

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Liverpool Hope University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12338-H2H5V1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	4
Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Amanda Fitchett	Social worker
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 November 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07291

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided in the submission for the academic years 2015 - 2016 (due to the external examiner resigning) and 2016 - 2017 (due to replacement being completed after the exam board)
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided in the submission for the academic years 2015 - 2016 (due to the external examiner resigning) and 2016 - 2017 (due to replacement being completed after the exam board)

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors noted that external examiner reports were not provided for the academic year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. However, it states in the documentation that “external examiners who had resigned had responded to assignments and work prior to UCUI action”. Without these key required documents, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme’s effectiveness. The visitors therefore require the external examiner reports or the comments from the external examiners mentioned in the annual review and enhancement undergraduate provision document 2015-2016 for the academic years 2015 – 16 and 2016 – 17, in order to determine that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested evidence: Comments from the external examiner for the academic year 2015-2016 and 2016-2017.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

From the information provided, the visitors noted that the internal monitoring reports provided did not provide sufficient information about monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme. Without these key required documents, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme’s effectiveness. The visitors therefore require more programme specific information for the academic years 2015 – 16 and 2016 – 17, in order to determine that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested evidence: Documentation to demonstrate the monitoring and evaluation systems in the 2015-2016 academic year.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the “Social Work Teaching Partnerships 2018-20 funding” document, the visitors noted that there were plans to increase learner numbers

in the future. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications this could have on the standards of education and training. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future through the appropriate processes to ensure the standards continue to be met.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Liverpool Hope University
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Full time Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date of initial assessment	13 June 2018
Case reference	CAS-12593-K1N7V4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation	4
Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s).....	4

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Amanda Fitchett	Social worker
Valerie Maehle	Physiotherapist
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2010
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07292

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07293

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided for the academic year 2015-2016 no reason was provided for the absence of this document.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided for the academic years 2016-2017 due to industrial action.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	This was not provided for the academic years 2016-2017 due to industrial action.

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors noted that external examiner reports and responses were not provided for the academic year 2015 – 2016 due to industrial action. Without these key required documents, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme’s effectiveness. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the programme was monitored in the academic year 2015-16, in order to determine that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to demonstrate there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the academic year 2015-2016.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors noted that the internal monitoring report 2016-2017 provided did not provide detailed information about monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme, rather the focus was upon the school level as opposed to programme level. The internal monitoring report 2015-2016 was not provided for which no reasoning was provided. Without this required document, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider evaluates the programme’s effectiveness. The visitors therefore require programme specific information for the academic years 2015 - 16 and 2016 - 2017, in order to determine that the programme continues to have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested evidence: Documentation to demonstrate the monitoring and evaluation systems in academic years 2015 - 2016 and 2016 - 2017.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 20 September 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 5: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these

areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

From the information provided in the “Social Work Teaching Partnerships 2018-20 funding” document, the visitors noted that there were plans to increase student numbers in the future. As such, the education provider should be aware of the implications this could have on the standards of education and training. The visitors would like to see that this aspect is addressed in future through the appropriate processes to ensure the standards continue to be met.