![hcpc health & care professions council]

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 November 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 3 December 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 4 November 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Teri Rogers (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	42
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2013
Chair	Vivien Sheard (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Emma Wingate (Manchester Metropolitan University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the previous cohort of the Step-up programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it. The visitors did not view specialist teaching accommodation as students for this programme are not taught on site.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that requirements of the HCPC are correctly stated, and therefore give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the admissions information, the visitors noted that the requirement for English and Maths at GCSE grade C for entry on to any social work course in England was listed as an HCPC requirement. This is incorrect and the HCPC does not set such a requirement. From discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that this was taken from the Department for Education (DfE) website. The HCPC have recently informed the DfE that this information is incorrect, and the visitors therefore require that this information is also updated within the admissions information for this programme, so as not to be misleading to applicants of the programme. Additionally, the visitors noted in the admissions information booklet that, students "will be able to register with HCPC as a social worker with this award". (page 43) Upon completion of the programme, students will be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, as registration will be subject to HCPC requirements. The visitors therefore require that the admissions documentation is updated to reflect this. This will ensure that applicants are given all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the requirements for the role of personal tutors on the programme, and how the education provider ensures that individuals recruited to these roles have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors were informed that personal tutors of the programme are recruited by the regional partnerships. From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unsure what the minimum requirements for individuals applying to these roles were, and how the education provider ensures that all individuals appointed have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in their role. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate what the requirements for the role of personal tutors are, and the systems that are in place that allows the education provider to ensure that all individuals recruited have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge for this role.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health care professions council' (programme specification, page 1 and programme handbook, page 2), the 'Health and care professional council' (Course development plan, page 7) and the 'codes of conduct performance and ethics' (programme handbook, page 2) rather than the 'Health and Care Professions Council' (HCPC) and the 'Standards of conduct, performance and ethics'. Additionally, the visitors noted that the admissions information booklet and the unit specifications booklet both refer to the 'MA Social Work (Employment Based)' programme, rather than this programme. The visitors therefore require that all information provided to students is reviewed to ensure that it reflects the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC, and of this programme, to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that students have access to a wide range of learning experiences whilst on placement, and that there are systems in place to ensure that students are getting the placement experiences that reflect the generic nature of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and at the visit, the visitors were informed that the local authority regional partnerships are responsible for providing suitable placements for students. In discussion with the students, they referred to a limited experience of adult services within placements, but that this was managed by being given shadowing opportunities and being allocated to areas within child related placements that had access to adult services. This was supported in the meeting with the practice placement providers, where it was explained that a range of placement experiences was ensured by supplementing child related placements with a series of shadowing opportunities and discussions around adult services whilst students were on placement. The visitors felt that whilst there were clearly opportunities for students to gain some experience of adult services whilst on placement, further evidence is required to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that students have access to a wide range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments, that reflect the generic nature of this programme, and therefore supports the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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 provide evidence of where it is clearly articulated within the programme documentation that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team it was clarified that both external examiners for the programme are currently HCPC registered. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not see where the requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register was stated within the

assessment regulations. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where this is stated to ensure that this will be a requirement of the programme going forward.

Michael Branicki
Teri Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Surrey and South East London Partnership with Royal Holloway, University of London
Validating body / Awarding body	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme name	Step-up Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 November 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 3 December 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 12 November 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Aidan Worsley (Social worker in England) Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observer	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	34
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2013
Chair	Patrick Lehman (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Secretary	Lynn Walsh (Royal Holloway, University of London) John Enright (Royal Holloway, University of London) Penny Webb (Surrey and South East London Partnership) Charlotte Brady (Surrey and South East London Partnership)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with a student from the MSc in Social Work at Royal Holloway, University of London, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made 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

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 submit further evidence demonstrating that applicants are fully informed about the financial implications, including any fiscal penalties and details of reassessment and progression, prior to starting the programme.

Reason: The evidence submitted as information provided to applicants included the Student Handbook and Department for Education website. At the visit, the presentation used to welcome students to assessment centre days was also tabled as additional evidence. The visitors noted that this gives prospective students information about the programme, including a statement that students will have their fees paid, and will receive a bursary of £19,833. However, the visitors could not see evidence that students are informed of the provisos regarding the bursary, particularly in relation to progression through the programme. The Trainee Bursary Agreement was also tabled at the visit, from which the visitors saw that there were a number of circumstances which would lead to the termination of the contract. Trainees who fail an assignment during the programme will have one additional attempt to pass. Should they fail to pass on the second attempt, or if they are unable to successfully complete the programme within 14 months, the contract will be terminated. There are also circumstances where the student will need to repay part of the bursary, which they must be made aware of prior to embarking on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how and when students are informed as to the progression requirements of the programme and the financial and employment implications.

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 submit further evidence of reasonable adjustments, implementation and monitoring of equality and diversity policies in admissions.

Reason: The standards of education and training mapping document highlighted the Royal Holloway, University of London (RHUL) Fair Admissions Policy and complaints system, stating that this runs in parallel with the process indicated by Penna Consulting and the partnership. The evidence also states that the education provider's Steering Board oversee selection as part of its remit, including consideration of over and under representation, and ensuring candidates from diverse backgrounds are recruited. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were not able to determine how the equality and diversity policies are applied and monitored across the various stages of admissions, through the Penna Consulting sift, assessment centres, local authority selection and within RHUL. The minutes of recent Steering Boards were provided on the day of the visit, but there were no statistics as to the representation of previous or current candidates, and the visitors were unable to determine just how equality and diversity, including representation issues had been overseen in the selection process. The visitors considered that more evidence as to the implementation and monitoring of equality and diversity in the various stages of admissions, and clarity as to how this is overseen, was needed in order for this standard to be met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of effective academic management and engagement in the Step Up programme's provision.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors noted a lack of representation from the academic staff at RHUL who will be responsible for delivering the taught elements of the programme. The visitors were therefore not provided with evidence of engagement from the whole academic programme team and assurance that the theoretic elements of the programme will be organised and delivered effectively by those identified in the programme's Course Syllabi. As the programme being delivered with RHUL is a new provision, the visitors need to be satisfied that there are effective systems in place to manage the programme, and that the people involved at the education provider have the skills and expertise to work within these systems. They therefore require further evidence that there is real engagement in the Step-up Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work's provision from those who will be teaching the courses. In this way they will ensure that the standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for placement learning.

Reason: The documentation provided included the Quality Assurance of Placement Learning (QAPL) Student Feedback Form which will be used in the quality assurance of practice placements, and the Placement Provision Form used for other social work programmes at RHUL. At the visit, the visitors heard that the placements are identified, monitored and scrutinised by the partner host agencies. The mapping document states that local systems are then subject to the scrutiny of the Steering Board, and the Practice Learning and Development Manager at RHUL. However, the visitors were could not see further evidence in the documentation of the formal processes for this scrutiny or to what extent the agencies themselves are given responsibility for quality assuring their own placements. The visitors were also not provided with any completed QAPL reports from RHUL showing how this audit tool is used in social work placement provision, results or action plans. They were therefore not provided with sufficient evidence of a robust procedure for quality assuring, monitoring and evaluating the partner agency placements. The visitors therefore require documentary evidence of the formalised regular monitoring and evaluation system that the education provider will use to ensure that all their practice placements are appropriate and effective for the programme to ensure this standard is being met.

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

Condition: Further evidence must be submitted to demonstrate that there is a system in place for training, and quality assuring the input of external contributors to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and from discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that specialist visiting lecturers, external

contributors and practitioners from the local authorities are integral to the delivery of the taught curriculum. The visitors were confident that the external contributors identified would have appropriate knowledge and experience to strengthen the delivery of the programme in the context of current practice. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider prepares and supports the contributors and guarantees the quality of this teaching. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the policies or procedures used to guarantee and safeguard the quality of the teaching from external contributors, who may not be subject to the institution's staff development and evaluation systems.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised and resubmitted to provide evidence that students will be clearly informed as to the unique requirements of the Step-up Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Programme Specification and Student Handbook for this programme. The Student Handbook makes several references to the MSc in Social Work, rather than this programme, which may cause confusion to students. The Programme Specification states that there may be opportunity for a student to complete the MSc in Social Work at RHUL programme. However, it is not made clear whether the student would need to wait until they have finished the MSc in order to get their award (and therefore to register with HCPC), or if they would be awarded the Post-Graduate Diploma and later have to 'trade' this in once they have completed the additional module for the MSc. These areas of the documentation must be reviewed in order to ensure that the programme's student-facing documentation is fully-informative and accurate for students. It was also noted that a lot of the documents submitted, including the Programme Schedule and Course Syllabi still appeared to be in 'draft' status. The visitors will therefore need to see final versions of any documentation which is revised following the visit, in order to ensure that the programme resources will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme documentation must be revised and resubmitted to provide evidence that students will be clearly informed as to the financial and employment implications in the context of progression and reassessment within the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Programme Specification and Student Handbook for this programme. However, some areas within reassessment and progression did not seem to give students fully comprehensive information regarding this programme's unique arrangements where it diverges from RHUL regulations. For example, the Student Handbook (page 43) in regards to repeating failed courses, informs students '…you will need to register for the course in the next academic session', but there is no information as to what consequences this would have on their progress or completion of the programme, or employment arrangements. There is also limited information as to the timing or deadlines for resubmission of assignments or second attempts at placements under the tight programme schedule, and the implications of any failed assessment on the student's progression or bursary contract. These areas of the documentation must be reviewed in order to ensure that the

programme's student-facing documentation is fully-informative and accurate for students. In this way the visitors can ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, there were multiple references to the programme being "validated by the HCPC" (for example, page two of the Programme Specification). Under the Health and Social Work Professions Order (2001), the HCPC is given power to grant 'approval' for a programme. There were also references which did not accurately reflect the HCPC's standards, processes or guidance, or appeared to use the terminology of the previous regulatory body. For example, the Student Handbook refers to, "HCPC Codes of Practice" (page 24) and, "HCPC's Code of Conduct for Practice and Ethics" (page 51). The visitors therefore require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail as to the arrangement of tutorials in delivering tutor support within the tight timescales of the programme.

