited and implicit. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Beverley Blythe
Patricia Higham
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Manchester
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
Relevant modality / domain	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 March 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 May 2013 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 6 June 2013. 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 6 June 2013. 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 4 July 2013.

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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programme - MA 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 education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Ruth Baker (Clinical psychologist) Beverley Blythe (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	70 (Inclusive of Master in Social Work)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Phil Padfield (University of Manchester)
Secretary	Sue Knight (University of Manchester)
Members of the joint panel	Jonathan Dickens (External Panel Member) Jane Heyes (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work) Nigel Haydon (Observer) (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that 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 2 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 programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. For example, the information pack for applicants on page 9 states 'the ECDL is a HCPC precondition for registration as a Social Worker, students are responsible for the ECDL'. This is an incorrect statement as HCPC does not require the European Computer Driving License (ECDL) as a precondition for registration. The same document on page 10 states 'The award (Postgraduate Diploma or MA in Social Work) will qualify students to register with the General Social Care Council a competent to practice social worker'. This reference to the previous regulatory body is misleading as the social work profession (in England) came onto the HCPC Register on 1 August 2012. The programme specification document page 9 refers 30 days of professional skill development and the 170 days of practice learning as requirements of HCPC which is incorrect. HCPC does not require specific number of practice learning days. On another occasion, the Social Work Placements Collaboration Agreement states 'We are now required by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) to have a written agreement contract in place with all of our placement providers'. This statement is incorrect as the HCPC requires the education provider to have appropriate policies and procedures in place to manage placements, but does not have specific requirements about what these policies must be. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. Such incorrect statements could create confusion and mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators are prepared for placements including information about an understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors noted that both groups were involved with the programme team in developing and evaluating the programme. It was also made clear

that they were provided information to prepare them for supervising students on placements. However, the visitors were unclear what information practice placement educators are given about the specific learning outcomes that students need to achieve while on placement. The visitors were also unclear about how these learning outcomes relate to the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers (in England) and how practice placement educators were aware of this. Therefore, visitors require further evidence from the education provider to demonstrate how practice placement educators are made aware of the specific learning outcomes students need to achieve while on placement. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how these learning outcomes are related to the SOPs. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard is met.

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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how practice placement educators are prepared to supervise students on placement and ensure that they adhere to the expectations of professional conduct.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors noted that both groups were involved with the programme team in developing and evaluating the programme. It was also made clear that they were provided information to prepare them for supervising students on placements. However, the visitors were unclear as to how placement educators were prepared to ensure that students adhere to the expectations of professional conduct while on placement. In particular the visitors could not determine how practice placement educators were prepared to ensure that students understand the application of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). Therefore, the visitors require further evidence from the education provider to demonstrate how practice placement educators are made aware of the professional expectations that students must adhere to and how these expectations reflect the SCPEs. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard is met.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider revisiting the programme documentation to further highlight learning outcomes specific to the Social Worker (in England) part of the Register.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of social work specific content ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the relevant standards of proficiency. The visitors also noted that the modules descriptors provided evidence to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors highlighted that it was not always clear which learning outcomes are associated with which standard of proficiency. The visitors recommend that the education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to further emphasise the learning outcomes that are specific to standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider reviewing the programme documentation to further emphasise the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the students, and from reviewing programme documentation, the visitors noted that HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics will be taught and assessed. The visitors were therefore satisfied that the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of these standards. However, from a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that references to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were limited and implicit. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider should consider reviewing the programme documentation to further highlight the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Beverley Blythe
Patricia Higham
Ruth Baker