

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Aston University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Hearing aid dispensers |
| Date of visit | 21 – 22 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Condition | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

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 'Hearing aid dispenser' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 June 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 4 July 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision. The education provider notified us they have closed the existing approved BSc (Hons) Audiology with Professional Training programme and will replace it with this new BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the September 2012 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme. 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 | Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2012 |
| Chair | Trevor Knight (Aston University) |
| Secretary | Gillian Cook (Aston 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and therefore does not exist. Visitors reviewed external examiner reports for the BSc (Hons) Audiology with Professional Training programme.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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.

Condition

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure it is accurate and provides information about the HCPC, the career pathway for a hearing aid dispenser and the protected title status.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation contained little information about the regulatory role of the HCPC, the implications of the protected title of hearing aid dispenser or details about the career of a hearing aid dispenser. The visitors considered it important that students be aware of hearing aid dispensing as a profession distinct from audiology as there are different regulatory requirements and different career routes although are similar in subject matter. The visitors also noted the references to the criminals convictions check are out of date. References to the criminal records bureau (CRB) check are made where this should now be referred to as the disclosure and barring service (DBS). To ensure the programme documentation effectively supports student learning the visitors require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure it is accurate and provides information about the HCPC, the career pathway for a hearing aid dispenser and the protected title status.

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 providing further information potential applicants about the profession of hearing aid dispensing including the potential career pathway, the regulatory requirements of registration and the implications of the protected title.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme. The visitors noted the programme does not provide initial information about hearing aid dispensing as a profession separate from audiology for potential applicants to the programme. The visitors feel this would enhance decision making for potential applicants if they are fully aware of the careers this programme can lead to and the regulatory requirements of the profession. The visitors suggest some initial information online may provide a valuable resource for these potential applicants.

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider consider whether they can provide students with an independent sector placement experience.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied the number, duration and range of practice placements would support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes enabling students to be able to meet all standards of proficiency for hearing aid dispensers. They noted other programmes the education provider delivers have direct links into the independent, non-NHS, practice placement settings. The visitors feel by making these options available to these students it would enhance their understanding of hearing aid dispensing and provide them with an experience to use if seeking employment as a hearing aid dispenser after graduation. The visitors recommend the education provider consider whether they can use the links already existing for other programmes to provide students with an independent sector placement experience.

Angela Duxbury
Tim Pringle

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Bradford College |
| Validating body / Awarding body | Teesside University |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time Part time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 10 |

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 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 7 June 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 4 July 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 June 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 22 August 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 part of a joint event. The professional body considered their endorsement of the programme and the HCPC and the professional body formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker) Lel Meleyal (Social worker) Paul Bates (Paramedic) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Louise Devlin |
| HCPC observer | Benjamin Potter |
| Proposed student numbers | 35 |
| First approved intake | January 2005 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2013 |
| Chair | Jeanette Logan (University of Manchester) |
| Secretary | Mandy Taylor (Bradford College) Diane Evans (Bradford College) |
| Members of the joint panel | Aiden Worsley (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Kausur Iqbal (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for 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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 9 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 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 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 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 the programme.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions documentation and information for applicants to ensure that the terminology in use is accurate, consistent and reflective of the HCPC and the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and care professionals council' and the 'Health and care profession council' rather than the 'Health and Care Professions Council' in the PowerPoint presentation that is sent to students who have been invited to attend an interview. Incorrect references to the HCPC were also evident in the 'course overview' section on the education provider's website, in reference to the 'Health and care profession' council, and in the statement that the HCPC register student social workers. The powerpoint presentation also states that registration with the HCPC is required upon completion of the course. The HCPC does not register students and HCPC registration is only required if a graduate wishes to use the title 'social worker' in England. The visitors therefore require the information provided to applicants to be updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC and statutory regulation of the profession.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the policy that is in place in relation to health requirements for applicants and students, and the procedures that are in place if a health condition is declared.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included a health questionnaire that is completed by all students taking part in placements with children or vulnerable adults. During the meeting with the senior team, it was also mentioned that students will be given additional support if they declare a health condition at the interview stage. However, from the documentation the visitors could not see evidence of an official policy regarding the health requirements that students would be required to meet, or information regarding any procedure that is followed if an applicant or student declares a health condition which may affect their participation on the programme. Therefore the visitors require additional evidence of the health requirements students and applicants are required to meet in order to complete the programme. The visitors also require evidence of the policies and procedures that are used to determine what, if any, adjustments can be made to aid students who have declared a health condition in the completion of the programme.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit provided little evidence of the arrangements that are in place to ensure the continued security of the programme for future cohorts. At the visit, the visitors requested and were provided with the 'Memorandum of Agreement' between the new validating body and the education provider. However, the visitors felt that while this clarified the arrangements between the validating body and the education provider it did not demonstrate how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme fits into the college business plan and the plan of the validating body to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the role of the new validating body in the regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the senior team the visitors were informed that the new validating body will be involved in quality assuring the programme, and that a full quality cycle has been agreed between the new validator and the education provider. However, it was not clear from the documentation provided exactly how, and to what extent, the new validating body is going to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence explaining the new validator's role in the quality assurance of the programme to ensure that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

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 'Health and care professionals council' in the module descriptors and programme specification. In the practice handbook (page 8) the visitors also noted a reference to the practice modules being 'derived from the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) and HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics [SCPEs]' rather than the standards of proficiency (SOPs). There were also references to the SCPEs when the SOPs should have been referenced in the module aims of the 'Professional Practice 1' module specification template, and in other module specifications. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation is reviewed to ensure that the terminology when referencing the HCPC, and the HCPC's standards, is correct and consistent to ensure that the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following validation of the programme by the new validating body.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider has not yet gone through the validation process with the new validating body for the programme. The visitors recognise that it is possible that documentation that will be used to deliver the programme could change as a result of the validation event. The visitors therefore require evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following validation of the programme to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings are being effectively used.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the role of the new validating body in the assessment process to ensure that all assessments are providing a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider has not yet gone through the validation process with the new validating body for the programme. As such the documentation received prior to the visit did not outline the new validating body's assessment and quality assurance procedures, and therefore the visitors were unsure how the education provider complies with the assessment framework of the new validating body. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the validating body's assessment and quality assurance procedures and how the education provider will meet the requirements of these. In this way the visitors can determine how the education programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the role of the new validating body as part of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that are in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment.

Reason: In discussion with the senior team it was stated that the education provider will chair their own exam boards and committees, and that the new validating body can attend as many or as few of these board meetings as they wish. However, the documentation provided did not detail the role of the new validating body in the monitoring and evaluation of assessments, therefore the visitors require further evidence of the validating bodies assessment and quality assurance procedures and how the education provider will meet the requirements of these. The visitors also require further evidence detailing how and where the new validating body are going to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation for the assessment of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the education programme can meet this standard.

6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must provide additional evidence regarding the procedure for the right of appeal for students, clarifying the difference in the academic and professional appeals process and the role of the new validating body in the appeals process.

Reason: The visitors noted in the student handbook (page 15) that there was an opportunity for students to appeal if they feel that they have been disadvantaged through the assessment process. They also noted that copies of the procedure could be obtained through the School of Teaching, Health and Care Administration Office or via the Student Ombudsman Office of the new validating body. The visitors were given some information in the form of a 'Complaints and Feedback' document which advised that students could make an appeal, but did not provide evidence of the appeals procedure. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that a procedure for the right of appeal for students is clearly specified within the programme documentation. The visitors also require information to clarify the difference between the academic and professional appeals process, as these were highlighted as separate processes in discussion with the programme team.

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

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

Reason: From discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the new validating body will recruit external examiners for the programme, with the education provider having the opportunity to make recommendations prior to the appointment of external examiners. They also informed the visitors that the recruitment of external examiners for this programme is still under review. This standard requires assessment regulations of the programme to state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. The visitors therefore require evidence of the relevant documentation where it clearly specifies the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the requirement for a daily reflective journal for students whilst on placement.

Reason: In the documentation provided and in the meeting with students, the visitors were made aware that reflective practice is emphasised and that students are required to complete a daily reflective journal as part of their placement experience. The visitors were therefore content that this standard was met. However, they noted from the meeting with students that a number of students expressed the requirement of completing a daily reflective journal as onerous, and that if it seen as a burden it could possibly reduce the effectiveness of regular reflection. In particular some students emphasised that they often struggled to find things to reflect upon that differed each day. The visitors would therefore like to suggest that the requirement for a daily reflective journal is kept under review for future cohorts. In this way the programme team can ensure that the purpose of the reflective journal and its effectiveness is maintained.

Deborah Kouzarides
LeI Meleyal
Paul Bates

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 5 |
| Recommended outcome | 6 |
| Conditions..... | 7 |
| Recommendations..... | 9 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012. The 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 and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Graeme Currie (Social Worker) Graham Noyce (Social Worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| HCPC observers | Jamie Hunt Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 40 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University) |
| Secretary | Susan Davies-Roper (Edge Hill University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Sam Baron (External Panel Member) Jenny Barrett (Internal Panel Member) Claire Hawkins (Internal Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Nigel Haydon (The College of Social Work) Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work) |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Helen Collinson (Edge Hill University Observer) Emma Webster (Edge Hill University Observer) |
|--|---|

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England.

Reason: Within the documentation submitted for the visit the visitors noted there were inaccuracies when referring to HCPC and HCPC's role. The visitors recognise these inaccuracies will occur whilst the social work profession becomes accustomed to the HCPC as the new regulatory body; the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in so students fully understand the HCPC's function. The visitors noted the online advertising materials state HCPC registers students, "As well as regulating individual social workers and students, the Health and Care Professions Council also..." (BA (Hons) Social Work website, Professional Accreditation). This is incorrect, the HCPC do not hold a register for students. The visitors also noted the programme handbook stated students would be "eligible for professional registration with the HCPC" (p17). The visitors considered this should be clarified to ensure students understand successful completion of the programme will confer them with 'eligibility to apply for HCPC registration' so they understand the process. The visitors also noted the General Social Care Council (GSCC) is referenced throughout the documentation provided. The GSCC no longer exists and therefore references to this body should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure the corrections above are made and the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England throughout.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the register.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted for the visit directed the visitors to various places within the submitted documentation including a SOPs mapping document and a SOPs (HCPC standards of proficiency)/PCF (the College of Social Work Professional Capabilities Framework) mapping document to demonstrate where the programme delivers the SOPs within the curriculum and learning outcomes. The visitors noted the HCPC's SOPs for social workers in England were mentioned in module descriptors and the practice assessment document; however there was no explicit reference to the SOPs themselves. The visitors could not determine the curriculum ensured students would be able to identify the SOPs and so identify their own ability to meet them. The visitors considered that whilst the programme could ensure students met the SOPs it would be difficult for the students to be able to link them with their practice, and so demonstrate how they meet the standards, without the programme explicitly referring to the SOPs alongside the PCF. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to demonstrate they meet the SOPs 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 further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included references to various sections to evidence this SET, "MVD [Validation submission document] paras 1.15; 1.18; 1.28; 2.3; 3.2; 3.7; 4.6; 4.7; 5.6; 5.9; 5.16; 5.29; 5.30; 8.12; 9.22-9.28; 9.33; 9.34; Module descriptors; Programme specification; Appendix D4; SOP's/PCF Mapping document. The curriculum is focused on the realities of practice and the need for clear evidence of developing professionalism" (SETs mapping 4.5). The visitors noted the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Guidance on conduct and ethics were mentioned in places; however there was no explicit reference to the standards themselves or evidence showing that the curriculum ensured students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are communicated to students and how it is ensured students understand the implications of the standards on graduation.

Recommendations

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.**

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider incorporating the standards of proficiency more extensively within the practice assessment documentation.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider ensures all parties are fully prepared for placement. The visitors noted within the practice assessment documentation that while the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are mentioned, the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) forms the basis of the competencies assessed. The visitors are aware that the PCF maps onto the SOPs so were assured the learning outcomes achieved at placement related directly to the SOPs. The visitors felt that by incorporating the SOPs more extensively alongside the PCF within the practice assessment documentation the students would gain a better understanding of how the SOPs and the PCF link together and how they differ. The visitors considered this consolidation would produce an enhanced student experience and ultimately an enhanced social worker.