Reason: The Student Handbook (page 14) states that, "The Tutor complements wider educational support by offering group and individual tutorials across the programme", and lists the possible areas which tutors can help with. A schedule for the programme was submitted within the student handbook, which states that tutorials will be integrated via negotiation through the course. The SETs mapping stated that tutors will be available on a twice termly basis, and would make two visits per placement. However, the visitors could not find further details in the documentation of the timing, purpose or content of individual or group tutorials. The visitors therefore require further information as to how the tutorials will be arranged, when they will take place, and clear definition as to what purpose these will have, for groups or for individuals, throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can ensure that this standard is met.

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 demonstrate that there are appropriate protocols to obtain explicit consent where students participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: Discussion with the student at the visit indicated they understood the programme may at times raise personal issues they would have to manage. In discussions with the programme team it was highlighted that students are briefed at the start of the programme and verbally accept that they have the right to withdraw from

participating if necessary, but that consistent refusal to participate in practical teaching would be reviewed. The visitors reasoned the programme could potentially cause emotional distress to students and so the implications of consenting to participate needs to be explicitly clear on entry to the programme. The programme team can then be assured that the programme and students are aware of how to manage or prevent any emotional distress. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate the education provider ensures students understand the implications of consent and managing emotional distress.

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

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

Reason: The programme intends to deliver graduates that are eligible to apply to the HCPC Register as a social worker in England. The Programme Specification states "The curriculum is designed to meet the requirements for social work training specified by The College of Social Work (Professional Capability Framework and Curriculum Guides), QAA benchmarks for Social Work and the HCPC Standards of Proficiency for Social Work" (page 2). The SETs mapping also directed the visitors to the QAA institutional audit report for Royal Holloway, University of London. However, the visitors could not find through the programme documentation any further references or mapping to the 2008 QAA benchmark statements for Social Work. The visitors were also unable to find reference to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in the documentation. The visitors therefore could not determine from the documentation how these external frameworks are reflected in the programme or how the programme team worked to include the benchmarks within the curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the social work profession and qualification.

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 clarity as to the quantity of independent study required to support learning throughout the programme, including evidence as to how this is communicated to students.

Reason: The visitors noted that there were a range of learning and teaching approaches used during the programme, however, the Course Syllabi did not specify for each course how many hours the students would be expected to undertake in independent study. In discussion at the visit, the programme team reasoned that the students will be made aware of the 'notional output' required for credits. They will also be informed at the beginning of the programme as to the fact that they will need to put in their own individual study time in addition to time spent in taught sessions or seminars. However the visitors were not able to see, for each course, the extent of student-directed learning which will be required of the students and could not determine how the parameters for this learning approach will be communicated to students and implemented in order to be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum. Further evidence is therefore required in ensuring that this standard will be met.

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

Condition: There must be further evidence provided that there is a thorough and effective system for overseeing the approval and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The documentation provided included the Quality Assurance of Placement Learning (QAPL) Student Feedback Form which will be used in the quality assurance of practice placements, and the Placement Provision Form used for other social work programmes at RHUL. At the visit, the visitors heard that the placements are identified, monitored and scrutinised by the partner host agencies. The standard of education and training mapping document states that local systems are then subject to the scrutiny of the Steering Board, and the Practice Learning and Development Manager at RHUL. However, the visitors were not provided with further detail as to what depth the Steering Board look at placements, and how the education provider ensures sufficient oversight in placement allocation in order to provide all students the opportunities to cover a full range of experiences over the placements. They were therefore unclear as to what extent the agencies themselves are given responsibility for quality assuring their own placements. The visitors were also not provided with any completed QAPL reports from RHUL showing how this audit tool is used in social work placement provision, results or action plans. The visitors therefore require further documentary evidence of the formalised approval and monitoring processes that the education provider will use to ensure that all their practice placements are appropriate and effective for the programme, to ensure this standard is being 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 that the timescale implications of the Step-up Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work programme's placements are effectively communicated to practice placement educators and students.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the Practice Learning Handbook as evidence that this standard of education and training (SET) will be met. The visitors were not clear as to how the placement staff and students will be fully informed of the reassessment arrangements and attendance requirements under the tight timescales of the programme. The Practice Learning Handbook reminds students that there will be financial and employment implications of low attendance (page 15) or a failed placement (page 40), but does not go into detail as to what these involve or what the arrangements for repeat placements will be. At the visit, the importance of resolving issues as early as possible was discussed, but the visitors could not determine the clear procedures in place where there is a delay in successful completion due to low attendance or failure to achieve the relevant learning outcomes on placement. It was

indicated at the visit that extraordinary Practice Assessment Panels may need to take place in such circumstances in order to review the student's progression or achievement. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the formal systems and scope that is in place to allow students to complete placements late or repeat a placement, including how this interacts with the dates of relevant Practice Assessment Panel or Steering Board deadlines. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the information provided to placement staff and students will provide them with sufficient understanding of the reassessment arrangements and attendance requirements under the tight timescales of the programme. 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 education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the importance of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England in placements are effectively communicated to practice placement educators and students.

Reason: As stated in the recommendations for standards of education and training (SETs) 4.1 and 6.1, 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 explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. In discussion with the placement educators, the visitors noted that the SOPs were, "to be kept in mind" throughout placements, though there was no explicit connections made of each SOP to learning opportunities or outcomes in the placement experiences. Visitors were therefore concerned that the fact that the SOPs are directly concerned with knowledge, skills and practice of social workers in England, and that registrants will be responsible for ensuring they continue to meet the SOPs in their professional practice, may be lost. The visitors noted that there will be briefings offered to the placement educators in respect to this programme, but were not provided with evidence that the relevance of the SOPs would be covered in detail in these briefings. The visitors therefore require evidence as to how the placement educators and students will be made aware of where, and how the HCPC's SOPs are being covered.

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, but were unable to determine from the evidence provided, the internal moderation systems that were in place for ensuring consistency in marking. The Programme Handbook outlines the marking procedure on page 39. In discussion at the visit the programme team gave a brief outline of the marking strategy specific to this programme which indicated that markers (and second markers) would be generally academics but there may be some aspects of the assessment undertaken by individuals outside of the academic programme team, such as local authority partners. The visitors could not find detail in the documentation as to these arrangements, or how people outside the programme team would be trained for involvement in assessing. They were also not clear on the details of moderation for the assignments within the academic team, and therefore were unable to determine a clear internal moderation strategy in relation to this programme. 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 education provider must provide evidence that equality and diversity policies will be appropriately implemented in the context of progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the tight timescales of the programme mean it will be very difficult for students to progress if they are unable to attend, or require extra time due to an illness or disability. In discussions at the visit, the programme team indicated that it would not be possible for students to progress through the programme if they were temporarily unable to attend or were in need of extra time. In the Student Handbook, it states, "In recognition of its legal responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010, the College may adjust the attendance requirement", and that this will be done on a case by case basis, ensuring that this does not impact on the competence standards or ability of a student to meet the learning outcomes. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine what would be considered as reasonable in terms of this adjustment, or what could be put in place in the case of this programme that would not inhibit a student's ability to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England, given the tight timescales. The programme team also indicated that, as there is no certainty as to future cohorts, depending on the particular case and stage through the programme, it may be possible for students who were unable to complete the programme to defer their studies or transfer credit onto the MSc Social Work at Royal Holloway, University of London. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that inclusivity will be ensured where possible, and that there are clear policies available to students, with information as to what a student should do if they feel they have been discriminated against. In this way, they can ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. In this way the visitors can be sure that this information is available to students and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how the criteria for appointing external examiners for the programme ensures that at least one will be appropriately experienced, qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on the HCPC Register.

Reason: From Steering Board minutes tabled at the visit, the visitors were able to see that an external examiner has now been appointed to the programme, and though they are not registered with the HCPC as they operate outside of England, the visitors were satisfied with the arrangements. The evidence provided for this SET referred to Royal Holloway, University of London's regulations in reference to examiners and assessors. This document outlines the criteria for appointment of external examiners, including that, "…where a programme has external accreditation from a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body, the programme specification may state additional criteria to be met in the appointment of a Visiting Examiner". However, in the Programme Specification document provided for the programme, the visitors could not see a clear policy set out that specifies HCPC registration requirements, or other criteria that will be required if they are not HCPC registered. Therefore the visitors require evidence that the additional requirements for the appointment of external examiners to this programme have been included in the programme documentation, to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The programme team should ensure that any IT issues that may inhibit access to learning resources in placement settings are minimised.

Reason: The education provider submitted information as to the library resources and IT facilities which students will have access to during the programme. A large amount of relevant resources for the programme will be available online through Moodle, and the visitors were satisfied that this standard was met. It was noted that the students will be taught in Bedford Square, where there is a small stock of books available, and the remainder of their time will largely be spent in their local authority on placements. The visitors noted that access issues resulting from firewalls at local authorities can often act as a barrier to enabling students and staff to access learning materials in the placement situation. In discussion at the visit, the visitors heard how the programme team are working with the relevant people at RHUL to make Moodle access available to students whilst on placements, as well as to placement educators. As the students will therefore be expected to undertake a large amount of academic work alongside their placements, the visitors recommend that the programme team undertake regular checks to ensure that learning resources are readily available in all settings, and that this standard continues to be 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.

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 in England 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 placement educators, the visitors noted that the SOPs were, "to be kept in mind" throughout placements, though there was no explicit linking of each SOP to learning opportunities or outcomes in the placement experiences. Visitors were therefore concerned that the fact that the SOPs are directly concerned with knowledge, skills and practice of social workers in England, and that registrants will be responsible for ensuring they continue to meet the SOPs in their professional practice, may be lost. The visitors noted 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, and how 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 in England are explicitly assessed.

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 placement educators, the visitors noted that the SOPs were, "to be kept in mind" throughout placements, though there was no explicit linking of each SOP to assessment in the placement experiences. 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, and how the HCPC's SOPs are being assessed.

<div align="right">

Beverley Blythe
Aidan Worsley

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Teesside University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	4 – 5 September 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' 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 16 October 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 10 October 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 4 November 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vincent Clarke (Paramedic) Robert Fellows (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	40
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Liz Holey (Teesside University)
Secretary	Joanne Almond (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Paul Taylor (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Wilford (Internal Panel Member) Sue Becker (Internal Panel Member) Tony Spence (External Panel Member) Andrew Yorke (External Panel Member) Paul Bates (The College of Paramedics) Paul Vigar (The College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as external examiners' reports have not been produced because the programme is new.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the Foundation Degree Paramedic Science, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how the numbers of practice placements needed are determined and secured to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation and during the meetings with the programme team, the visitors heard practice placement providers will inform the education provider the number of placements they can provide. However, during the meeting with the practice placement providers the visitors heard that the education provider will stipulate the number of placements required for each intake of students. It was unclear how the number of placements impact on the number of students per intake. The visitors were also aware that service level agreements were in the process of being finalised with placement providers which are linked to placement numbers. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the numbers of practice placements needed are determined and secured to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure practice placements are integral to the programme, especially placements in the ambulance settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team meeting, the visitors were made aware service level agreements were in the process of being finalised with placement providers in the ambulance settings. The visitors were provided with an incomplete draft version of the formal arrangements. The visitors were unable to determine from the draft document how the education provider will ensure partnership arrangements with ambulance placement providers are effective and consequently how this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require the final service level agreements with placement providers in the ambulance settings ensuring placements for students and providing evidence these placements are integral to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to explain whether or not there is overlapping of cohort placements and demonstrate how this is managed if it occurs.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors noted the mapping of the programme to show how the number, duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme (programme specification appendix 1). This document showed there was some overlap between different cohort groups being on placement at the same time. During presentation in the programme team meeting, the visitors noted a different mapping document showing the details of how the placements in the ambulance settings were used. The visitors noted from this there was no overlap between different cohort groups while they are on their

placements in ambulance settings. In light of this discrepancy the visitors were unable to determine whether or not overlap and associated management occurs. The visitors require further evidence such as an updated mapping document and strategies in place to deal with any overlapping of placements, to demonstrate whether overlapping occurs and associated management if it does.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Paramedic Mentor Preparation Workshop" document in their SETs mapping document, however the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, the visitors understood there are policies and procedures in place to manage staffing levels at practice placements, but these policies and procedures were not reflected in the documentation provided prior to the visit. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. The education provider may wish to provide a list of practice placement educators as evidence to support 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 clearly articulate the mechanisms they use to ensure students and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements. The education provider must also provide documentation which details the expected placement structure at each stage of the programme and how this information is provided to fully prepare practice placement educators and student for placements.

Reason: From discussions with the students, the visitors understood that they were expected to demonstrate several competencies at each placement. The visitors were unclear about how the demonstration of the ability to meet the competencies led to a clear progression through the programme and how progression is communicated to students and practice placement educators. The visitors also could not determine the rationale behind the broad set of competencies each student would be expected to meet after each placement to enable them to progress to the next stage of the

programme. The practice assessment document did not provide evidence of how these broad set of competencies and the rationale behind it will be communicated to placement educators and students. The visitors therefore require further information about how students and practice placement educators are informed and prepared for placements. This is to ensure that students and practice placement educators are aware of the requirements for successful completion of each placement and that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy.

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

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

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

Robert Fellows
Vincent Clarke

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The Open University
Programme name	BA (Honours) Social Work (England)
Mode of delivery	Distance Learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	17 – 18 September 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. 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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 October 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 3 December 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 28 October 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Helen Best (Diagnostic radiographer) Teri Rogers (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	260
First approved intake	August 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	December 2013
Chair	Julie Messenger (The Open University)
Secretary	Josie Hughes (The Open University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of teaching at the education provider means that teaching facilities are not on site.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 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 ongoing 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 ongoing 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 threshold level.

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted that the programme management structure is complex, in that there are a number of different job titles within the structure, for example, 'Programme tutor', 'Staff tutor' and 'Link tutor'. In discussion with the students it was clear that they understood the roles and responsibilities of various members of the programme team, and who their main points of contact were. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not see evidence that the programme management structure was documented, and as such the visitors could not be assured that future students and staff of the programme would have a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the roles and lines of responsibility of the programme team, to ensure that the programme continues to be effectively managed.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the previous regulator for Social workers in England in the programme specification (page 8). In factsheet 8 the visitors also noted reference to 'accreditation' and the previous regulator. HCPC 'approve' Social work programmes in England rather than accredit them, and the visitors therefore require that the programme documentation is reviewed to ensure that the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social workers in England, so that the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the learning outcomes for modules K101 'An introduction to Health and Social Care', K312 'Working together for children', K313 'Leadership and management in Health and Social Care', and K319 'Adulthood, ageing and the life course' ensure that students upon successful completion of the programme, meet all standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the following module descriptors were not provided, and therefore had not been mapped to the HCPC Standards of proficiency (SOPs)**:** K101 'An introduction to Health and Social Care', K312 'Working together for children', K313 'Leadership and management in Health and Social Care', and K319 'Adulthood, ageing and the life course'. At the visit,

the programme team had provided these module descriptors, and the visitors reviewed them. Whilst the visitors were satisfied with the content of the modules, as the SOPs had not been mapped to these modules, the visitors could not be sure of the contribution they were making towards meeting the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the SOPs that are delivered through these modules to ensure that the learning outcomes are appropriate in allowing students to meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of where the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught and met throughout the programme, and that students understand these standards, including how and when they apply.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there was detailed information regarding the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE's) in the student handbook (page 27). However, from a review of the module descriptors the visitors could not see how the SCPE's were incorporated into the curriculum, and therefore how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of the SCPE's. At the visit, the programme team informed the visitors that they were in the process of updating the curriculum from the standards of conduct of the previous regulator, to the HCPC standards. The visitors therefore require evidence of where within the curriculum, the SCPE's are taught and met throughout the programme to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the assessment strategy for modules K101 'An introduction to Health and Social Care', K312 'Working together for children', K313 'Leadership and management in Health and Social Care', and K319 'Adulthood, ageing and the life course' to ensure that they are appropriate to assess the standards of proficiency that are being met through these modules.

Reason: In line with the reasoning provided for SET 4.1, as modules K101 'An introduction to Health and Social Care', K312 'Working together for children', K313 'Leadership and management in Health and Social Care', and K319 'Adulthood, ageing and the life course', had not been mapped to the HCPC Standards of proficiency (SOPs), it was not clear which SOPs were being delivered through these modules, and therefore that the methods of assessment for these modules were appropriate in assessing the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence of which SOPs are being met through these modules, and the methods of assessment for these modules to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme have met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 provide evidence of where it is clearly articulated within the programme documentation that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the education provider has an external examiner for each module of the programme, and that currently more than one of these examiners is registered with the HCPC as a Social worker. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not see where the requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register was stated within the assessment regulations. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where this is stated to ensure that this will be a requirement of the programme going forward.

<div align="right">
Helen Best
Teri Rogers
</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Social Work Practice
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	24 – 25 September 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 November 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 3 December 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 30 October 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	46 across two delivery sites (at Aylesbury and Luton)
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Colin Davies (University of Bedfordshire)
Secretary	Gina Indge (University of Bedfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Peter Craig (Internal Panel Member) Tim Gregory (Internal Panel Member) Keith Popple (External Panel Member) Leah Thompson (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. Due to the timeframes for the internal quality assurance procedures, the external examiners' reports were not available.