Claire Brewis
Graeme Currie
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 5 |
| Recommended outcome | 6 |
| Conditions..... | 7 |
| Recommendations..... | 9 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012. The 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 and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Graeme Currie (Social Worker) Graham Noyce (Social Worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| HCPC observers | Jamie Hunt Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 10 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University) |
| Secretary | Susan Davies-Roper (Edge Hill University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Jenny Barrett (Internal Panel Member) Claire Hawkins (Internal Panel Member) Sam Baron (External Panel Member) Irene Jones (External Panel Member) David Mudd (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Nigel Haydon (The College of Social Work) |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Irene McTaggart (The Nursing and Midwifery Council)</p> <p>Helen Collinson (Edge Hill University Observer)</p> <p>Emma Webster (Edge Hill University Observer)</p> |
|--|--|

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. The programme has run for two academic years. The appointment of the external examiners was too late in the academic session for them to be able to complete external examiners reports for the first academic year. The Internal quality processes were not complete at the time of the visit for the second academic year. The visitors did review external examiner reports for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England.

Reason: Within the documentation submitted for the visit the visitors noted there were inaccuracies when referring to HCPC and HCPC's role. The visitors recognise these inaccuracies will occur whilst the social work profession becomes accustomed to the HCPC as the new regulatory body; the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role so students fully understand the HCPC's function. The visitors noted the programme handbook had the statement, "To meet HCPC requirements you [students] must spend 200 days in practice" (p25). This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirement for students to complete a particular amount of time in practice. The visitors noted the practice learning handbook stated students would be "eligible to register with the NMC and HCPC at programme completion" (p7). The visitors considered this should be clarified to ensure students understand successful completion of the programme will confer them with 'eligibility to apply for HCPC registration' so they understand the process. The visitors also noted the module descriptor for Module PUP1190 had the statement, "The HCPC and TCSW require that students undertake and pass a distinct and discreet assessment within this module to determine their 'Readiness for Direct Practice'." This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirements for students to undertake particular assessments. With the changes to the regulatory environment for social workers the documentation should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure the corrections above are made and the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England throughout.

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 appropriately informed about the implications surrounding consent for when they are expected to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: Documentation submitted and discussion at the visit indicated the programme uses a range of teaching methods including role play based scenarios and sharing personal information when appropriate. Discussions with the programme team indicated students were aware of the implications of consenting to participate and if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader, if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors could not determine from the documentation provided that students are fully aware of consenting to participate or of the procedures following opting-out. The visitors considered there are risks to students and the education provider when situations arise in the academic setting that may cause emotional distress and therefore it is important that clear information is provided by the programme team to the students to mitigate the risks. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate students are fully informed about the implications of declining to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the register.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted for the visit directed the visitors to various places within the submitted documentation including a SOPs mapping document and a SOPs (HCPC standards of proficiency)/PCF (the College of Social Work Professional Capabilities Framework) /SoCs (Nursing and Midwifery Council standards for competence) mapping document to demonstrate where the programme delivers the SOPs within the curriculum and learning outcomes. The visitors noted the HCPC's SOPs for social workers in England were mentioned in module descriptors and the practice assessment document; however there was no explicit reference to the standards of proficiency themselves. The visitors were unable to determine the curriculum ensured students would be able to identify the SOPs and so identify their own ability to meet them. The visitors considered that whilst the programme could ensure students met the SOPs it would be difficult for the students to be able to link them with their practice, and so demonstrate how they meet the standards, without the programme explicitly referring to the SOPs alongside the PCF and the SoCs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to demonstrate they meet the SOPs 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 further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included references to various sections to evidence this SET, "See MVD [Validation submission document], Section 1 Progression Social Work, Section 4 Design, Section 4 Practice learning, Module PUP 1190, Appendix E2: Practice Assessment Record" (SETs mapping 4.5). The visitors noted the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Guidance on conduct and ethics were mentioned in places; however there was no explicit reference to the standards themselves or evidence showing that the curriculum ensured students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are communicated to students and how it is ensured students understand the implications of the standards.

Recommendations

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.**

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider incorporating the standards of proficiency more extensively within the practice assessment documentation.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider ensures all parties are fully prepared for placement. The visitors noted within the practice assessment documentation that while the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are mentioned, the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) and the Nursing and Midwifery Council competencies form the basis of the competencies assessed. The visitors are aware that the PCF maps onto the SOPs so were assured the learning outcomes achieved at placement related directly to the SOPs. The visitors felt that by incorporating the SOPs more extensively alongside the PCF and the Nursing and Midwifery Council within the practice assessment documentation, students would gain a better understanding of how the SOPs and the PCF link together and how they differ. The visitors considered this consolidation would produce an enhanced student experience and ultimately an enhanced social worker.

Claire Brewis
Graeme Currie
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 24 – 25 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 5 |
| Recommended outcome | 6 |
| Conditions..... | 7 |
| Recommendations..... | 9 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 7 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012. The 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 and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Graeme Currie (Social Worker) Graham Noyce (Social Worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| HCPC observers | Jamie Hunt Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 10 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University) |
| Secretary | Susan Davies-Roper (Edge Hill University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Jenny Barrett (Internal Panel Member) Claire Hawkins (Internal Panel Member) Sam Baron (External Panel Member) Irene Jones (External Panel Member) David Mudd (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work) |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Nigel Haydon (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Bridget Crofts (The Nursing and Midwifery Council)</p> <p>Helen Collinson (Edge Hill University Observer)</p> <p>Emma Webster (Edge Hill University Observer)</p> |
|--|---|

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. The programme has run for two academic years. The appointment of the external examiners was too late in the academic session for them to be able to complete external examiners reports for the first academic year. The Internal quality processes were not complete at the time of the visit for the second academic year. The visitors did review external examiner reports for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England.

Reason: Within the documentation submitted for the visit the visitors noted there were inaccuracies when referring to HCPC and HCPC's role. The visitors recognise these inaccuracies will occur whilst the social work profession becomes accustomed to the HCPC as the new regulatory body; the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role so students fully understand the HCPC's function. The visitors noted the programme handbook had the statement, "To meet HCPC requirements you [students] must spend 200 days in practice" (p25). This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirement for students to complete a particular amount of time in practice. The visitors noted the practice learning handbook stated students would be "eligible to register with the NMC and HCPC at programme completion" (p7). The visitors considered this should be clarified to ensure students understand successful completion of the programme will confer them with 'eligibility to apply for HCPC registration' so they understand the process. The visitors also noted the module descriptor for Module PUP1190 had the statement, "The HCPC and TCSW require that students undertake and pass a distinct and discreet assessment within this module to determine their 'Readiness for Direct Practice'." This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirements for students to undertake particular assessments. With the changes to the regulatory environment for social workers the documentation should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure the corrections above are made and the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England throughout.

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 appropriately informed about the implications surrounding consent for when they are expected to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: Documentation submitted and discussion at the visit indicated the programme uses a range of teaching methods including role play based scenarios and sharing personal information when appropriate. Discussions with the programme team indicated students were aware of the implications of consenting to participate and if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader, if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors could not determine from the documentation provided that students are fully aware of consenting to participate or of the procedures following opting-out. The visitors considered there are risks to students and the education provider when situations arise in the academic setting that may cause emotional distress and therefore it is important that clear information is provided by the programme team to the students to mitigate the risks. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate students are fully informed about the implications of declining to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the register.

Reason: The SETs mapping document submitted for the visit directed the visitors to various places within the submitted documentation including a SOPs mapping document and a SOPs (HCPC standards of proficiency)/PCF (the College of Social Work Professional Capabilities Framework) /SoCs (Nursing and Midwifery Council standards for competence) mapping document to demonstrate where the programme delivers the SOPs within the curriculum and learning outcomes. The visitors noted the HCPC's SOPs for social workers in England were mentioned in module descriptors and the practice assessment document; however there was no explicit reference to the SOPs themselves. The visitors could not determine the curriculum ensured students would be able to identify SOPs and so identify their own ability to meet them. The visitors considered that whilst the programme could ensure students met the SOPs it would be difficult for the students to be able to link them with their practice, and so demonstrate how they meet the standards, without the programme explicitly referring to the SOPs alongside the PCF and the SoCs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to demonstrate they meet the SOPs 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 further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit included references to various sections to evidence this SET, "See MVD [Validation submission document], Section 1 Progression Social Work, Section 4 Design, Section 4 Practice learning, Module PUP 1190, Appendix E2: Practice Assessment Record" (SETs mapping 4.5). The visitors noted the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Guidance on conduct and ethics were mentioned in places; however there was no explicit reference to the standards themselves or evidence showing that the curriculum ensured students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are communicated to students and how it is ensured students understand the implications of the standards on graduation.

Recommendations

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.**

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider incorporating the standards of proficiency more extensively within the practice assessment documentation.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider ensures all parties are fully prepared for placement. The visitors noted within the practice assessment documentation that while the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are mentioned, the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) and the Nursing and Midwifery Council competencies form the basis of the competencies assessed. The visitors are aware that the PCF maps onto the SOPs so were assured the learning outcomes achieved at placement related directly to the SOPs. The visitors felt that by incorporating the SOPs more extensively alongside the PCF and the Nursing and Midwifery Council within the practice assessment documentation, students would gain a better understanding of how the SOPs and the PCF link together and how they differ. The visitors considered this consolidation would produce an enhanced student experience and ultimately an enhanced social worker.

Claire Brewis
Graeme Currie
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Hidden Hearing Limited |
| Programme name | Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence |
| Mode of delivery | Work based learning |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Hearing aid dispenser |
| Date of visit | 16 - 17 April 2013 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 6 June 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 4 July 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 August 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 12 September 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 | Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Sarah Johnson (Occupational therapist) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| Proposed student numbers | 20 per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | October 2013 |
| Chair | Roger Lewin (British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologist) |
| Secretary | Nick Barton (Hidden Hearing Limited) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review a programme specification prior to the visit as the education provider does not create programme specifications for this award type. The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, there have been no past external examiners reports 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC met with students from the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology (De Montfort University) 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 32 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 25 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 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 visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. Appendix 4 Becoming A Hearing Aid Dispenser is sent to potential applicants and on the front page states “Our unique fully funded programme of training, work experience and block release enables you to gain a FdSc (Audiology) degree and be ready for HPC registration in 13 Month” and on page 4 there are references to the programme as ‘Hidden Hearing Training’ which negate the title of the programme in the earlier reference.. The visitors also noted inconsistencies around the levels of Criminal Record checks/clearance required from potential applicants and students. They also noted the education provider has referenced HCPC as ‘HPC’ in the documentation submitted. . The HPC is now known as The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). Such incorrect and inconsistent statements create confusion and have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme, including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: At the visit, the HCPC Panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor were unable to determine the management processes in place for the programme. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine if there are effective systems in place to manage the programme and that the people involved have appropriate skills and expertise to work within these systems. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates the management structure of the programme; the roles and lines of responsibility; where the links to the management of practice placement providers are; and the associated processes. This will enable the visitors to determine this programme will be effectively managed.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the systems in place for monitoring and evaluating the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine if there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place. From the programme team meeting the visitors learnt the monitoring and evaluation systems for the programme were either in the process of being developed or did not exist. The visitors suggest the education provider consult the Standards of Education and Training Guidance document for further information regarding how to meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further information which demonstrates how the monitoring and evaluation systems in place are appropriate to, and effective for, the programme and how any information gathered will be acted upon.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide the role description for the individual with overall responsibility for the programme and details of the resources in place to support them in their role.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors did not receive any evidence relating to the named person who holds overall professional responsibility for the programme. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt the education provider has now appointed a programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme. However, the visitors could not determine whether the named person was appropriate for the role and had the right level of support without having sight of the programme leader role job description and details of the required criteria for the role. The visitors consider this condition to be linked with SET 3.2. The visitors therefore require the role description for the individual with overall responsibility for the programme and details of the resources in place to support them in their role, to ensure this SET is met.