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

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

The HCPC met with graduates from the Master of Professional Social Work Practice programme.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

3.14 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 students understand the implications of consent and the management of emotional distress.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit did not include evidence to support this SET. Discussion with the students indicated they understood the programme may at times raise personal issues they would have to manage. It was highlighted they accepted they could withdraw from participating if necessary. Discussion with the programme team considered the programme required participation and implicitly included the agreement that students consent to this and are aware they can withdraw when necessary. The visitors reasoned the programme could potentially cause emotional distress to students and so the implications of consenting to participate needs to be explicitly clear. The programme team can then be assured students are aware of how to manage or prevent any emotional distress. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate the education provider ensures students understand the implications of consent and managing emotional distress.

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 evidence to demonstrate how students will be fully prepared for placement through the 30 'skills days'.

Reason: The documentation submitted indicated the programme has 30 mandatory 'skills days' students must complete before they can progress onto the practice placements. Discussion indicated the 'skills days' are designed to prepare the students so they all have a base level of knowledge and skills they need for the practice placements. The programme team indicated the 'skills days' were in the process of being developed. The visitors considered the 'skills days' to be crucial to fully prepare the students for the practice placement experiences. As the 'skills days' are still being finalised, the visitors were unable to determine that students would be fully prepared for placement. The visitors require further evidence regarding the 'skills days', demonstrating they will be finalised before the programme commences and that the content of the days will fully prepare students for placements.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider how they can better prepare students for the learning experience through the admissions and induction process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the information available to students was enough for them to be able to make a decision about this programme and so considered this standard to be met. From discussions with the students it was clear they had been informed of the nature of the programme however certain aspects were not fully realised until the programme had commenced. The visitors felt the funding arrangements in the case of failure, the two site delivery management and the intensity of the programme could be further emphasised at the beginning of the programme. The visitors recommend the education provider use the admissions and induction stages of the programme to further emphasise all aspects of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider the programme provision and equity across the two delivery sites.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme has appropriate resources to support student learning in all settings and so considered this standard to be met. From discussions at the visit regarding the two site delivery arrangements it was clear that although students were able to access resources equally there were differing perceptions of the availability of the resources. Due to the intense nature of the programme the visitors felt the education provider could be more proactive in considering equity of provision across the two delivery sites, particularly regarding access to programme team staff and library resources. The visitors suggested the induction process could be used to further communicate the provision arrangements to students.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider provide further clarification for students in the programme handbook of the different roles available for student support.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied there was a system in place for academic and pastoral student support so considered this standard to be met. Discussions indicated the learning guides / mentors, personal tutors, practice educators, module leads and other programme team staff were all available for student support. It was clear students had support available to them however the visitors perceived the students could be confused as to who was the best person to approach if support was needed. The programme is very time intensive and due to the necessity for timely support, the visitors recommend the education provider provide further clarification for students in the programme handbook of the different roles available for support.

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 visitors recommend the education provider consider how they maintain the generic nature of the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for Social Workers in England within the children's social care focussed framework of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme ensures the learning outcomes encompass all Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for Social Workers in England within the programme and so considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted the programme is designed primarily to focus on meeting the needs of the children's social care workforce. However, the visitors noted the programme team need to be careful not to lose the holistic approach to social work as is required from the generic SOPs. The visitors recommend the education provider consider how they maintain the generic nature of the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for Social Workers in England within the children's social care focussed framework.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider including practice educators, their role and requirements within the Quality Assurance for Practice Learning (QAPL) process.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit provided a comprehensive overview of the Quality Assurance for Practice Learning (QAPL) audit tool used for the approval and monitoring of all placements alongside the regular practice placement provider meetings. It was highlighted further work was being undertaken with the audit tool to make it more connected with the placements. The visitors therefore considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted the QAPL audit tool could be used further to look at practice educators. The visitors suggest the education provider look to further include practice educators, their role and their requirements within the auditing process to strengthen the quality assurance of practice placements.

David Childs
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 December 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 3 December 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 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Graham Noyce (Social Worker)
	Teri Rogers (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	12
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Alan White (University of East London)
Secretary	Mewish Hafeez (University of East London)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work and MA in Social Work programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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 submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of social work programmes. As part of the internal validation event, it was indicated programme documents would be amended and rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will provide correct information and effectively support students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence of how they emphasise the generic nature of the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England are embedded within the curriculum of the programme. The visitors noted there is a focus on children and families in the curriculum content and that the practice placement settings are in child and family social work. The visitors could not determine how the programme team teaches students about the holistic approach to the adult perspective and orientation in social work as is required from the generic SOPs. The visitors felt the current emphasis of the programme could reduce focus from other service user needs that are not linked to child and family social work. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how they emphasise the generic nature of the SOPs within the programmes conceptional framework.

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 to demonstrate how they will ensure students gain sufficient breadth of social work experience on placement to support students meeting the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their profession.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, and from discussions with the placement providers and the programme team, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures students undertake a sufficient range of practice placement settings. During discussions with the programme team and the placement providers, the visitors noted students will have both their placements in child and family settings. The visitors agreed that child and family focused social work competencies are covered in these two placements; however they were unclear how the competencies not linked to child and family settings are achieved. The visitors considered this to be important especially as the curriculum of the programme is also focused on child and family settings (linked to SET 4.1 and 6.1). The visitors were unclear how the programme will ensure all the

standards of proficiency for social workers in England and associated learning outcomes that students are expected to meet when completing placements are achieved. Therefore, the visitors require further information that demonstrates how the programme team will ensure students have a sufficient breadth of social work experience on placement to support students meeting the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their profession.

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 to demonstrate they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the education provider uses the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) audit tool. It was highlighted by the education provider that the placement coordinator has left her post and a new member of staff has been appointed. The visitors considered the auditing system currently in place to work well in its role however they could not see evidence of what the programme team does with the information collated through QAPL. The visitors additionally could not determine that the education provider has systems in place to deal with any issues that may be raised through the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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 the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) audit tool was used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around this tool or associated processes including how it is used to ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. The SETs mapping referred to the roles and responsibilities of practice educators, however the visitors could find no evidence or further information around this in the documentation. The programme team and placement providers discussed the various practice educators training that is in place and what level of qualification is required from the practice educators for each placement. 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 individual 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.

5.11 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 evidence to demonstrate how students will be fully prepared for placement through the 'skills days' and information given to students regarding readiness for practice.

Reason: The documentation submitted indicated the programme has readiness for practice process and 'skills days' for students to complete before they can go out onto their practice placements. Discussions with the programme team indicated the 'skills days' are designed to prepare the students so they all have a base level of knowledge and skills they need for the practice placements. The programme team indicated the 'skills days' were in the process of being developed. The visitors considered the 'skills days' to be crucial to fully prepare the students for the practice placement experiences. As the 'skills days' are still being finalised, the visitors were unable to determine that students would be fully prepared for placements. The visitors require further evidence about the process and information given to students regarding readiness for practice and the 'skills days', demonstrating they will be finalised before the programme commences and that the content of the days will fully prepare students for placements.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme ensures the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England are embedded and assessed within the curriculum of the programme. The visitors noted there is a focus on children and families in the curriculum content and that the practice placement settings are in child and family social work. The visitors could not determine how the programme team teaches or assesses students' knowledge of the holistic approach to social work particularly the adult perspective and orientation in social work as is required from the generic SOPs. The visitors felt the current focus of the programme could reduce focus from other service user needs that are not linked to child and family social work. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy will ensure students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England particularly considering the generic nature of the SOPs.

Graham Noyce
Teri Rogers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Occupational Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Occupational psychologist
Date of visit	8 – 9 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'occupational psychologist' or 'practitioner psychologist' 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 November 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 3 December 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 31 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 May 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body (the British Psychological Society (BPS)) considered their accreditation of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Stephen Fisher (Occupational psychologist) Rosemary Schaeffer (Occupational psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	12
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	William Munday (University of East London)
Members of the joint panel	Lucy Kerry (British Psychological Society) Matthew Jelis (British Psychological Society) Michal Tombs (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from other programmes in the school as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining twelve SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions procedures and programme documentation to clearly articulate the procedures for criminal convictions checks for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify whether information was provided to applicants about who would fund criminal conviction checks. It was also unclear if the admissions procedures had protocols in place to deal with declared criminal convictions. In discussions with the programme team, they stated that criminal conviction checks would be funded by the education provider and that there were appropriate protocols in place should a conviction arise through the admissions process, but did not state what the protocols were. The visitors require evidence to show how funding arrangements are communicated to students prior to taking up a place on the programme, and the policy in place if an applicant declares a criminal conviction.

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

Condition: The education provider must identify relevant health requirements in the information it makes available to applicants and formalise the process for dealing with any health issues that are declared.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit outlined the need for applicants to disclose any health issues. However, no clear information for applicants of how health is considered through application was set out in the programme documentation and there was no information about how relevant health issues would be addressed. When speaking with students, the visitors heard that they were not aware of any clear health requirements prior to taking up a place on the programme. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures include consideration of applicants' health, and to demonstrate that potential applicants and students are fully aware of the requirements of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all of the programme documentation, and any advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate when referencing the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC).

Reason: The visitors noted that elements of the programme documentation submitted by the education provider were not accurate when referencing the HCPC, for example: "…including the Health Professional Council (HCPC)…" (Programme Handbook, page 62). In particular, there were instances of referring to the HCPC by its previous name, for example: "…and the statutory regulator (HPC)." (Placement Handbook, page 50). The visitors considered that the incorrect use of terminology could be misleading to applicants and students and therefore require all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to be amended to remove any instance of incorrect terminology.

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 where students participate as service users in practical teaching, or partake in discussions involving personal information, appropriate protocols are used to obtain and document their consent.

Reason From discussions with the students, the visitors noted that they participate in group discussions based on personal experiences. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if there were any protocols for gaining and documenting students' consent. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that verbal consent is obtained during group discussions and that participation is not mandatory, however, there is no clear system in place to evidence this. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of appropriate protocols for gaining students' informed consent and that students have been informed of their right to confidentiality.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that sets out the procedures for identifying and addressing concerns about students' profession-related conduct, including how this procedure will be communicated to students and practice placement educators.

Reason: Discussion with the programme team included how concerns about students' profession related conduct would be managed and how practice placement educators were made aware of this. It was mentioned that the practice placement educator would be informed, in training, that they could contact any member of the programme team to discuss their concerns whilst a student was on placement. However, the visitors could find only limited information in the programme documentation about the process used for dealing with any issues around professional related conduct whilst on placement. Due to the different aspects of managing concerns around students' fitness to practise the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider and practice placement providers would work together. As the visitors were unclear about how students' profession-related conduct would be dealt with while students are on placement, they require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard 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 education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational psychologists.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references, rather than specific references. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme meets the SOPs for occupational

psychologists. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes were in place but were yet to be finalised through documentation. Therefore, the visitors were still not satisfied that this standard was met. Further documentation will be required to clearly evidence how the learning outcomes ensure that each student meets the SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors have suggested that the education provider submits further documentation that clearly defines the link between the module learning outcomes and SOPs in order to meet this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure the range of placements will be appropriate to support the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: The documentation provided suggests that students should come prepared with their own practice placement provider secured. The visitors heard from the programme team that placements were likely to be in one, but possibly two, placement settings. The visitors also heard, in the practice placement team meeting, that the programme team are currently in the process of seeking wider placements for the programme. However, it was articulated that plans were currently in development and were only with a small number of companies. Therefore there could be a limited range of practice placement providers, and no formal arrangements have been made at this stage. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team and the practice placement provider(s) would manage the placement to ensure that students understood the key concepts of the bodies of knowledge which are relevant to occupational psychologists alongside a range of experience in supporting how the learning outcomes are achieved. The visitors noted the importance of students gaining a wide range of learning experiences to support the delivery of learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure how the range of placements will be appropriate to support the students' achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide more detail on the content of practice placement educator training to ensure that each practice placement educator will be fully prepared when they come to work with students.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit states that practice placement educators must "…be willing to undertake and successfully complete our supervisor placement workshop…". It is unclear, however, what the content of this training is, "…which introduces them to the academic, professional and pastoral standards and responsibilities…"(Placement Handbook, page 12). Discussion with the programme team did not provide further details about the nature of the training undertaken by practice placement educators for this programme. The visitors received no information regarding the specific content and learning outcomes of such training. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the programme team would ensure practice placement educators are appropriately prepared for the requirements of the programme. The

visitors therefore require further information regarding the content and learning outcomes of practice placement educator training to ensure they are appropriately trained to work with students from this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessments of learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for occupational psychologists.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessments of students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references, rather than specific references. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the assessment of module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme meets the SOPs for occupational psychologists. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary assessments of learning outcomes were in place but were yet to be finalised through documentation. Therefore, the visitors were still not satisfied that this standard was met. Further documentation will be required to clearly evidence how the assessment of learning outcomes ensures that each student meets the SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors have suggested that the education provider submits further documentation that clearly defines the link between the assessment of module learning outcomes and SOPs in order to meet this condition.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that any exit awards from the programme do not provide eligibility for graduates to apply for admission to the HCPC register, and do not contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in the award title.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team it is clear that they intend to provide two exit routes from the programme. However there had been no decision made at this point about the titles of these exit awards. The visitors noted that there was a possibility for confusion by students as the documentation provided did not clearly state the option of an exit award, or if such award was given, that it would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require updated information to clarify if exit awards will be available and that the names of such exit awards do not contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register. It will also need to be evidenced how this information is made clear to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that any aegrotat award given will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The programme team were also unclear whether aegrotat awards would be offered for the programme or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that, should aegrotat awards be given, they do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. In this way the visitors can be sure that this information is available to students and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the assessment regulations to clearly articulate that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme will be HCPC registered, unless alternative arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail regarding the registration status of an external examiner in the external examiner recruitment policy specific to the programme. In discussion with the education provider it was stated that no current external examiner as in place for the programme. The visitors' therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to show evidence that HCPC requirements on the programme have been included to demonstrate that this standard has been met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the HCPC of any future changes to the programme's curriculum, especially considering any changes made to the Division of Occupational Psychology's curriculum framework.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team, it was mentioned that the curriculum may change with the upcoming implementation of new guidelines from the British Psychological Society (BPS). Discussion at the visit indicated that, as part of this change, the programme team may amend the module descriptors learning outcomes and assessments. The visitors were satisfied that this standard is met currently, but they would like to remind the education provider that if these changes take place that they inform the HCPC via the major change process.

Stephen Fisher
Rosemary Schaeffer

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	MSc Social Work (Step up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	10 – 11 September 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 October 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 3 December 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 14 October 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social Worker) Christine Stogdon (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	35
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Petros Khoudian (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Bowyer (Internal Panel Member) Laura Beard (Internal Panel Member) Keith Popple (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC reviewed the practice placement portfolio and other placement documentation prior to the visit; the practice placement handbook was viewed at the visit.

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

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

The HCPC met with graduates from the transitionally approved MSc Social Work (Step up to Social Work) programme.

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 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine 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

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 (University of Hertfordshire) must provide relevant advertising materials for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion indicated the application process for this programme is a two stage process. Applicants apply through the Department for Education (DfE) for shortlisting and then are subject to the programme application process managed by the West London Alliance (WLA). Once this has been completed those who have received an offer are then subject to the University of Hertfordshire's application and registration requirements. Because of this non-direct entry route, the University of Hertfordshire public website does not host any materials for this programme. Potential applicants can find information on their local authority and DfE websites about this programme. Discussion at the visit indicated the education provider felt it to be appropriate that programme materials be created and hosted by University of Hertfordshire too. In light of this action the visitors are required to review the programme materials to ensure they provide information that allows potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply or take up a place on the programme. The visitors considered it important for the programme materials to include information about the application process (how to apply, application procedures, minimum requirements, requirements for DBS and Occupational Health, equality and diversity policies) and information about the arrangements between the WLA and University of Hertfordshire (delivering the programme, commissioning, delivery site, placement arrangements). The education provider must therefore provide relevant advertising materials for the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate the premises service agreement will be agreed before the next cohort commences.

Reason: Documentation submitted for this visit indicated the programme was delivered offsite with premises agreements in place. Discussion at the visit indicated the current agreement was under negotiation to ensure its relevancy and clarifications to what the agreement holds. The visitors considered this programme's next cohort is due to commence in January 2014 and the agreement will need to be in place by then to ensure the offsite delivery arrangements are secure and appropriate and consequently the programme is being effectively managed. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the premises service agreement will be agreed before the next cohort commences.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure students are fully informed about the management and implementation of regulations and procedures.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated students are employed under a trainee contract at the West London Alliance (WLA) for the duration of the

programme. The documentation also indicated the University of Hertfordshire and the WLA have separate procedures and policies to be applied for fitness to practise procedures, complaints procedures and whistleblowing policies. Students stated they were not clear whose procedures to follow and they would discuss anything with the group of supporting individuals from both WLA and University of Hertfordshire before using the policies. The visitors are aware that students are registered with University of Hertfordshire and so are subject to those policies and procedures, they are also aware that whilst working with the WLA they will be subject to the policies and procedures there too. In discussion at the visit it was indicated it would be looked at on a case by case basis to see whose policies to defer to however as a general rule academic matters would go to University of Hertfordshire and employment matters would go to the WLA. The visitors considered it to be important that the policies and procedures available are clearly communicated to students along with information as to when each party's policies and procedures should be followed. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how they ensure students are fully informed about the management and implementation of regulations and procedures.