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

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received a list of internal and external training associates who deliver the academic content of the programme. From the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt there were two internal training associates responsible for delivering the curriculum and managing the programme. Other internal training associates and external training associates were used as visiting teaching staff to teach the curriculum. Discussions also indicated the two internal training associates were responsible for administrative activities and support services available to students on the programme as well. The visitors could not determine the impact the extra responsibilities would have on the two internal training associates and were unable to ascertain that the programme has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme curriculum and undertake the operational activities associated with the programme. The visitors therefore require further information around the roles and responsibilities of the staff in place to ensure this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that staff have appropriate qualifications and experience to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted the teaching staff did not have formal teaching qualifications although they were qualified trainers. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors highlighted the importance of creating staff development policies encouraging staff to gain formal teaching qualifications to help them in their role of creating modules, formulating assessments and assessment criteria, marking and moderating assessments, developing the programme and leading modules with associated administration. The education provider acknowledged this however had not considered this need beforehand. The visitors therefore were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure the staff have the expertise to deliver an effective programme and therefore require further evidence considering the detail above demonstrating how this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the programme for staff development for those individuals undertaking the activities relating to the academic teaching elements of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not determine whether the education provider had a policy for development in place. The visitors learnt that development and training is provided at various times throughout the year and requirements are identified through appraisals and reviews. The visitors also noted from the staff CVs that none of the teaching staff had formal teaching qualifications. The visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. The visitors noted it is important for the programme curriculum to ensure the teaching staff are up to date academically and professionally. The visitors require further information about the programme for staff development for those individuals undertaking teaching of the curriculum to ensure they are equipped for teaching this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit and the tour of facilities, the visitors noted that there were no opportunities for the students to access core text books and supportive journals either online or from a library, although there was a limited selection of books available. The visitors noted the nature of this programme meant students will be onsite for blocks of time and then offsite for longer periods of time. The visitors noted the programme offered limited resources for distance learning. To determine whether this SET has been met, the visitors require further information

regarding how the education provider will support student learning in all settings especially when considering offsite students, core text books, journals and other academic resources.

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 that demonstrates how they provide adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Reason: From discussions with the students from the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology programme the visitors noted a number of positive comments about the support offered by the programme team. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team examples were given describing how they have supported the welfare and wellbeing of students by offering flexibility within the programme, including where appropriate, assignment extensions and also counselling support. However, the visitors noted the programme documentation did not describe the systems in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. They considered that as the first point of reference for these students, the programme documentation should provide information about the support systems in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to outline the facilities and systems available for student support, to demonstrate how the education provider provides adequate and accessible facilities for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the student support systems in place for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the academic and pastoral support systems in place on the programme. The visitors noted the two internal training associates were allocated as personal tutors for all the students. Discussions with students from the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology programme revealed the programme team was considered to be very supportive, but there was some variability in the levels of support offered to students, possibly as a result of the staffing levels on the programme. Given the lack of clarity around staffing levels (SET 3.5) the visitors were concerned about the ability of the programme team to sustain the level of support needed for this programme alongside running and developing the programme effectively. The visitors noted the demands placed on the programme team in supporting students on a complex programme that involved practice placements, academic work and hence were concerned about the sustainability and consistency of the support systems. The visitors therefore require further information about the student support systems in place, the allocation of students to personal tutors, how students are made aware of the support systems and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials so they can be assured that student support is sustainable and can be delivered consistently.

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 students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers.

Reason: The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document referenced SOPs to particular learning outcomes within the module descriptors. The visitors noted that within some modules there were learning outcomes that were not attached to assessments within the modules. The visitors were unable to determine all SOPs were being covered by the modules and subsequently assessed. For example, SOP 1b2 was stated as being covered by learning outcome 4 within module BUS2013(1) Business Aspects. Within this module descriptor learning outcome 4 was not assessed. The visitors were not able to determine how within the six modules, this programme will ensure that students who complete the programme will be able to meet all the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors suggest a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes will assist their review of this SET. The visitors require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

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 demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the hearing aid dispensing profession.

Reason: The programme intends to deliver graduates that are eligible to apply to the HCPC Register as a hearing aid dispenser. The visitor noted from reading the documentation and from discussions with the students, the programme is heavily focused on company training. The visitors acknowledge the students felt prepared as a hearing aid dispenser and noted the work the education provider has done to ensure students learn the skills needed to be a hearing aid dispenser. The SETs mapping document for other SETs make reference to the programme using British Society of Hearing Aid Audiologist (BSHAA) guidelines. However, the visitors noted through the programme documentation no reference is made to any professional bodies or the QAA benchmark statements for healthcare professions or other similar external frameworks. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how any professional body guidance is reflected in the programme or how the programme team worked to include it within the curriculum. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the hearing aid dispensing profession.

4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they ensure the delivery of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensured the delivery of the programme supports

and develops autonomous and reflective thinking. Within the programme team meeting, it was highlighted they planned some of the teaching methods and assessment to encourage students to reflect on their learning and practice throughout the programme. However the visitors could not see any evidence of this in the documentation. The visitors suggest ways for the students to consider their own practice, the limits of their practice, their responsibilities, how they link to other professionals could be demonstrated through self-appraisals, discussion groups, reflective logs, placement reviews or professional development portfolios. The visitors therefore require information which ensures the delivery of the programme supports and develops autonomous and reflective thinking.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

Reason: From a review of the documentation submitted it was clear the programme consisted of several competency based assessments with formal teaching and learning approaches in place. The visitors noted that students on the programme were assessed against a range of competencies based on learning taught in the curriculum. The visitors were unable to find evidence of evidence based practice within the programme such as through student-centred and independent learning, teaching and assessment strategies. The visitors suggest ways for the programme to encourage evidence based practice could be through self-appraisals, discussion groups, reflective logs, placement reviews or professional development portfolios. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence which shows how they ensure the range of learning and teaching approaches used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures the range of learning and teaching approaches used are appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum. Within the programme team meeting, the visitors were made aware that due to the nature of the programme, a number of learning and teaching approaches will be used. The visitors require further information about the range of approaches and how they are used to ensure they are appropriate for the programme. The visitors therefore require the information detailed above to determine whether this SET is met.

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 update the programme documentation to clearly specify the range of practice placements that all students will undertake through the duration of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine the range of practice placement experiences that students will undertake throughout the duration of the programme. The visitors noted during discussions with the programme team that students would experience one placement location for the entirety of the programme unless their supervisor was moved in which case they could be moved to another location. Although all placements are provided by the education provider, the visitors were unable to determine if the students get a range of practice placement experience with appropriately managed direct and indirect supervision in line with student's experience and competence whilst on the programme. The visitors need to be assured that all students gain access to the required range of learning experiences in a variety of practice environments with a range of clientele to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors require the education provider to clearly define the range of practice placements that all students will undertake throughout the duration of the programme and update the programme documentation to clearly specify this information.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about how the approval and monitoring of practice placements ensures that a safe and supportive environment is provided for students while they are on placements.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation, and in discussion with the programme team, that each placement setting utilised by the programme will be provided directly by the education provider. The visitors also noted that once the initial 9 week placement is complete, students go on domiciliary visits as part of their placement experience. The domiciliary visit occurs when the students are given an area for themselves, where they are a pre-registration hearing aid dispenser visiting clients and selling hearing aids. The pre-registration hearing aid dispenser has no prescribed contact with their supervisor although if necessary they can contact their supervisor via telephone. The visitors were unclear as to the approval and monitoring processes involved with this placement experience and how the education provider ensured that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment especially while students are on domiciliary visits. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the approval and monitoring processes and more specifically how they ensure that domiciliary visits provide a safe and supportive environment for students. In this way the visitors can be sure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice placement educators are appropriately trained and prepared to work with students from this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured the practice placement educators were fully prepared to work with students. The documentation did not include a practice educator's handbook or any other information detailing how the programme is structured, learning outcomes to be achieved at placements or information supporting the assessment of placements. The visitors expect training of some form to be provided by the programme team to enable the practice educators to be aware of their role and responsibility for the student, the

support offered by the programme team, any changes that may occur to the programme and to ensure parity across the assessment of placements. The visitors suggest the education provider consult the Standards of Education and Training Guidance document for further information regarding how to meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this SET is met.

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

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

Reason: From documentation and in discussion with the programme team, and the practice placement providers, the visitors noted there would be limited collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers. The documentation indicated there would be a programme review group which would have one representative from practice placement providers. The visitors noted that the intended practice placement providers had not had any impact into the design of this programme. There was no additional evidence for any practice placement provider meetings or ways to feedback to the programme team in the future. The visitors were concerned that the programme would not have a strong partnership and ongoing relationship with the practice placement providers as a group of stakeholders for the programme. The visitors suggest the education provider consult the Standards of Education and Training Guidance document for further information regarding how to meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this SET 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 mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured the practice placement educators were fully prepared for placement. The documentation did not include a placement handbook or any other information detailing how the programme is structured, learning outcomes to be achieved at placements, 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. This SET links to SET 5.8. The visitors expect the programme team to enable the practice placement educators to be aware of their role and responsibility for the student, the support offered by the programme team, any changes that may occur to the programme and to ensure there is parity across the assessment of placements.

The visitors suggest the education provider consult the Standards of Education and Training Guidance document for further information regarding how to meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the domiciliary visits will encourage safe and effective practice.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation, and in discussion with the programme team, that each placement setting utilised by the programme will be provided directly by the education provider. The visitors also noted that once the initial 9 week placement is complete, students go on domiciliary visits as part of their placement experience. The domiciliary visit occurs when the students are given an area for themselves, where they are a pre-registration hearing aid dispenser visiting clients and selling hearing aids. The pre-registration hearing aid dispenser has no prescribed contact with their supervisor although if necessary they can contact their supervisor via telephone. The visitors were unclear how the education provider ensured that domiciliary visit settings encourage safe and effective practice without structured input from a supervisor. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the domiciliary visits will encourage safe and effective practice. In this way the visitors can be sure that this SET 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 demonstrate how the assessment strategy ensures ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for hearing aid dispensers.

Reason: The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document referenced SOPs to particular learning outcomes within the module descriptors. The visitors noted that within some modules there were learning outcomes that were not attached to assessments within the modules. The visitors were unable to determine all SOPs were being assessed appropriately by the modules. For example, SOP 1b2 was stated as being covered by learning outcome 4 within module BUS2013(1) Business Aspects. Within this module descriptor learning outcome 4 was not assessed. The visitors were not able to determine how within the six modules, this programme will ensure that students who complete the programme will be able to meet all the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers. The visitors suggest a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes and assessment of the learning outcomes will assist their review of this SET. The visitors require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for hearing aid dispensers.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment methods will measure all learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors noted in the module descriptors that some learning outcomes were not attached to assessments within the module. For example within module BUS2013(1) Business Aspects there are 9 learning outcomes of which 4 are assessed within the module leaving 5 not assessed. During discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that this was an area to be reviewed further. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment methods will assess all learning outcomes.

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

Condition: the education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit did not include any information about external examiner policies or policies to ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place ensuring appropriate standards in the assessment. At the visit further information was given about the external examiner however there was still confusion from the programme team regarding the policies surrounding the external examiner role and the evaluation of assessments including the format and frequency of reports to be completed, what access to marked assessments they have and the resulting actions to be taken by the programme team from any external examiner reports. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate the education provider has policies in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate there are procedures in place for the right of appeal for students.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit directed visitors to information about the trainee complaints, grievances and appeal for this SET. The visitors could not determine how this information linked to the students having the right to appeal against assessment, progression and achievement decisions made by the programme team. During discussions the programme team highlighted that this was an area they needed to further develop. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate there is a procedure in place for the right of appeal for students and how this is communicated to students.

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 hearing aid dispensing 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 continues to be met.

Sarah Johnson
Elizabeth Ross

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Liverpool John Moores University |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) in Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 14 – 15 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 July 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 12 September 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) David Childs (Social worker) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 20 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Secretary | Jagori Banerjee (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Rebecca Bartlett (Internal Panel Member) Debbie Ford (External Panel Member) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work) Ruth Sawyers (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 demonstrate how the curriculum ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit indicated the modules where the curriculum would ensure students are introduced to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where the programme team would ensure they understand the implications of the standards. The modules are new modules so the module materials were not available at the time of the validation event, the internal processes will have them created after the validation event. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 the assessment strategy and design will ensure the student who successfully completes the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme adheres to education provider regulations concerning assessment. Modules with two components of the overall assessment require both to be passed to pass the module. Due to the assessment regulations (C7), a student may be able to pass one component and fail one component, however due to compensation regulations be able to achieve a pass overall in the module. Discussion highlighted this could lead to concerns surrounding whether or not the students are achieving the learning outcomes for that module. The visitors considered this may impact on how the student can meet the standards of proficiency upon completing the programme. In light of this discussion the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage this situation and ensure students who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 ensure the information provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit highlighted information was provided to potential applicants and applicants to the programme through different ways. The visitors were satisfied applicants to the programme had the information they require to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors noted the information provided in the prospectus for the programme included details about the costs of the enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) which was not included in the online materials. The visitors also noted the open days for the programmes provided additional information the online materials and prospectus did not. The visitors recommend the programme team review the information presented in different ways through the admissions procedures to ensure the information is consistent and current.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider carefully monitor student attendance.