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

Condition: the education provider must submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted prior to the visit were draft versions. It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of social work programmes and at the visit it was indicated documents would be rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors noted some areas that need to be taken into account when amending documents so they effectively support student learning. The programme specification document (page 12) states "As specified by the HCPC, no compensation for failed modules is permitted". This is incorrect; the HCPC has no such specifications. The visitors note it will be important to accurately state the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors additionally noted the importance of referring to the current situation of social work, in particular noting the General Social Care Council (GSCC) and the GSCC Code of Practice no longer exist and the National Occupational Standards (NOS) have been replaced by the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) from 2012. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will effectively support students learning.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate students are able to access the facilities in place to support their welfare and wellbeing particularly considering reasonable adjustments.

Reason: Documentation and the tour of resources demonstrated facilities are in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. The students highlighted that whilst they could use these facilities, it is unpractical for them to access these facilities in person as they are too far away from the University of Hertfordshire campus. The visitors had some information about the provisions for disability services which help provide reasonable adjustments for those who need it. The visitors noted this service

may be difficult to access for offsite students who are located some distance away and in the middle of their studies. The visitors heard during the visit there are online resources and other ways to gain the support or reasonable adjustments that did not require on-campus presence. The visitors considered this information to be pertinent for students on this programme and therefore require further information about these resources and options to be clearly articulated within the programme documentation for students. Therefore the education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate students are able to access the facilities in place to support their welfare and wellbeing particularly considering reasonable adjustments.

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 students are fully informed about consenting to participate within the programme and how to manage any potential emotional distress.

Reason: Documentation and discussion with students and the programme team indicated that consent was discussed verbally whenever necessary through the programme. The visitors noted the programme uses a range of teaching methods including participation in role-plays and disclosing and reflecting on personal experience when considering social work practice. The visitors considered these activities could potentially lead to emotional distress and subsequent disruption in learning. There was no information within the programme documentation regarding the expectation to participate within the programme, consenting to participate, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. To ensure this standard is met the visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure students are fully informed about consenting to participate in the programme and how to manage any emotional distress that may be caused.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information of the service user strategy in place for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not determine how the programme incorporated service user involvement within the programme management or delivery. Discussion at the visit indicated service users were used within the programme at the instigation of the West London Alliance (WLA); however there was no clearly defined role for them. The visitors considered service user involvement to be a fundamental aspect of social work and heavily integrated into the philosophy and core values of the social work profession. The visitors could not determine how the programme could reflect the philosophy, core values, associated skills and knowledge base of social work without formal service user involvement. Further discussion indicated there is a faculty-wide strategy for service user involvement which would include this programme; however there was no information of how this programme is engaged with the strategy. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the service user strategy in place for this programme to ensure this standard is met.

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 to demonstrate they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated there were different systems in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The University of Hertfordshire uses the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) audit tool. The audit is undertaken by the staff from the University of Hertfordshire and outcomes are not shared with the placement co-ordinators at West London Alliance (WLA). The WLA has an approval and monitoring system whereby the suitability of each placement location is assessed by WLA placement co-ordinators and outcomes are not shared with staff at the University of Hertfordshire. It was highlighted by both parties that if there were serious concerns about a placement it would be discussed and a solution reached. At the visit further discussion indicated the education provider was looking to change the auditing system to the ARC Placement Tool. The visitors considered the two auditing systems currently in place to work well in their role however were concerned the two parties undertook their own placement approval and monitoring and had little interaction with each other. The visitors could not determine how the education provider (University of Hertfordshire) could maintain overall responsibility for all placements without interacting with the WLA internal auditing system. The visitors considered it to be beneficial for both systems to provide outcomes to each other so decisions can be made jointly and that both parties are aware of each other's decisions. The visitors had received no information about the change of system from QAPL to ARC so were unable to determine whether this system would be appropriately used. The visitors therefore could not determine that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements and require further evidence to demonstrate 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 ensure students and practice placement educators are fully informed about the assessment procedures and associated policies for practice placements.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated there was some ambiguity around the assessment procedures and policies particularly relating to the practice placement elements of the programme. Firstly, from the documentation and discussion with the students, it was unclear as to whether or not students would be able to progress onto a following placement without completing the previous placement. The visitors were aware of the short timeframe within which students need to complete this

programme and therefore considered it to be important that progression policies are clearly articulated.

Secondly, from the documentation and discussion at the visit, the procedures to follow when a placement is failed were unclear. The University of Hertfordshire assessment regulations indicate that placements can be re-taken up to a certain number of times. The professional nature of the programme and the programme timeframe however would not accommodate this. Discussion with the programme team indicated this would be looked at and programme specific regulations may be required. The visitors consider the re-sit policies to be important information for students and so should be clearly articulated.

Thirdly, from the documentation provided for the visit, it was unclear how the competencies to be demonstrated at placement would be appropriately assessed for development and achievement. The competency marking system is a range of capability of how the student meets each professional capability framework domain (No evidence of capability / Some evidence of capability / Sufficient evidence of capability / Good and varied evidence of capability). The visitors had not seen any assessment criteria and so were unable to determine how practice placement educators would be able to determine capabilities. The visitors additionally were unclear as to what level the competencies had to be marked at in order for the student to be able to pass the placement and then progress to the next placement. The visitors considered it to be important for students to understand the competency assessment processes in order for them to understand their practice placement assessment.

In light of these ambiguities, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate for students and practice placement educators the assessment procedures and associated policies for practice placements to ensure they are fully prepared for placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the assessment of module Risk, Reflection and Resilience (7HSK0048).

Reason: The visitors noted from documentation and discussion that one of the assessment methods for module 7HSK0048 is a courtroom presentation and reflective summary. The visitors considered this assessment method to be particularly pertinent assessment tool to enable students to be able to formally act in a courtroom setting, present to court and to understand how the court system works. The visitors are aware this is an essential part of a social worker's role and links to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for social workers and fitness to practise. The visitors have not seen any assessment criteria for the courtroom assessment and were therefore unable to determine whether this assessment method contributes to ensuring fitness to practise effectively. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further information about the courtroom assessment within module 7HSK0048.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider include further information about the Fitness to Practise policy within the student handbook.

Reason: The visitors noted there was a faculty wide Fitness to Practice policy in place at the education provider. They have also noted the condition under SET 3.2 related to policies in place that students on this programme are subject to. The visitors noted the student handbook refers to the faculty wide Fitness to Practise policy and indicates where this can be found. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. The visitors felt there could be some further information about the policy and how it works in regards to the outcomes of any Fitness to Practise procedure and how the Fitness to Practise panels are formed and how they work. The visitors felt this information would be useful to students who are considering the Fitness to Practise policy.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider how they emphasise the generic approach to social work competencies.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme ensures all Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for Social Workers in England are linked to the integration of theory and practice within the programme and so considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted there is a three stage framework of "think child, think parent, think family" for the programme. However, the programme team need to be careful not to lose the holistic approach to the adult perspective and orientation in social work as is required from the generic SOPs. The visitors feel the current focus of the programme may detract from other service user needs that are not linked to the adult / parent / child focus. The visitors recommend the programme team consider how they emphasise the generic approach within the programmes conceptional framework to ensure students are able to fully integrate the programme theory to all social work practice.

Michael Branicki
Christine Stogdon

health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Step Up to Social Work)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	10 – 11 September 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 October 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 3 December 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 14 October 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social Worker)
	Christine Stogdon (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	35
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Petros Khoudian (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Bowyer (Internal Panel Member)
	Laura Beard (Internal Panel Member)
	Keith Popple (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC reviewed the practice placement portfolio and other placement documentation prior to the visit; the practice placement handbook was viewed at the visit.

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

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

The HCPC met with graduates from the transitionally approved MSc Social Work (Step up to Social Work) programme.

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 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine 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

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 (University of Hertfordshire) must provide relevant advertising materials for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion indicated the application process for this programme is a two stage process. Applicants apply through the Department for Education (DfE) for shortlisting and then are subject to the programme application process managed by the West London Alliance (WLA). Once this has been completed those who have received an offer are then subject to the University of Hertfordshire's application and registration requirements. Because of this non-direct entry route, the University of Hertfordshire public website does not host any materials for this programme. Potential applicants can find information on their local authority and DfE websites about this programme. Discussion at the visit indicated the education provider felt it to be appropriate that programme materials be created and hosted by University of Hertfordshire too. In light of this action the visitors are required to review the programme materials to ensure they provide information that allows potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply or take up a place on the programme. The visitors considered it important for the programme materials to include information about the application process (how to apply, application procedures, minimum requirements, requirements for DBS and Occupational Health, equality and diversity policies) and information about the arrangements between the WLA and University of Hertfordshire (delivering the programme, commissioning, delivery site, placement arrangements). The education provider must therefore provide relevant advertising materials for the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate the premises service agreement will be agreed before the next cohort commences.