Reason: The education provider has further developed the attendance policy and is in the process of rolling it out across all programmes and all levels. The programme documentation defines the mandatory attendance requirements for the academic and practice placement settings. The visitors were satisfied this standard is met. The students identified attendance at lectures varied which was having a noticeable impact on their learning. The students indicated they had discussed this with the module leaders however in some modules, attendance stayed low. The visitors recommend the programme team carefully monitor attendance to ensure they know when to take necessary action if attendance levels across the cohort appears to be low.

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to work with practice educators to ensure they are familiar with the new placement paperwork

associated with the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and the professional capabilities framework (PCF).

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team was in the process of visiting practice placement providers to introduce them to the new placement paperwork which uses the SOPs and the PCF. The visitors noted the programme team had carried out initial work discussing the new paperwork with the practice educators and would follow this up with further meetings once the programme had started. The visitors feel this is an appropriate way to manage the introduction of the paperwork and recommend the programme team continue with this to develop the practice educators understanding of the documentation and the assessment of the PCF and SOPs.

Martin Benwell
David Childs
Vicki Lawson-Brown

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Liverpool John Moores University |
| Programme name | MA in Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 14 – 15 May 2013 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 July 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 12 September 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) David Childs (Social worker) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 30 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Secretary | Jagori Banerjee (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Rebecca Bartlett (Internal Panel Member) Debbie Ford (External Panel Member) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work) Ruth Sawyers (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made 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

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 demonstrate how the curriculum ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit indicated the modules where the curriculum would ensure students are introduced to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where the programme team would ensure they understand the implications of the standards. The modules are new modules so the module materials were not available at the time of the validation event, the internal processes will have them created after the validation event. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 the assessment strategy and design will ensure the student who successfully completes the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme adheres to education provider regulations concerning assessment. Modules with two components of the overall assessment require both to be passed to pass the module. Due to the assessment regulations (C7), a student may be able to pass one component and fail one component, however due to compensation regulations be able to achieve a pass overall in the module. Discussion highlighted this could lead to concerns surrounding whether or not the students are achieving the learning outcomes for that module. The visitors considered this may impact on how the student can meet the standards of proficiency upon completing the programme. In light of this discussion the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage this situation and ensure students who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 clearly articulate an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit indicated clearly that other awards possible for the programme would not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration (programme specification). The visitors noted the education provider assessment regulations contained the following statement regarding aegrotat awards, "Aegrotat awards do not carry any classification, distinction or merit." (The Academic Framework Regulations 2012-13, C8.7). The visitors considered this implies a student could be

given an award of MA Social Work as an aegrotat award. The visitors raised this with the programme team and it was confirmed a student would not be given the MA Social Work as an aegrotat award. The visitors require a clarifying statement to be included within the programme documentation so students are aware an aegrotat award from this programme will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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 ensure the information provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit highlighted information was provided to potential applicants and applicants to the programme through different ways. The visitors were satisfied applicants to the programme had the information they require to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors noted the information provided in the prospectus for the programme included details about the costs of the enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) which was not included in the online materials. The visitors also noted the open days for the programmes provided additional information the online materials and prospectus did not. The visitors recommend the programme team review the information presented in different ways through the admissions procedures to ensure the information is consistent and current.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider carefully monitor student attendance.

Reason: The education provider has further developed the attendance policy and is in the process of rolling it out across all programmes and all levels. The programme documentation defines the mandatory attendance requirements for the academic and practice placement settings. The visitors were satisfied this standard is met. The students identified attendance at lectures varied which was having a noticeable impact on their learning. The students indicated they had discussed this with the module leaders however in some modules, attendance stayed low. The visitors recommend the programme team carefully monitor attendance to ensure they know when to take necessary action if attendance levels across the cohort appears to be low.

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.**

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to work with practice educators to ensure they are familiar with the new placement paperwork associated with the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and the professional capabilities framework (PCF).

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team was in the process of visiting practice placement providers to introduce them to the new placement paperwork which uses the SOPs and the PCF. The visitors noted the programme team had carried out initial work discussing the new paperwork with the practice educators and would follow this up with further meetings once the programme had started. The visitors feel this is an appropriate way to manage the introduction of the paperwork and recommend the programme team continue with this to develop the practice educators understanding of the documentation and the assessment of the PCF and SOPs.

Martin Benwell
David Childs
Vicki Lawson-Brown

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Liverpool John Moores University |
| Programme name | Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Step up to Social Work) |
| Mode of delivery | Work based learning |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 14 – 15 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 July 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 22 August 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 1 July 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 12 September 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 and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BA (Hons) in Social Work and MA in Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Martin Benwell (Diagnostic radiographer) David Childs (Social worker) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 30 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2014 |
| Chair | Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Secretary | Jagori Banerjee (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Rebecca Bartlett (Internal Panel Member) Debbie Ford (External Panel Member) Gary Hickman (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work) Ruth Sawyers (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is a new programme. The HCPC did review the Annual monitoring report (AMR) 2011-2012 for the MA Social Work Step up programme which is to be replaced by this programme.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work and the MA 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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 demonstrate how the curriculum ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: The documentation provided for the visit indicated the modules where the curriculum would ensure students are introduced to the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and where the programme team would ensure they understand the implications of the standards. The modules are new modules so the module materials were not available at the time of the validation event, the internal processes will have them created after the validation event. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 the assessment strategy and design will ensure the student who successfully completes the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme adheres to education provider regulations concerning assessment. Modules with two components of the overall assessment require both to be passed to pass the module. Due to the assessment regulations (C7), a student may be able to pass one component and fail one component, however due to compensation regulations be able to achieve a pass overall in the module. Discussion highlighted this could lead to concerns surrounding whether or not the students are achieving the learning outcomes for that module. The visitors considered this may impact on how the student can meet the standards of proficiency upon completing the programme. In light of this discussion the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider will manage this situation and ensure students who successfully complete the programme will meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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 ensure the information provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit highlighted information was provided to potential applicants and applicants to the programme through different ways. The visitors were satisfied applicants to the programme had the information they require to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors noted the information provided in the prospectus for the programme included details about the costs of the enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) which was not included in the online materials. The visitors also noted the open days for the programmes provided additional information the online materials and prospectus did not. The visitors recommend the programme team review the information presented in different ways through the admissions procedures to ensure the information is consistent and current.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider carefully monitor student attendance.

Reason: The education provider has further developed the attendance policy and is in the process of rolling it out across all programmes and all levels. The programme documentation defines the mandatory attendance requirements for the academic and practice placement settings. The visitors were satisfied this standard is met. The students identified attendance at lectures varied which was having a noticeable impact on their learning. The students indicated they had discussed this with the module leaders however in some modules, attendance stayed low. The visitors recommend the programme team carefully monitor attendance to ensure they know when to take necessary action if attendance levels across the cohort appears to be low.

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.**

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to work with practice educators to ensure they are familiar with the new placement paperwork associated with the standards of proficiency (SOPs) and the professional capabilities framework (PCF).

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team was in the process of visiting practice placement providers to introduce them to the new placement paperwork which uses the SOPs and the PCF. The visitors noted the programme team had carried out initial work discussing the new paperwork with the practice educators and would follow this up with further meetings once the programme had started. The visitors feel this is an appropriate way to manage the introduction of the paperwork and recommend the programme team continue with this to develop the practice educators understanding of the documentation and the assessment of the PCF and SOPs.

Martin Benwell
David Childs
Vicki Lawson-Brown

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Stockport College of Further and Higher Education |
| Validating body / Awarding body | University of Chester |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time Part time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 23 – 24 April 2013 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 June 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 4 July 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 24 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Richard Barker (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| Proposed student numbers | 30 per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Amanda Davis (Stockport College of Further and Higher Education) |
| Secretary | Chris Doyle (Stockport College of Further and Higher Education) |
| Members of the joint panel | Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 44 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about the modes of delivery.

Reason: In the documentation provided by the education provider, the visitors noted that the programme will be delivered full and part time and information regarding Criminal Record and health checks. However, the visitors could not determine the timescales for the part time route of the programme and information about the costs for Criminal Record and health checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that students had to pay for the Criminal Record and health checks without any prior information during the admissions process. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about the modes of delivery.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme, including the lines of responsibility and links to the management of practice placement providers.

Reason: At the visit, the HCPC Panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitor were unable to determine the management processes in place for the programme. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine if there are effective systems in place to manage the programme. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates the management structure of the programme; the roles and lines of responsibility; where the links to the management of practice placement providers are; and the associated processes. This will enable the visitors to determine this programme will be effectively managed by the education provider and the validating body.

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

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

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors received staff curriculum vitae who deliver the academic content of the programme. The visitors did not see any evidence of the staff and their roles associated with the programme. From the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the education provider is in the process of recruiting two new members of staff who will be responsible for delivering the curriculum and managing the programme. The visitors could not determine the impact the extra responsibilities would

have on the teaching staff as there was no evidence provided for the lines of responsibility and links to the management of the programmes. This condition is linked to SET 3.2. The visitors were unable to ascertain that the programme has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme curriculum and undertake the operational activities associated with the programme. The visitors therefore require further information to demonstrate there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff their roles and responsibilities to ensure this SET is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the resources to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

Reason: From the documentation received prior to the visit, the visitors received a draft student handbook with information for students on the programme. The visitors also noted that the student handbook did not include all the policies and procedures that were in place. During discussions with the students the visitors learnt that students were satisfied with resources in place to support their learning .To determine whether this SET has been met, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate students received all the information regarding the resources available during their programme to support their learning and policies and procedures clearly articulated in the programme documentation. The education provider may submit a completed student handbook as evidence to meet this SET.

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 that demonstrates how they provide adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Reason: From discussions with the students the visitors noted a number of positive comments about the support offered by the programme team. The visitors also noted in discussions with the programme team examples were given describing how they have supported the welfare and wellbeing of students by offering immediate responses to students' queries and support students. The visitors learnt that students can access facilities provided by education provider and validating body. However, the visitors noted the programme documentation did not describe clearly the systems in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students and guidance available to them. They considered that as the first point of reference for these students, the programme documentation should clearly provide information about the support systems in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to outline the facilities and systems available for student support, to demonstrate how the education provider provides adequate and accessible facilities for students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the student support systems in place for the programme including the allocation of personal tutors

to students, timing of tutor allocation, frequency of tutorials and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials throughout the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the academic and pastoral support systems in place on the programme and the visitors noted that each student was allocated a personal tutor. Discussions with students revealed that the programme team was considered to be very supportive, but that there was some variability in the levels of support offered to students and the timing of allocation of personal tutors, possibly as a result of the staffing levels on the programme. Given the lack of clarity around staffing levels the visitors were concerned about the ability of the programme team to sustain the level of support provided and to run and develop the programme effectively SET 3.2 and 3.5. Discussions with the programme team revealed that staff devoted a lot of time and effort to supporting students. The visitors considered the demands placed on the programme team in supporting students on a programme that involved practice placements and academic work, and hence about the sustainability and consistency of the support systems. The visitors therefore require further information about the student support systems in place including the allocation of personal tutors to students, timing of tutor allocation, frequency of tutorials and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials throughout the programme. So they can be assured that student support is sustainable and can be delivered consistently.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of a formal student complaints process.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that an informal process for student complaints was used by the education provider. The visitors were made aware that if a complaint is made that complaint can be cascaded up the education provider's management structure and dealt with formally, if required. However, the visitors could find no evidence of a formalised student complaints process and in reviewing the programme documentation were unable to find documented evidence of the process described to them in the meetings at the visit. As a consequence the visitors could not determine how a student could complain formally or how students are provided information about the complaints process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of a student complaints process, and how this process is highlighted to students to demonstrate 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 programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk

involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise programme documentation to clearly identify the minimum attendance requirements for the practice placement setting and the academic setting.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting. Discussions with the students indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary however did not know the minimum requirements for attendance at the practice placement setting or in the academic setting. Discussions with the programme team indicated there was an expected attendance of 100% for all components of the programme with allowances made for reasonable absences. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied the minimum requirements were being fully communicated to the students. The visitors also noted that if students were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect students' learning and development. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to communicate the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the procedures in place for formal collaboration between the programme team and practice placement providers from all sectors at operational levels.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided prior to the visit, and in discussion with the practice placement providers, that there is regular and effective collaboration between the placement providers and the programme team at strategic levels especially with statutory sector. However, the visitors were unclear as to how this collaboration will be managed with the practice placement providers from independent, voluntary and private sectors, especially at operational level. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that formal collaboration is in place at strategic and operational levels with practice placement providers from all sectors. In this way, the visitors can be sure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the practice placement providers and the programme team from all sectors and that 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 mechanism they use to ensure practice placement educators are fully prepared for placements.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured the practice placement educators were fully prepared for placement. The documentation did include a placement handbook. However, during discussions with the practice placement providers and educators the visitors learnt practice educators were not aware of the learning outcomes to be achieved while students are on placements. The visitors also notice that practice educators were not aware about the overall structure and rationale of the programme including theory and practice being integral to the programme. The visitors expect the programme team to enable the practice placement educators to be aware of their role and responsibility for the student, the support offered by the programme team, any changes that may occur to the programme and to ensure there is parity across the assessment of placements. The visitors suggest the education provider consult the Standards of Education and Training Guidance document for further information regarding how to meet this SET. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this SET is met especially showing evidence of practice educators know the learning outcomes to be achieved.

6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate there are procedures in place for the right of appeal for students.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit directed visitors to the link for information about appeals process for this SET. The visitors noted that there were two appeal processes in place the education provider has their own appeal process and the validating body has theirs. However, the visitors could not determine which of the appeal process students will have to follow when they need to appeal against assessment, progression and achievement decisions made by the programme team. During discussions the programme team highlighted that this was an area they needed to further articulate clearly in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence clearly articulating which process procedure students will have to follow for the right of appeal and this is communicated to students effectively.

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 continues to be met.

Christine Stogdon
Paul Blakeman
Richard Barker

Visitors' report

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

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Richard Barker (Social worker) Michael Branicki (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 90 to be shared between the BA (Hons) Social Work and the MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying) / Postgraduate Diploma Social Work programmes |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | October 2013 |
| Chair | Judith Porch (Teesside University) |
| Secretary | Joanne Almond (Teesside University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Andrew Hill (External Panel Member) Simon Wall (External Panel Member) Linda Dickinson (Internal Panel Member) Jane Johnstone (Internal Panel Member) Dave Mudd (Internal Panel Member) Brienne Nichols (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Allan Winthrop (Internal Panel Member) Carolyn Spray (The College of Social Work) David Ward (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining SET.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the Students Essential Guide (student's handbook) which provided information for students about consent protocols for practical activities (page 22). Discussion with the students indicated the academic sessions often included service user input and students' often made disclosures of a personal nature. It was described that students could use recording devices for the sessions which may not be obvious to the other students. This could lead to the recording of personal information without knowledge or consent. This concern was raised with the programme team and it was highlighted that students were informed through discussions the expectation that academic sessions are treated as a confidential space and how to manage themselves if they have any concerns of a personal nature. The visitors are aware some students may require a recording device to assist with their learning, they are also aware that students have a right to confidentiality which may be put at risk when recording devices are used. The visitors considered the programme team must ensure students are aware of recording devices present and can request them to be turned off if necessary. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration within the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted that references to the HCPC were made throughout the documentation. The visitors noted within the documentation and information provided that there were different ways of stating that the students would have eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC upon successful completion of the programme, “enter the social work profession by registration with the HCPC at the point of qualification” (BA (Hons) Social Work Programme Handbook, p4). The visitors felt this could lead to confusion over whether they would automatically be processed for registration or not. The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration to ensure there are no confusions.

Richard Barker
Michael Branicki
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Teesside University |
| Programme name | MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying) |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Richard Barker (Social worker) Michael Branicki (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 90 to be shared between the BA (Hons) Social Work and the MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying) / Postgraduate Diploma Social Work programmes |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2014 |
| Chair | Judith Porch (Teesside University) |
| Secretary | Joanne Almond (Teesside University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Andrew Hill (External Panel Member) Simon Wall (External Panel Member) Linda Dickinson (Internal Panel Member) Jane Johnstone (Internal Panel Member) Dave Mudd (Internal Panel Member) Brienne Nichols (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Allan Winthrop (Internal Panel Member) Carolyn Spray (The College of Social Work) David Ward (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore this documentation does not exist. The visitors did review external examiners' reports from the last two years for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the Students Essential Guide (student's handbook) which provided information for students about consent protocols for practical activities (page 22). Discussion with the students indicated the academic sessions often included service user input and students' often made disclosures of a personal nature. It was described that students could use recording devices for the sessions which may not be obvious to the other students. This could lead to the recording of personal information without knowledge or consent. This concern was raised with the programme team and it was highlighted that students were informed through discussions the expectation that academic sessions are treated as a confidential space and how to manage themselves if they have any concerns of a personal nature. The visitors are aware some students may require a recording device to assist with their learning, they are also aware that students have a right to confidentiality which may be put at risk when recording devices are used. The visitors considered the programme team must ensure students are aware of recording devices present and can request them to be turned off if necessary. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration within the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted that references to the HCPC were made throughout the documentation. The visitors noted within the documentation and information provided that there were different ways of stating that the students would have eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC upon successful completion of the programme. The visitors felt this could lead to confusion over whether they would automatically be processed for registration or not. The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration to ensure there are no confusions.

Richard Barker
Michael Branicki
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Teesside University |
| Programme name | Postgraduate Diploma Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 17 – 18 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 10 June 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying). The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Richard Barker (Social worker) Michael Branicki (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 90 to be shared between the BA (Hons) Social Work and the MA Social Work (Pre-Qualifying) / Postgraduate Diploma Social Work programmes |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | January 2014 |
| Chair | Judith Porch (Teesside University) |
| Secretary | Joanne Almond (Teesside University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Andrew Hill (External Panel Member) Simon Wall (External Panel Member) Linda Dickinson (Internal Panel Member) Jane Johnstone (Internal Panel Member) Dave Mudd (Internal Panel Member) Brienne Nichols (Internal Panel Member) Fiona Terry (Internal Panel Member) Allan Winthrop (Internal Panel Member) Carolyn Spray (The College of Social Work) David Ward (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore this documentation does not exist. The visitors did review external examiners' reports from the last two years for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining SET.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the Students Essential Guide (student's handbook) which provided information for students about consent protocols for practical activities (page 22). Discussion with the students indicated the academic sessions often included service user input and students' often made disclosures of a personal nature. It was described that students could use recording devices for the sessions which may not be obvious to the other students. This could lead to the recording of personal information without knowledge or consent. This concern was raised with the programme team and it was highlighted that students were informed through discussions the expectation that academic sessions are treated as a confidential space and how to manage themselves if they have any concerns of a personal nature. The visitors are aware some students may require a recording device to assist with their learning, they are also aware that students have a right to confidentiality which may be put at risk when recording devices are used. The visitors considered the programme team must ensure students are aware of recording devices present and can request them to be turned off if necessary. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the programme team are doing all they can to ensure their students' right to confidentiality.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration within the programme documentation.

Reason: The visitors noted that references to the HCPC were made throughout the documentation. The visitors noted within the documentation and information provided that there were different ways of stating that the students would have eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC upon successful completion of the programme. The visitors felt this could lead to confusion over whether they would automatically be processed for registration or not. The visitors suggest the programme team ensure language is consistent when referencing HCPC registration to ensure there are no confusions.

Richard Barker
Michael Branicki
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | The City of Liverpool College (formerly Liverpool Community College) |
| Validating body / Awarding body | Liverpool John Moores University |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) in Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 23 – 24 April 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 11 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has 20 June 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 4 July 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 1 August 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating/awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their endorsement of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. 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 | Dorothy Smith (Social Worker) Caroline Jackson (Social worker) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist / Occupational psychologist) |
| HCPC executive officer | Benjamin Potter |
| Proposed student numbers | 18 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Secretary | Kris Barrow (Liverpool John Moores University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Rebecca Bartlett (Internal Panel Member) Debbie Ford (External Panel Member) Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 8 SETs.

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

The visitors 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 programme team need to clarify the entry criteria for the programme to ensure that it is referenced consistently and clearly for the new programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that in exceptional circumstances an entry examination will be offered to applicants if they cannot provide evidence of achieving the required 240 Universities and Colleges Application Service (UCAS) points for entry to the programme. However, the visitors were unclear as to when this examination was offered to applicants and what the 'exceptional circumstances' may be. The visitors were also unclear as to what this examination covered and how this was mapped to the UCAS points to ensure parity in the application process. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that this examination had formed part of the part time programme which is no longer recruiting and that it was put in place so that mature students who may not meet the UCAS criteria were not disadvantaged. The team further clarified that this examination would no longer be offered as part of the admissions process for this programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to ensure that the entry criteria that is included in the programme documentation, on the website and in any advertising information is clarified and the offer of an entry examination is removed. In this way the visitors can be sure that applicants applying to the programme have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider needs to provide further evidence of the formal structures within the education provider and the validating body which are in place to effectively manage the programme

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were aware of how the programme is managed day to day. The programme manager is responsible for all aspects of the operation and function of the programme and is responsible to the head of school and the head of higher education at the education provider. The programme manager is also responsible for liaising with the link tutor from the validating body. However, in discussion at the visit the visitors noted that some elements of the programme were dealt with by the education provider's policy and processes while others were covered by the validating body's policies and processes. As such it was not always clear which institutions' policies and procedures were responsible for which aspects of the programme and where there were similar policies and procedures which took precedence, such as in aspects of assessment. As a result the visitors were unclear about the management structures at the education provider and how these structures work in tandem with the validating body's management structures. Therefore the visitors require further information about the structures that are in place to manage the programme effectively, how they are designed to operate and how the education provider's management structures work with those of the validating body. In this way the visitors can determine where responsibility for each aspect of the programme lies and how the structures in place support the effective management of the programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included instances of incorrect terminology and occasional errors. This was highlighted by the programme team at the visit and a list of updates and corrections that were to be made to the documentation were provided to the visitors. However, in addition to these changes there were some errors when referencing the HCPC. In particular there were references to the programme providing a ‘...licence to practice qualification in social work approved by the Health and Care Professions Council’ (Student Handbook, page 84) and the ‘Programme accredited by: Health and Care Professions Council’ (Student Handbook, page 91). The HCPC does not ‘accredit’ education programmes, as a statutory regulator we ‘approve’ education programmes. It is also the case that the HCPC does not grant a ‘licenses to practice’ instead we register professionals who are then able to use the protected title Social worker, in England. The visitors considered the use of this terminology could be misleading to students and therefore required the programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instance of incorrect terminology throughout.

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

Condition: The programme team should provide further evidence of their relationship with the Forum Of Carers and Users of Services (FOCUS) North West group to identify how the provision of support to service users and carers enables the team to effectively manage their input into the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the evidence provided at the visit and in the documentation prior to the visit, that service users and carers play key roles in a number of aspects of the programme. In discussion with the service user and carer representatives it was highlighted that their primary role in the programme was in the delivery of seminars to describe their experiences of being a service user or carer. In addition the representatives from FOCUS highlighted that they were involved in some of the assessment of students work and in the interview parts of the programme’s admission process. It was also made clear to the visitors that those members of the group who wanted to get involved in these areas volunteered through the FOCUS group’s internal processes and weren’t picked and trained by the programme team to undertake these roles. In the programme team meeting it was clarified that there is a great deal of support for the members of the FOCUS group through the group’s staff and that there were opportunities through the group for development and training opportunities. However, the visitors were unclear about the support that the programme team offered group members to ensure they could effectively undertake the roles that they were being asked to undertake. The visitors were also unclear about what training was offered for FOCUS group members to ensure they could undertake any required role in the assessment of students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide more information about the support and training they provide to service users and carers to ensure that the service users can effectively undertake the roles they are being asked to fulfil and support student learning.

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

Condition: The programme team need to provide further evidence of how they obtain students' consent to participate in role play element of the course particularly when they are acting as service users or carers.

Reason: From their reading of the programme documentation the visitors could not identify how the programme team obtains students' consent to act as service users in practical teaching, such as role play. In discussion with the students the visitors noted that while students felt comfortable opting out of any role play, in some instances this was dependent on the knowledge the teaching staff have of individual student's circumstances. It was also highlighted that there was no formal mechanism for obtaining students' consent to participate in practical or role playing aspects of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the programme team obtain students' consent to participate in role play elements of the course particularly when they are acting as service users or carers.