Reason: Documentation submitted for this visit indicated the programme was delivered offsite with premises agreements in place. Discussion at the visit indicated the current agreement was under negotiation to ensure its relevancy and clarifications to what the agreement holds. The visitors considered this programme's next cohort is due to commence in January 2014 and the agreement will need to be in place by then to ensure the offsite delivery arrangements are secure and appropriate and consequently the programme is being effectively managed. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate the premises service agreement will be agreed before the next cohort commences.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must ensure students are fully informed about the management and implementation of regulations and procedures.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated students are employed under a trainee contract at the West London Alliance (WLA) for the duration of the

programme. The documentation also indicated the University of Hertfordshire and the WLA have separate procedures and policies to be applied for fitness to practise procedures, complaints procedures and whistleblowing policies. Students stated they were not clear whose procedures to follow and they would discuss anything with the group of supporting individuals from both WLA and University of Hertfordshire before using the policies. The visitors are aware that students are registered with University of Hertfordshire and so are subject to those policies and procedures, they are also aware that whilst working with the WLA they will be subject to the policies and procedures there too. In discussion at the visit it was indicated it would be looked at on a case by case basis to see whose policies to defer to however as a general rule academic matters would go to University of Hertfordshire and employment matters would go to the WLA. The visitors considered it to be important that the policies and procedures available are clearly communicated to students along with information as to when each party's policies and procedures should be followed. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how they ensure students are fully informed about the management and implementation of regulations and procedures.

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

Condition: the education provider must submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted prior to the visit were draft versions. It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of social work programmes and at the visit it was indicated documents would be rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors noted some areas that need to be taken into account when amending documents so they effectively support student learning. The programme specification document (page 12) states "As specified by the HCPC, no compensation for failed modules is permitted". This is incorrect; the HCPC has no such specifications. The visitors note it will be important to accurately state the programme leads to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors additionally noted the importance of referring to the current situation of social work, in particular noting the General Social Care Council (GSCC) and the GSCC Code of Practice no longer exist and the National Occupational Standards (NOS) have been replaced by the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) from 2012. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will effectively support students learning.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate students are able to access the facilities in place to support their welfare and wellbeing particularly considering reasonable adjustments.

Reason: Documentation and the tour of resources demonstrated facilities are in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. The students highlighted that whilst they could use these facilities, it is unpractical for them to access these facilities in person as they are too far away from the University of Hertfordshire campus. The visitors had some information about the provisions for disability services which help provide reasonable adjustments for those who need it. The visitors noted this service

may be difficult to access for offsite students who are located some distance away and in the middle of their studies. The visitors heard during the visit there are online resources and other ways to gain the support or reasonable adjustments that did not require on-campus presence. The visitors considered this information to be pertinent for students on this programme and therefore require further information about these resources and options to be clearly articulated within the programme documentation for students. Therefore the education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate students are able to access the facilities in place to support their welfare and wellbeing particularly considering reasonable adjustments.

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 students are fully informed about consenting to participate within the programme and how to manage any potential emotional distress.

Reason: Documentation and discussion with students and the programme team indicated that consent was discussed verbally whenever necessary through the programme. The visitors noted the programme uses a range of teaching methods including participation in role-plays and disclosing and reflecting on personal experience when considering social work practice. The visitors considered these activities could potentially lead to emotional distress and subsequent disruption in learning. There was no information within the programme documentation regarding the expectation to participate within the programme, consenting to participate, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed. To ensure this standard is met the visitors therefore require the education provider to ensure students are fully informed about consenting to participate in the programme and how to manage any emotional distress that may be caused.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information of the service user strategy in place for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not determine how the programme incorporated service user involvement within the programme management or delivery. Discussion at the visit indicated service users were used within the programme at the instigation of the West London Alliance (WLA); however there was no clearly defined role for them. The visitors considered service user involvement to be a fundamental aspect of social work and heavily integrated into the philosophy and core values of the social work profession. The visitors could not determine how the programme could reflect the philosophy, core values, associated skills and knowledge base of social work without formal service user involvement. Further discussion indicated there is a faculty-wide strategy for service user involvement which would include this programme; however there was no information of how this programme is engaged with the strategy. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the service user strategy in place for this programme to ensure this standard is met.

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 to demonstrate they maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated there were different systems in place for the approval and monitoring of placements. The University of Hertfordshire uses the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) audit tool. The audit is undertaken by the staff from the University of Hertfordshire and outcomes are not shared with the placement co-ordinators at West London Alliance (WLA). The WLA has an approval and monitoring system whereby the suitability of each placement location is assessed by WLA placement co-ordinators and outcomes are not shared with staff at the University of Hertfordshire. It was highlighted by both parties that if there were serious concerns about a placement it would be discussed and a solution reached. At the visit further discussion indicated the education provider was looking to change the auditing system to the ARC Placement Tool. The visitors considered the two auditing systems currently in place to work well in their role however were concerned the two parties undertook their own placement approval and monitoring and had little interaction with each other. The visitors could not determine how the education provider (University of Hertfordshire) could maintain overall responsibility for all placements without interacting with the WLA internal auditing system. The visitors considered it to be beneficial for both systems to provide outcomes to each other so decisions can be made jointly and that both parties are aware of each other's decisions. The visitors had received no information about the change of system from QAPL to ARC so were unable to determine whether this system would be appropriately used. The visitors therefore could not determine that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements and require further evidence to demonstrate 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 ensure students and practice placement educators are fully informed about the assessment procedures and associated policies for practice placements.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated there was some ambiguity around the assessment procedures and policies particularly relating to the practice placement elements of the programme. Firstly, from the documentation and discussion with the students, it was unclear as to whether or not students would be able to progress onto a following placement without completing the previous placement. The visitors were aware of the short timeframe within which students need to complete this

programme and therefore considered it to be important that progression policies are clearly articulated.

Secondly, from the documentation and discussion at the visit, the procedures to follow when a placement is failed were unclear. The University of Hertfordshire assessment regulations indicate that placements can be re-taken up to a certain number of times. The professional nature of the programme and the programme timeframe however would not accommodate this. Discussion with the programme team indicated this would be looked at and programme specific regulations may be required. The visitors consider the re-sit policies to be important information for students and so should be clearly articulated.

Thirdly, from the documentation provided for the visit, it was unclear how the competencies to be demonstrated at placement would be appropriately assessed for development and achievement. The competency marking system is a range of capability of how the student meets each professional capability framework domain (No evidence of capability / Some evidence of capability / Sufficient evidence of capability / Good and varied evidence of capability). The visitors had not seen any assessment criteria and so were unable to determine how practice placement educators would be able to determine capabilities. The visitors additionally were unclear as to what level the competencies had to be marked at in order for the student to be able to pass the placement and then progress to the next placement. The visitors considered it to be important for students to understand the competency assessment processes in order for them to understand their practice placement assessment.

In light of these ambiguities, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate for students and practice placement educators the assessment procedures and associated policies for practice placements to ensure they are fully prepared for placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the assessment of module Risk, Reflection and Resilience (7HSK0048).

Reason: The visitors noted from documentation and discussion that one of the assessment methods for module 7HSK0048 is a courtroom presentation and reflective summary. The visitors considered this assessment method to be particularly pertinent assessment tool to enable students to be able to formally act in a courtroom setting, present to court and to understand how the court system works. The visitors are aware this is an essential part of a social worker's role and links to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for social workers and fitness to practise. The visitors have not seen any assessment criteria for the courtroom assessment and were therefore unable to determine whether this assessment method contributes to ensuring fitness to practise effectively. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further information about the courtroom assessment within module 7HSK0048.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider include further information about the Fitness to Practise policy within the student handbook.

Reason: The visitors noted there was a faculty wide Fitness to Practice policy in place at the education provider. They have also noted the condition under SET 3.2 related to policies in place that students on this programme are subject to. The visitors noted the student handbook refers to the faculty wide Fitness to Practise policy and indicates where this can be found. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. The visitors felt there could be some further information about the policy and how it works in regards to the outcomes of any Fitness to Practise procedure and how the Fitness to Practise panels are formed and how they work. The visitors felt this information would be useful to students who are considering the Fitness to Practise policy.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider how they emphasise the generic approach to social work competencies.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the programme ensures all Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for Social Workers in England are linked to the integration of theory and practice within the programme and so considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted there is a three stage framework of "think child, think parent, think family" for the programme. However, the programme team need to be careful not to lose the holistic approach to the adult perspective and orientation in social work as is required from the generic SOPs. The visitors feel the current focus of the programme may detract from other service user needs that are not linked to the adult / parent / child focus. The visitors recommend the programme team consider how they emphasise the generic approach within the programmes conceptional framework to ensure students are able to fully integrate the programme theory to all social work practice.

Michael Branicki
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	30 – 31 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' 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 18 December 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 03 December 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 31 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science) full time and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science) full time. 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 decision on the program's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Phil Warren (Biomedical scientist)
	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	24 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Mel Joyner (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Sara Wing (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Nymeth Ali (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Patrick Naughton (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the advertising materials and programme documentation to make it clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the advertising materials and programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to registration as a "Healthcare science practitioner", but not specifically as a "Biomedical scientist" with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). To an applicant, this may cause confusion. The visitors require the advertising materials and programme documentation to include further explanation of the importance of registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist and what this entails in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of healthcare science programmes. During the approval visit, it was indicated that programme documents would be amended and possibly rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will provide correct information and effectively support student learning.