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

Condition: The programme team must identify how students are made aware of the implications of non-attendance are and how these implications relate to the professional suitability policy of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there is an expectation articulated that the students are expected to attend 100 per cent of the course and that their attendance will be monitored both at the education provider and practice placement providers. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that that there is an attendance policy and that the students are aware of when and where attendance is mandatory. However, when asked, the students were unsure what level of non-attendance would trigger any action from the programme team to address it or what that action would be. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that in scrutinising students' attendance a decision would be taken to intervene if any student's attendance became inconsistent but that there was no absolute level of non-attendance that would trigger action. It was also clarified that there was currently no explicit link between level of attendance and the fitness to practice procedure. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of what the level of attendance is considered acceptable in order to meet the required learning outcomes of the programme and what action is taken when attendance drops below this level. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme and how non-attendance is linked to the professional suitability policy.

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 information about how their relationship with the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to and during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close relationship the programme team have with the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. Through this partnership a great deal of the co-ordination regarding the placement providers, placement educators and students occurs. This includes the approval of LA placement environments, provision of training for placement educators, determination of the number of LA placements available and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. They also noted in conversation with students that some students had been provided with their preferences for placement on two occasions while other students had not. As such the visitors are unclear as to the role of the programme team in the allocation of placements for students and how the team ensure that each student gets the experience they need to meet the learning outcomes associated with practice placements. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensure there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership ensures that they have overall responsibility for the quality and monitoring of practice placements.

Reason: From the evidence provided prior to and during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close relationship the programme team have with the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. Through this partnership a great deal of the co-ordination regarding the placement providers, placement educators and students occurs. This includes the approval of LA placement environments, provision of training for placement educators, determination of the number of LA placements available and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership approves LA placements by completing the Quality Assurance of Placement Learning assessments (QAPL) paperwork on behalf of the programme team. They then provide this information to the programme team. As such the visitors are unclear as to the process by which the programme team ensure that these assessments had been undertaken appropriately and that the information provided was correct. Therefore the visitors

require further information about the relationship the programme team has with the partnership and how this works in practice to ensure that the programme's system for approving and monitoring all placements is thorough and effective. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensure that all practice placements meet their requirements and provide a suitable environment for their students to achieve the required 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 revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternate arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations of the programme to state that any external examiner appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the equality and diversity policy under review to ensure that the equality and diversity policy is being applied consistently and clearly at programme level.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided at the visit and in discussion with the programme team that the education provider has an equality and diversity policy in relation to applicants and students. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, from the evidence given the visitors could not determine how the 'Equality Impact Assessment', particularly in relation to the application and selection process, links with the gathering of equality and diversity monitoring data. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider keeps the implementation of its equality and diversity policy under review to ensure that it is being applied clearly and consistently at programme level. In this way the education provider may be better able to identify where issues concerning equality and diversity may occur and put in place actions to circumvent any such issues arising.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the level of input from regulated professionals into the programme under review and determine if the programme leader needs to be HCPC registered in light of this.

Reason: The visitors noted that while the programme lead is not currently HCPC registered two other member of the programme team are and the team is supported by a number of visiting lecturers who are on the Register. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However the visitors recommend that the team should keep this situation under review and, if necessary, the programme lead should become HCPC registered, if possible. In this way the programme team may be better placed to maintain the input into the curriculum from registered social work professionals and ensure that any changes to the landscape of statutory regulation can be quickly and clearly communicated to students.

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 education provider should keep the resources at the college campus under review to ensure that the available budget is used effectively to support the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme team have been able to access sufficient resources at the education provider when necessary. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, in discussion with the senior management team and the programme team it was clear that the method of allocation

of the resources to the programme and the campus at which it is based was not always clear. The visitors also noted that the education provider had made some recent changes to the way resources have to be requested and are allocated which caused some difficulties for the programme team. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider keeps the resource allocation to the programme, and the college campus at which it is based, under review. In this way the education provider may be in a better position to ensure that the resources available for the programme's delivery continue to effectively support the programme team's learning and teaching activities.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the channels of communication with local private, voluntary and independent placement educators under review to ensure that the level of communication with them is comparable to those educators in local authority settings.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided, and in the meeting with the practice placement providers that there was effective collaboration with practice placement educators, mainly through the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work Partnership. Therefore the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However, in the meeting with the practice placement providers it was highlighted that there were some difficulties getting placement educators from the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector organisations involved in some of the regular partnership meetings. As such some PVI placement educators did not have as regular communication with the programme as those educators who worked in local authority or statutory settings. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team keeps their communication with the educators in the PVI sector under review to ensure that those educators are fully informed of the developments in the programme and of the opportunities available for them to get involved. In this way the programme team may be able to facilitate a greater number of placement opportunities for their students in the PVI sector.

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.**

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the channels of communication with local private, voluntary and independent placement educators under review to ensure that they can access the same training opportunities as those educators in local authority settings.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided, and in the meeting with the practice placement providers that there was effective collaboration with practice placement educators, mainly through the Cheshire and Merseyside Social Work

Partnership. Therefore the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However, in the meeting with the practice placement providers it was highlighted that there were some difficulties getting placement educators from the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector organisations involved in some of the regular partnership meetings. As such some PVI placement educators did not receive as many of the regular offers for training as those educators who worked in local authority or statutory settings. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team keeps their communication with the educators in the PVI sector under review to ensure that those educators are fully informed of the opportunities for training that are being offered in the local area. In this way the programme team may be able to facilitate a greater number of placement opportunities for their students in the local PVI sector.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reinforcing the completion deadlines for students to ensure that they are aware of when and how long they have to complete the required work for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were able to identify how long students had to complete the course and the number of re-sits that students were able to take in order to pass relevant assessments. This information was re-iterated in discussion with the programme team and as such the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that there was some divergence of opinion amongst the students when they were asked questions about re-sits and the amount of time they had available to complete the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team identify where they can reinforce this information either via the programme documentation or in induction sessions for the students. In this way the programme team may better facilitate students' understanding of the requirements for progression through the programme.

Caroline Jackson
Dorothy Smith
George Delafield

Visitors' report

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Name of education provider | The Smae Institute |
| Programme name | Diploma In Prescription Only Medicines for Podiatric Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Part time |
| Relevant entitlement | Prescription only medicine |
| Date of visit | 9 May 2013 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes for those already on the Register. The post-registration programmes we currently approve are supplementary prescribing programmes (for chiropodists / podiatrists, radiographers and physiotherapists) and programmes in local anaesthetics and prescription only medicine (for chiropodists / podiatrists).

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 June 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 4 July 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 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 July 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as 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 | Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Nicola Baker |
| Proposed student numbers | 15 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Steven West (University of the West of England, Bristol) |
| Secretary | Alison Barnard (University of the West of England, Bristol) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit 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 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The HCPC met with students from the Diploma in Local Anaesthesia for Podiatry Practice, 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 the standard of proficiency (SOP) for this entitlement.

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors 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 submit evidence that the information available to applicants will provide comprehensive information for them to make an informed choice about whether to apply for or take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit, but were not provided with any documents that would be used in the admissions or application procedure to inform students about the programme. At the visit, the programme team articulated that there would be a website to inform people about the programme, and that applicants would fill out a questionnaire. The information on this questionnaire would be reviewed by the programme team and any suitable candidates would then be invited to an open day, where they would receive further information about the programme. However, there was no evidence submitted to demonstrate what information would be covered on the website, through the questionnaire or at the open day. The visitors were therefore unable to ascertain how and when potential applicants would be notified as to the requirements of the programme, including criminal records checks, IT capability and occupational health declarations, as well as the financial implications associated with studying. The visitors therefore require to see the proposed documentation to be used in admissions procedures to ensure that applicants are given sufficient information to make an informed choice as to whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the documentation as to the formal procedures in place for health requirements for applicants.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted that the programme requires applicants to be registered with the HCPC, and the programme team therefore expect that all candidates will be aware of occupational health requirements for the profession. It is stated in the documentation that applicants are required to attend an open day, where their suitability for the programme will be discussed. The student handbook (page 14) also states that 'students should declare any health problems and illnesses from which they suffer prior to starting their modules'. At the visit, the visitors heard that the education provider encourages students to declare any occupational health circumstances that may affect their learning and progress through the programme in order for reasonable adjustments to be made. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence in the documentation as to a formal process for this. The visitors were therefore unclear as to what health requirements are in place for entry to the programme, and what the formal procedure is where health conditions are declared. They therefore require further evidence to ensure that this standard will be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence demonstrating how students are informed of the mechanisms in place to support their welfare and wellbeing in all settings throughout the programme.

Reason: In discussions with the senior team and programme team, the visitors heard that they encourage regular contact from the students, particularly due to the distance learning delivery of the programme. For many of the processes and procedures students may have queries about, they are encouraged to contact the programme team, rather than referring to the resources available, for example the website or student handbook. However, the visitors could not see evidence that the students would be notified of a number of the resources available to support them in their studies, and could therefore not confirm that they were accessible to students. From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware of the student support mechanisms in place at the education provider, including a personal tutor system, financial advice and counseling service and a student complaints procedure. However, the visitors could not find these facilities referenced in the student handbook, and therefore were unclear as to how students are notified as to what is available. There are also formal procedures in place for students regarding extenuating circumstances and reassessment through the programme, which the visitors could not see clearly articulated to students. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that students are informed of the procedures and services available to support them through the programme.

Paul Blakeman
Catherine Smith

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 8 – 9 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 10 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 12 September 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a MA Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Linda Mutema (Diagnostic Radiographer) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 45 at Carlisle 15 at Barrow |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Helen Kerry (University of Cumbria) |
| Secretary | Susan Parkes (University of Cumbria) |
| Members of the joint panel | Steve J Hothersall (External Panel Member) Jane Maffey (External Panel Member) Peter Crossley (Internal Panel Member) Becky Liebman (Internal Panel Member) Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 provide further information to demonstrate how the admissions procedures ensure potential applicants and applicants to the programme can make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided and discussion at the visit included information about the admissions policies for the programme. Open days were highlighted as the main way to provide detailed information about the programme and the application process. The visitors did not receive any documentation regarding the open days prior to the visit. During discussions with the programme team the visitors highlighted the importance of providing full information about the programme so applicants are able to make informed decisions. Information about the application process requirements, the enhanced disclosure and barring service and a medical clearance; information about the interview day, the written tests and group work to be completed; and particularly the potential consequences of not having any means of personal transport and associated costs of transport. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the above information is provided to potential applicants and applicants through the admissions procedures to inform their decisions about the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided for the visit contained some inaccuracies when referring to the programmes delivered, the HCPC and HCPC requirements. Discussion at the visit also indicated there were some inaccurate statements within the documentation. The visitors noted references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) within some practice placement documentation. The visitors also noted there was a statement implying HCPC have requirements for the number of practice hours to be completed, 'programme leaders consider the number of practice hours undertaken by the applicant and check that these meet HCPC requirements for the competency level reached' (BA programme specification, page 23). The HCPC have no requirements for the number of practice hours to complete. As the GSCC no longer exists, the documentation needs to be reviewed to ensure the current regulator is reflected appropriately and accurately. During discussion it was highlighted the programme was no longer offering international placements for students. It was also highlighted the personal tutor contact time was considered to be a minimum requirement of 2 hours instead of the 'total of 2 hours total per student per year' as indicated within the programme specification document (page 20). The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to have accurate information about their programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

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 submit further evidence to demonstrate there is a protocol in place to inform students of consent.

Reason: Documentation provided at the visit was to include a 'Consent form to participate in role play and other exercises' (Supplementary Documents). The form included in this documentation was however a 'consent form for filming of patients'. The visitors raised consent to participate with the current students and learnt they were unaware of having signed a consent form. The students were content they could opt-out of any teaching that may cause them emotional distress and that this would be appropriately managed by the programme team. The programme team highlighted that discussion would set boundaries for the session teaching if role plays would be used. It was later indicated the programme team plans to implement a form for students to sign and indicate their understanding of consenting to participate. The visitors considered it to be important for the programme team to ensure they have fully informed students about consenting to participate and associated support when necessary. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate there is a protocol in place to inform students of consent.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit details of how the processes for approving and monitoring placements are managed effectively.

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included three placement audit forms for the student, the practice educator and the education provider to complete. At the visit it was indicated that due to staff movement, there had been difficulties in the past maintaining the placement systems. The education provider's Placement Learning Unit (PLU) has now become involved and has just completed an audit of all placement areas to ensure the database of placements is up to date. The programme team is currently in the process of developing the policies and processes for placement management with the PLU. Because the processes are still in development it was not known to what extent the PLU and the programme team would input to the management of placements and visitors were therefore unable to determine this SET was met. The visitors consider the placement auditing tools should be used to determine the appropriateness of placements, that HCPC requirements for placements are kept under advisement and to enable the programme team to regularly review and undertake appropriate actions if necessary. The visitors note this condition could be linked to SETs 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about the processes for placement management.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice educators undertake appropriate training.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the practice placement providers deliver some training for practice educators. Practice educators can also access programme specific

training delivered by the education provider. This training comprises of initial training and refresher update days. Within the documentation provided there was limited information about the content of this training or how the programme team would ensure practice educators had received the mandatory initial training and refresher training when appropriate. The education provider's Placement Learning Unit (PLU) has become involved with placement management for the programme. It was discussed they would hold a database for placements which would include the practice educators training history and requirements. The programme team is currently developing the policies and processes for placement management with the PLU. Because the database and associated processes are still in development, and the visitors have not received details about the training content, the visitors are unable to determine this SET is met. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate they ensure practice educators undertake appropriate training.

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 practice placement educators and students fully understand the learning outcomes to be achieved at placement.

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included the placement handbook and associated placement assessment documentation. The visitors noted the assessment of the placement required students to evidence how they meet the professional capabilities framework (PCF) which has been mapped to the standards of proficiency (SOPs). From the documentation the visitors could not determine the assessment criteria for the learning outcomes linked to the placement module and the PCF. The visitors considered the broad nature of the PCF without any assessment criteria would be difficult for the placement educators to assess against the required learning outcomes. It would also be difficult for the students to ensure they are providing the correct evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes are achieved. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating practice educators and students fully understand the learning outcomes to be achieved and assessed at placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the assessment requirements for students, particularly considering the procedures for failing placement.

Reason: The documentation provided stated "if a student fails a placement, then there is no possibility of a student re-registering or resubmitting for that placement module" (Placement Handbook, p6). During discussions with the programme team it was indicated that although they state that there is no possibility for a student to repeat a

placement, they would pick up on any problems with a student meeting the capabilities at the mid-placement meeting and there would be opportunities for the student to have extra time if necessary. The visitors were satisfied by the discussions around this however considered it to be important for the students to fully understand the assessment arrangements for failing placements. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the documentation to clarify the above detail for students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review the staffing resources for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated in past years there had been some staff movement which may have impacted on the delivery of the programme. The visitors were satisfied the programme team has worked hard to ensure there are no longer any difficulties delivering the programme and heard they are currently recruiting further staff. The visitors are aware the programme team will be delivering the programme from a second site from the next cohort. In light of the past concerns and the development of the programme, the visitors recommend the education provider continue to carefully monitor the staffing resources for 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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the number and range of placements available for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated placement allocation was discussed through meetings with practice providers and other education providers to ensure placements would satisfy the demands of all parties involved. The visitors noted there were slight differences in the perception of the availability of suitable placements. The senior team and programme team were satisfied they would be able to provide suitable placements for all students and indicated a possible surplus especially with the new delivery site. The visitors met with a representative group of placement providers who indicated they felt there may be some placement areas that were at capacity. The visitors understand that placement provision is a challenge, and recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the number and range of placements available for the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to develop and strengthen the relationships between themselves and the placement providers.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team has been working to strengthen the relationships between placement providers and themselves. In discussion with the placement providers it was clear they appreciated the developing links to the programme, would welcome further collaboration and were keen to input further into the programme design and delivery. The visitors were pleased to hear this and wish to encourage the programme team to continue with this development.

Linda Mutema

Dorothy Smith
Paula Sobiechowska

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Programme name | MA Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 8 – 9 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 10 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 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 4 July 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 1 July 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 12 September 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BA (Hons) Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. 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. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Linda Mutema (Diagnostic Radiographer) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Ruth Wood |
| Proposed student numbers | 25 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Helen Kerry (University of Cumbria) |
| Secretary | Susan Parkes (University of Cumbria) |
| Members of the joint panel | Steve J Hothersall (External Panel Member) Jane Maffey (External Panel Member) Peter Crossley (Internal Panel Member) Becky Liebman (Internal Panel Member) Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 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 provide further information to demonstrate how the admissions procedures ensure potential applicants and applicants to the programme can make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: Documentation provided and discussion at the visit included information about the admissions policies for the programme. Open days were highlighted as the main way to provide detailed information about the programme and the application process. The visitors did not receive any documentation regarding the open days prior to the visit. During discussions with the programme team the visitors highlighted the importance of providing full information about the programme so applicants are able to make informed decisions. Information about the application process requirements, the enhanced disclosure and barring service and a medical clearance; information about the interview day, the written tests and group work to be completed; and particularly the potential consequences of not having any means of personal transport and associated costs of transport. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the above information is provided to potential applicants and applicants through the admissions procedures to inform their decisions about the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided for the visit contained some inaccuracies when referring to the programmes delivered, the HCPC and HCPC requirements. Discussion at the visit also indicated there were some inaccurate statements within the documentation. The documentation references a PG Dip Social Work exit award which was originally included in the programmes to be visited and approved at this event. Before the visit it was confirmed the education provider would not be revalidating the PG Dip Social Work programme. This programme was closed on our records and therefore students graduating with this award after July 2012 will not be eligible to apply for HCPC registration. The documentation therefore needs to reflect the final MA Social Work award as being the only award leading to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors noted references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) within some practice placement documentation. The visitors also noted there was a statement implying HCPC have requirements for the number of practice hours to be completed, "programme leaders consider the number of practice hours undertaken by the applicant and check that these meet HCPC requirements for the competency level reached" (MA programme specification, page 19). The HCPC have no requirements for the number of practice hours to complete. As the GSCC no longer exists, the documentation needs to be reviewed to ensure the current regulator is reflected appropriately and accurately. During discussion it was highlighted the programme was no longer offering international placements for students. It was also highlighted the personal tutor contact time was considered to be a minimum requirement of 2 hours instead of the 'total of 2 hours total per student per year' as

indicated within the programme specification document (page 16). The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to have accurate information about their programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

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 submit further evidence to demonstrate there is a protocol in place to inform students of consent.

Reason: Documentation provided at the visit was to include a 'Consent form to participate in role play and other exercises' (Supplementary Documents). The form included in this documentation was however a 'consent form for filming of patients'. The visitors raised consent to participate with the current students and learnt they were unaware of having signed a consent form. The students were content they could opt-out of any teaching that may cause them emotional distress and that this would be appropriately managed by the programme team. The programme team highlighted discussion would set boundaries for the session teaching if role plays would be used. It was later indicated the programme team plans to implement a form for students to sign and indicate their understanding of consenting to participate. The visitors considered it to be important for the programme team to ensure they have fully informed students about consenting to participate and associated support when necessary. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate there is a protocol in place to inform students of consent.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit details of how the processes for approving and monitoring placements are managed effectively.

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included three placement audit forms for the student, the practice educator and the education provider to complete. At the visit it was indicated that due to staff movement, there had been difficulties in the past maintaining the placement systems. The education provider's Placement Learning Unit (PLU) has now become involved and has just completed an audit of all placement areas to ensure the database of placements is up to date. The programme team is currently in the process of developing the policies and processes for placement management with the PLU. Because the processes are still in development it was not known to what extent the PLU and the programme team would input to the management of placements and visitors were therefore unable to determine this SET was met. The visitors consider the placement auditing tools should be used to determine the appropriateness of placements, that HCPC requirements for placements are kept under advisement and to enable the programme team to regularly review and undertake appropriate actions if necessary. The visitors note this condition could be linked to SETs 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about the processes for placement management.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice educators undertake appropriate training.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the practice placement providers deliver some training for practice educators. Practice educators can also access programme specific training delivered by the education provider. This training comprises of initial training and refresher update days. Within the documentation provided there was limited information about the content of this training or how the programme team would ensure practice educators had received the mandatory initial training and refresher training when appropriate. The education provider's Placement Learning Unit (PLU) has become involved with placement management for the programme. It was discussed they would hold a database for placements which would include the practice educators training history and requirements. The programme team is currently developing the policies and processes for placement management with the PLU. Because the database and associated processes are still in development, and the visitors have not received details about the training content, the visitors are unable to determine this SET is met. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate they ensure practice educators undertake appropriate training.

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 practice placement educators and students fully understand the learning outcomes to be achieved at placement.

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included the placement handbook and associated placement assessment documentation. The visitors noted the assessment of the placement required students to evidence how they meet the professional capabilities framework (PCF) which has been mapped to the standards of proficiency (SOPs). From the documentation the visitors could not determine the assessment criteria for the learning outcomes linked to the placement module and the PCF. The visitors considered the broad nature of the PCF without any assessment criteria would be difficult for the placement educators to assess against the required learning outcomes. It would also be difficult for the students to ensure they are providing the correct evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes are achieved. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating practice educators and students fully understand the learning outcomes to be achieved and assessed at placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the assessment requirements for students, particularly considering the procedures for failing placement and details of the portfolio and oral exam.

Reason: The documentation provided stated “if a student fails a placement, then there is no possibility of a student re-registering or resubmitting for that placement module” (Placement Handbook, p6). The visitors also noted the module descriptor for the Social work placement (HSWG9001) indicated the module has a 100% weighting for the portfolio (section 5). In the additional notes (section 7) for the module, it states there is also an oral exam for the module. The visitors considered if a student is given a decision of a failed placement due to the oral exam then they may be able to appeal this decision because the module descriptor references 100% to the portfolio only. During discussions with the programme team it was indicated that although they state that there is no possibility for a student to repeat a placement, they would pick up on any problems with a student meeting the capabilities at the mid-placement meeting and there would be opportunities for the student to have extra time if necessary. It was also confirmed the oral exam was considered separately from the placement module. The visitors were satisfied by the discussions around this however considered it to be important for the students to fully understand the assessment arrangements for failing placements and for the details around the placement portfolio and associated oral exam. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the documentation to clarify the above details for students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review the staffing resources for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated in past years there had been some staff movement which may have impacted on the delivery of the programme. The visitors were satisfied the programme team has worked hard to ensure there are no longer any difficulties delivering the programme and heard they are currently recruiting further staff. The visitors are aware the programme team will be delivering the BA (Hons) Social Work programme from a second site from the next cohort. In light of the past concerns and the development of the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, the visitors recommend the education provider continue to carefully monitor the staffing resources for 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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the number and range of placements available for the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated placement allocation was discussed through meetings with practice providers and other education providers to ensure placements would satisfy the demands of all parties involved. The visitors noted there were slight differences in the perception of the availability of suitable placements. The senior team and programme team were satisfied they would be able to provide suitable placements for all students and indicated a possible surplus especially with the new delivery site. The visitors met with a representative group of placement providers who indicated they felt there may be some placement areas that were at capacity. The visitors understand that placement provision is a challenge, and recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the number and range of placements available for the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to develop and strengthen the relationships between themselves and the placement providers.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team has been working to strengthen the relationships between placement providers and themselves. In discussion with the placement providers it was clear they appreciated the developing links to the programme, would welcome further collaboration and were keen to input further into the programme design and delivery. The visitors were pleased to hear this and wish to encourage the programme team to continue with this development.

Linda Mutema

Dorothy Smith
Paula Sobiechowska

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Salford |
| Programme name | BA (Hons) Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 30 April – 1 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 7 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 18 June 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 4 July 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 22 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the Programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing Programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the Programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the Programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their endorsement of the Programme. The visit also considered the following Programmes – MA in Social Work and BSc (Hons) Integrated Practice Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this Programme only. Separate reports exist for the other Programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| Proposed student numbers | 75 per year |
| Proposed start date of Programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Debra Leighton (University of Salford) |
| Secretary | Julie Evans (University of Salford) |
| Members of the joint panel | Jane Jenkins (University of Salford) Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the Programme.

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

Recommendations are normally set to encourage further enhancements to the programme and are normally set when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about the bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees, criminal record and health checks. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students are changing. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new fee structure and bursary will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors were also unable to find evidence of information about the costs for criminal record and health checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that the students had been required to pay for the criminal record and health checks and had not had consistent information about this during the admissions process. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about new bursary arrangements.

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 that 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 programme specification states the programme is “to be accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) formerly GSCC (General Social Care Council) and to be endorsed by The College of Social Work” (page 1). HCPC use the terminology of ‘approving’ programmes and not ‘accreditation’. The Fitness for Professional Practice Procedure document states that programmes leading to professional registration must comply with the regulations and codes of professional conduct of the relevant bodies, specifically: Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), Health Professions Council (HPC) and General Social Care Council (GSCC) (page 1). References to the previous regulatory body in the documentation is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Additionally the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) changed its name from Health Professions Council (HPC) on 1 August 2012 when Social Work Professions came on to HCPC Register. 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, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider how they communicate to students the processes for feedback.