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 details of how the education provider ensures practice placement providers, practice educators and students are made aware of the programme specific information and how it fully prepares practice placement educators to supervise students.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the practice placement providers and the education provider demonstrated a good working relationship at the visit, but also noted that there is a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience

students will undertake smaller periods of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. The visitors received information about placements in the Placement Handbook, however during the meeting with the practice placement providers and educators the visitors noted inconsistent understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved, the expectations of professional conduct and of the students' progression. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements particularly considering, the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the assessment procedures, expectations of professional conduct, and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this way the visitors can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies is applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors noted students will be assessed whilst on placement and their clinical skills portfolios will be assessed as part of it. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt the education provider has assessment criteria for assessing students whilst on placement. However, the visitors noted the practice educators assess students based on their own experience and their observation of students. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the education provider will ensure students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies are applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how this SET is met.

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

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

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit however were unable to determine if they were registered as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Phil Warren
Mary Popeck

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	30 – 31 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical scientist' 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 18 December 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 03 December 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 31 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science) full time and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science) full time. 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 the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Phil Warren (Biomedical scientist)
	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	24 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Mel Joyner (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Sara Wing (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Nymeth Ali (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Patrick Naughton (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the advertising materials and programme documentation to make it clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the advertising materials and programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to registration as a "Healthcare science practitioner", but not specifically as a "Biomedical scientist" with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). To an applicant, this may cause confusion. The visitors require the advertising materials and programme documentation to include further explanation of the importance of registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist and what this entails in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of healthcare science programmes. During the approval visit, it was indicated that programme documents would be amended and possibly rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will provide correct information and effectively support student learning.

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 details of how the education provider ensures practice placement providers, practice educators and students are made aware of the programme specific information and how it fully prepares practice placement educators to supervise students.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the practice placement providers and the education provider demonstrated a good working relationship at the visit, but also noted that there is a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience

students will undertake smaller periods of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. The visitors received information about placements in the Placement Handbook, however during the meeting with the practice placement providers and educators the visitors noted inconsistent understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved, the expectations of professional conduct and of the students' progression. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements particularly considering, the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the assessment procedures, expectations of professional conduct, and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this way the visitors can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies is applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors noted students will be assessed whilst on placement and their clinical skills portfolios will be assessed as part of it. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt the education provider has assessment criteria for assessing students whilst on placement. However, the visitors noted the practice educators assess students based on their own experience and their observation of students. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the education provider will ensure students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies are applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how this SET is met.

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

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

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit however were unable to determine if they were registered as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Phil Warren
Mary Popeck

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Science)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	30 – 31 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'biomedical Scientist' 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 18 December 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 03 December 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 31 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Science) full time and BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Science) full time. 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 the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Phil Warren (Biomedical scientist)
	Mary Popeck (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	24 (includes all specialisms)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Mel Joyner (University of Plymouth)
Secretary	Sara Wing (University of Plymouth)
Members of the joint panel	Nymeth Ali (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Alan Wainwright (The Institute of Biomedical Science)
	Patrick Naughton (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the advertising materials and programme documentation to make it clear that upon successful completion of the programme the individual will be eligible to apply for registration as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors found inconsistent advice about registration with the HCPC in the advertising materials and programme documentation. For example, there were several references in the documentation to registration as a "Healthcare science practitioner", but not specifically as a "Biomedical scientist" with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). To an applicant, this may cause confusion. The visitors require the advertising materials and programme documentation to include further explanation of the importance of registration with the HCPC as a biomedical scientist and what this entails in order to be satisfied that this condition has been met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit finalised programme documentation.

Reason: It was highlighted this programme is part of a suite of healthcare science programmes. During the approval visit, it was indicated that programme documents would be amended and possibly rewritten to ensure programme specific information is clear. The visitors require the education provider to submit the finalised programme documentation so they can be assured it will provide correct information and effectively support student learning.

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 details of how the education provider ensures practice placement providers, practice educators and students are made aware of the programme specific information and how it fully prepares practice placement educators to supervise students.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the practice placement providers and the education provider demonstrated a good working relationship at the visit, but also noted that there is a significant change in the way students will undertake placements in the new programme. Instead of taking one year to undertake all of their practical experience

students will undertake smaller periods of placement experience in each of the three years of the programme. The visitors received information about placements in the Placement Handbook, however during the meeting with the practice placement providers and educators the visitors noted inconsistent understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved, the expectations of professional conduct and of the students' progression. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements particularly considering, the learning outcomes to be achieved on each placement, the assessment procedures, expectations of professional conduct, and the communication and lines of responsibility while a student is on placement. In this way the visitors can be sure that everyone is fully prepared for placement and that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies is applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors noted students will be assessed whilst on placement and their clinical skills portfolios will be assessed as part of it. During the meeting with placement providers, the visitors learnt the education provider has assessment criteria for assessing students whilst on placement. However, the visitors noted the practice educators assess students based on their own experience and their observation of students. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the education provider will ensure students' placement assessment criteria, including clinical skills portfolio and students' competencies are applied consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how this SET is met.

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

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

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. Additionally, the visitors did not see the evidence in the documentation to inform students that the successful completion of the programme will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documents to reflect that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. However, the visitors require evidence that the final draft of programme documents are produced in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiner at the visit however were unable to determine if they were registered as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Phil Warren
Mary Popeck

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	9 – 10 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 11 November 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 3 December 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 21 October 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	60 across two partnerships
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Debra Leighton (University of Salford)
Secretary	Julie Evans (University of Salford)
Members of the joint panel	Jane Jenkins (Internal Panel Member) Lee Sobo-Allen (The College of Social Work) Bill Penson (The College of Social Work) Annie Hudson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with graduates from the MA Social Work (Professional Practice) (Step Up to Social Work) programme.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

2.1 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 to demonstrate applicants are fully apprised of the expectations of the programme particularly considering any interruptions, delays or failure of practice placements and the possible associated financial expenditures.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit indicated the partnerships hold assessment centres for admission onto this programme. It was indicated that through these assessment centres information about the intense nature of the programme, the critical timings for progressing through the programme and the expectations of students are provided. Discussion with the students indicated they believed an interruption, of any length, to a placement would be considered as a fail of that placement and therefore would lead to a termination of their place on the programme. Further discussions with the senior team, placement educators and programme team indicated they had not considered in detail the implications and actions to be taken in the case of a placement being interrupted, delayed or failed. Discussion with all parties at the visit considered the following points:

- the intense timing of the 14 month programme;
- the potential financial costs being incurred;
- the possibilities of transference to other programmes;
- the possibilities of continuing or extending placements;
- the differences between the two partnerships; and
- the potential application of appeals processes if clear information was not communicated to students.

The visitors stress that the education provider need to provide information about the implications of interruptions, delays or failure of practice placements and associated financial expenditures, for applicants prior to them entering into contractual arrangements with partnerships in order that they are able to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors also considered this would mitigate the potential use of appeals processes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate applicants are fully apprised of the expectations of the programme particularly considering any interruptions, delays or failure of practice placements and the possible associated financial expenditures.

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 revisit the programme documentation to include further detail of the implications of interruptions, delays and failing practice placements.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit included a practice placement handbook for students, practice educators and onsite supervisors. There was some indication within the handbook (page 12) as to the implications and actions to be taken in the cases of interrupted, delayed or failed placements. Discussion with the students indicated they believed an interruption, of any length, to a placement would be considered as a fail of that placement and therefore would lead to a termination of their place on the programme. Further discussions with the senior team, placement educators and programme team indicated they had not considered in detail the implications and actions to be taken in the case of a placement being interrupted, delayed or failed. Discussion with all parties at the visit considered the following points:

- the intense timing of the 14 month programme;
- the potential financial costs being incurred;
- the possibilities of transference to other programmes;
- the possibilities of continuing or extending placements;
- the differences between the two partnerships; and
- the potential application of appeals processes if clear information was not communicated to students.

The visitors also heard that progressing past the first 70 days placement was the critical stress point for students and that the placement educators felt more flexibility could be applied in the 100 days placement. The visitors stress that the education provider need to provide information about the implications of interruptions, delays to placement and failing to progress, for students in order to mitigate the potential use of appeals processes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to include further detail of the implications of interruptions, delays and failing practice placements.

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

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

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

Michael Branicki
Dorothy Smith
Ruth Baker

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Winchester
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 11 November 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 3 December 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 4 November 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 3 December 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Patricia Higham (Social Worker) Graeme Currie (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2014
Chair	Janice de Sousa (University of Winchester)
Secretary	Ros Knapton (University of Winchester)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) changed its name from Health Professions Council (HPC) on 1 August 2012 when Social Work in England came on to the HCPC Register. For accuracy all references to HPC should be changed to HCPC. The programme specification stated the programme is "to be accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)" (page 6). HCPC use the terminology of 'approving' programmes and not 'accreditation'. On another occasion section 7.2 of the programme specification stated "The following basic entry criteria are requirements set out either by the professional regulator…". This statement is incorrect as HCPC do not prescribe specific admission criteria; education providers must meet the HCPC standards of education and training for admission processes. The visitors noted that when referencing the programme award and exit awards within the programme documentation it was clear which awards did not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration; however, there was no explicit statement that clearly articulated the approved programme award would lead to eligibility to apply for registration (the visitors also noted this links to SET 6.8). The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

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

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

Patricia Higham
Graeme Currie