Reason: Programme documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the programme feedback mechanisms. During discussion with the students the visitors heard about the range of ways to provide feedback to the programme team and heard examples of how they had fed back to the programme team. The visitors heard that some changes had occurred as a result of this feedback; however it was clear that not all students were aware of the changes, or the decisions not to implement changes as a result of the feedback they had given. The visitors were satisfied that feedback from students is considered in a fair way but heard from students that the changes made or rationale for not acting on feedback was not always effectively communicated. The visitors recommend the education provider to review the way it communicates the processes for feedback to the students, effectively closing the feedback loop. They suggest implementing a written response to student feedback so students are aware of how changes were related to anything they had put forward to the programme team.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to explore the possibilities of new and innovative placements to expand their range of placements settings.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In the meeting with the students, it was highlighted that not all students had the same opportunity to experience as much variation in their placements between voluntary and statutory settings as each other. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continues to develop further the variety of placements available to students so that all students experience a wide range of different placement settings.

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.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening links with practice placement educators to ensure they are fully equipped to take students, and have access to any information which may help to support students while on placement.

Reason: During the meeting with practice placement educators and coordinators and tour of the facilities, there was discussion that practice placement staff have access to some education provider resources, but the practice placement staff were not always aware that they could access these resources. The visitors also noted that practice placement educators did not always know what stage students were at when they took them on placement. In the meeting with practice placement staff, the visitors also noted the concerns of some practice placement educators who felt unprepared for taking students on placement. The visitors considered the education provider made information and resources available for the placement provider and so considered this standard to be met at threshold level, however, they recommend the education provider strengthens links with practice placement educators, ensuring they have access to any relevant teaching materials (such as lecture notes on Blackboard) and to learning resources (such as the library). This will help ensure that the placement experience is consistent for practice placement educators and therefore students.

Patricia Higham
Anthony Power
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Salford |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Integrated Practice Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 30 April 2013 – 1 May 2013 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 9 |

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 18 June 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 4 July 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 22 July 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 22 August 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 part of a joint event. The professional body (the College of Social Work (TCSW)) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BA (Hons) Social Work (Full time), MA in Social Work (Full time) and MA in Social Work (Part 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, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Beverly Blythe (Social worker) William Gilmore (Biomedical scientist) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Jamie Hunt |
| Proposed student numbers | 26 |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Debra Leighton (University of Salford) |
| Secretary | Julie Evans (University of Salford) |
| Members of the joint panel | Jane Jenkins (University of Salford) Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example, page 10 of the Programme Specification refers to 'entry onto the appropriate part of the... GSCC Professional Register'. There are also incorrect references to policies and requirements of the former regulator. Following its closure, the functions of the GSCC have passed to the HCPC. All social work education providers in England must now meet HCPC standards. For example, page 22 of the Curriculum Document states '[a]ll Social Work students are registered with the HCPC at the commencement of the programme'. The HCPC does not hold a student register. There are also incorrect statements about the requirements of the HCPC for practice learning. For example, page 4 of the Programme Specification states '[t]he HCPC/TCSW requirements for 200 practice days' and the page 3 of the Programme Handbook states that '[i]t is a requirement of the NMC and the HCPC and The Collage of Social Work (TCSW) that students are exposed to experiences in all fields of practice'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of practice days or range of placements. The HCPC's requirements around placements are for the education provider to demonstrate that the practice learning effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. The visitors also noted several of the documents provided had not been updated to reflect the change in regulation for the social work profession in England, but had a statement that the documentation 'will be adapted for the 2013 intake to reflect the HCPC and TCSW requirements'. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, and to ensure that all documentation is finalised as soon as possible.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that they differentiate between the purpose and requirements of the HCPC and the College of Social Work (TCSW)

Reason: Throughout the documentation, the education provider consistently references the HCPC and TCSW alongside each other when referring to the policies of one of the two organisations. For example, page 10 of the programme handbook talks to 'HCPC/TCSW competencies', which suggests that a jointly agreed set of competencies is available. Each organisation has different requirements for student learning; the HCPC has standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England and TCSW has the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF). The Programme Specification document consistency refers to the requirements of the 'NMC and HCPC/TCSW'. This wording suggests that HCPC and TCSW requirements are one and the same, when in reality the HCPC and TCSW have different roles and requirements, as the regulator and

as the professional body respectively. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation clearly differentiate between the HCPC and TCSW, as the two organisations are independent.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the learning outcomes allow graduates of the programme to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England:

- **13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:**
 - social work theory;
 - social work models and interventions;
 - the development and application of relevant law and social policy;
 - the development and application of social work and social work values;
 - human growth and development across the lifespan and the impact of key developmental stages and transitions;
 - the impact of injustice, social inequalities, policies and other issues which affect the demand for social work services;
 - the relevance of psychological, environmental, sociological and physiological perspectives to understanding personal and social development and functioning;
 - concepts of participation, advocacy and empowerment; and
 - the relevance of sociological perspectives to understanding societal and structural influences on human behaviour

- **14.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment tools**

- **14.4 be able to use social work methods, theories and models to achieve change and development and improve life opportunities**

Reason: As part of their documentation submission, the education provider completed a SOPs mapping document. In this document, each SOP was mapped very broadly against module titles, rather than against specific learning outcomes. Following clarification with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that graduates of the programme would meet all of the SOPs with the exception of 13.4, 14.2 and 14.4. As the mapping was broad, the visitors were unable to determine where the programme curriculum would explicitly teach and assess the students understanding of these standards. Therefore, the visitors require further information from the programme team about how they ensure that graduates of the programme will meet these standards.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that graduates of the programme meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:**

- social work theory;
 - social work models and interventions;
 - the development and application of relevant law and social policy;
 - the development and application of social work and social work values;
 - human growth and development across the lifespan and the impact of key developmental stages and transitions;
 - the impact of injustice, social inequalities, policies and other issues which affect the demand for social work services;
 - the relevance of psychological, environmental, sociological and physiological perspectives to understanding personal and social development and functioning;
 - concepts of participation, advocacy and empowerment; and
 - the relevance of sociological perspectives to understanding societal and structural influences on human behaviour
- **14.2 be able to select and use appropriate assessment tools**
 - **14.4 be able to use social work methods, theories and models to achieve change and development and improve life opportunities**

Reason: In line with the condition set for SET 4.1, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures that graduates of the programme will meet these SOPs. As the visitors were unsure where the standards were taught on the programme, they were also unable to make a judgement about how the education provider assesses that students are meeting these standards. Therefore, the visitors require further information which clearly demonstrates how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who successful complete the programme meet SOPs 13.4, 14.2 and 14.4.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how planned changes to its policies around interprofessional learning (IPL) may impact on the way that this standard is met going forward, and ensure that they inform the HCPC of any changes to these policies.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. The visitors are satisfied that the programme meets this standard with its current policies, but would like to remind the education provider to ensure that the HCPC's requirements around SET 4.9 are considered in the development of any new IPL policies, and that the HCPC is informed of any changes which may impact on how 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.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening links with practice placement educators to ensure they feel fully equipped to take students, and have access to any information which may help to support students while on placement.

Reason: In the meeting with practice placement staff, the visitors noted the concerns of some practice placement educators who felt underprepared for taking students on placement. While the visitors considered this standard to be met at threshold level, they recommend that the education provider strengthens links with practice placement educators, ensuring that they have access to any relevant teaching materials (such as lecture notes on Blackboard) and to learning resources (such as the university library). During the tour of the facilities, there was discussion that practice placement educators have access to some university resources, but the visitors were not clear how, or whether they were aware that they can access these resources. The visitors also noted that practice placement educators did not always know at which stage students were when taking them on placement. To ensure that the placement experience is consistent for practice placement educators, and therefore students, the visitors recommend that the education provider revises its policies to address the above.

Beverly Blythe
William Gilmore
Vicki Lawson-Brown

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Salford |
| Programme name | MA in Social Work |
| Mode of delivery | Full time Part time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Social worker, in England |
| Date of visit | 30 April – 1 May 2013 |

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 18 June 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 4 July 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 22 July 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 22 August 2013.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the Programme at the education provider as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing Programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the Programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the Programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their endorsement of the Programme. The visit also considered the following Programmes - BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Integrated Practice Learning Disabilities Nursing and Social Work. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this Programme only. Separate reports exist for the other Programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| Proposed student numbers | 120 per year |
| Proposed start date of Programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Debra Leighton (University of Salford) |
| Secretary | Julie Evans (University of Salford) |
| Members of the joint panel | Jane Jenkins (University of Salford) Lynn Heath (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) |

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about the bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees, criminal record and health checks. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students are changing. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new fee structure and bursary will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors were also unable to find evidence of information about the costs for criminal record and health checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that the students had been required to pay for the criminal record and health checks and had not had consistent information about this during the admissions process. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about new bursary arrangements.

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 that 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 programme specification states the programme is “to be accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) formerly GSCC (General Social Care Council) and to be endorsed by The College of Social Work” (page 1). HCPC use the terminology of ‘approving’ programmes and not ‘accreditation’. The Fitness for Professional Practice Procedure document states that programmes leading to professional registration must comply with the regulations and codes of professional conduct of the relevant bodies, specifically: Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), Health Professions Council (HPC) and General Social Care Council (GSCC) (page 1). References to the previous regulatory body in the documentation is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Additionally the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) changed its name from Health Professions Council (HPC) on 1 August 2012 when Social Work Professions came on to HCPC Register. 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, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the student support systems in place for the programme including the allocation of personal tutors to students, timing of tutor allocation, frequency of tutorials and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials throughout the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included information about the academic and pastoral support systems in place; the visitors noted each student was allocated a personal tutor. Discussions with students revealed the programme team was considered to be very supportive, but there was some variability in the levels of support offered to students and the timing of allocation of personal tutors. Given this information the visitors were concerned about the ability of the programme team to sustain the level of support provided to students. Discussions with the programme team revealed that staff devoted much time and effort to supporting students and the senior team are in the process of recruiting four extra staff to manage and support the programme including personal tutoring. The visitors considered the demands placed on the programme team in supporting students on a programme that involves practice placements and academic work may impact on the sustainability and consistency of the support systems. The visitors therefore require further clarification about the student support systems in place including the allocation of personal tutors to students, timing of tutor allocation, frequency of tutorials and the amount of time allocated to personal tutorials throughout the programme to demonstrate the student support systems are sustainable and can be delivered consistently.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider how they communicate to students the processes for feedback.

Reason: Programme documentation provided prior to the visit detailed the programme feedback mechanisms. During discussion with the students the visitors heard about the range of ways to provide feedback to the programme team and heard examples of how they had fed back to the programme team. The visitors heard that some changes had occurred as a result of this feedback; however it was clear that not all students were aware of the changes, or the decisions not to implement changes as a result of the feedback they had given. The visitors were satisfied that feedback from students is considered in a fair way but heard from students that the changes made or rationale for not acting on feedback was not always effectively communicated. The visitors recommend the education provider to review the way it communicates the processes for feedback to the students, effectively closing the feedback loop. They suggest implementing a written response to student feedback so students are aware of how changes were related to anything they had put forward to the programme team.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to explore the possibilities of new and innovative placements to expand their range of placements settings.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In the meeting with the students, it was highlighted that not all students had the same opportunity to experience as much variation in their placements between voluntary and statutory settings as each other. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continues to develop further the variety of placements available to students so that all students experience a wide range of different placement settings.

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.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider strengthening links with practice placement educators to ensure they are fully equipped to take students, and have access to any information which may help to support students while on placement.

Reason: During the meeting with practice placement educators and coordinators and tour of the facilities, there was discussion that practice placement staff have access to some education provider resources, but the practice placement staff were not always aware that they could access these resources. The visitors also noted that practice placement educators did not always know what stage students were at when they took them on placement. In the meeting with practice placement staff, the visitors also noted the concerns of some practice placement educators who felt unprepared for taking students on placement. The visitors considered the education provider made information and resources available for the placement provider and so considered this standard to be met at threshold level, however, they recommend the education provider strengthens links with practice placement educators, ensuring they have access to any relevant teaching materials (such as lecture notes on Blackboard) and to learning resources (such as the library). This will help ensure that the placement experience is consistent for practice placement educators and therefore students.

Patricia Higham
Anthony Power
Graham Noyce