Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Buckinghamshire New University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	30 – 31 October 2013

Contents

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 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 15 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 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 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	12
Proposed start date of programme approval	February 2014
First approved intake	February 2014
Chair	John Boylan (Buckinghamshire New University)
Secretary	Marcus Wood (Buckinghamshire New University)
Members of the joint panel	Aidan Worsley (The College of Social Work (TCSW)
	Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work (TCSW)
	Dr Pat Mahon-Daly (Internal panel member)
	Ruth Gunstone (Internal panel member)
	Jo Finch (External panel member)
	Karen Matthews (External panel member)
	Will Hoskin (Student Engagement Officer)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒
Developmental committee minutes	☒	☐	☐
Memorandums of understanding	☒	☐	☐
Faculty of Society & Health academic plan 2013-16	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC did not review External examiners' reports for the programme prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. The visitors therefore reviewed external examiner reports for the BSc (Hons) Social Work and the MSc Social Work.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the MSc Social Work programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the financial implications of completing the programme outside of the fourteen month timeframe.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the programme will be completed over a fourteen month period, and that this period is fully bursary funded. However, it was not clear from the documentation if there were any financial implications for students who complete the programme outside of this timeframe. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that full information regarding the bursary is provided in the bursary contract. However, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be able to gain an understanding of all costs associated with the programme, specifically any costs that the student would have to cover if the programme was completed outside of the fourteen month timeframe. The visitors therefore require that the admissions material is revised to include any financial implications of the programme, and therefore ensure that individuals are given the information they require to make an informed choice regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the context document provided prior to the visit, that a maximum of 60 per cent of academic credit can be transferred to the programme, not including the final placement (page 5). This is contradictory to the information provided in the student handbook, that "APEL arrangements do not apply to the 2 practice learning modules" (page 35). In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that it is a university wide policy that 50 per cent of academic credit can be transferred to programmes at the education provider. The information provided in the programme documentation was therefore inconsistent, and not reflective of the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy of the programme. Whilst the visitors noted that the students for this programme have been selected, with no students of the cohort applying to have AP(E)L considered in their application, they recognised the importance of clarifying the AP(E)L policy specific to this programme for potential future cohorts, and ensuring that if future cohorts do apply to have AP(E)L considered, that they are informed that their prior learning is mapped to the learning outcomes of the programme, to ensure that the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs) have been previously met. The visitors therefore require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L and that the programme team demonstrate that there is a process in place for assessing AP(E)L.

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 further evidence to demonstrate the relevant experience of the programme leader, or of the support mechanisms in place within the programme team to ensure that the programme leader is adequately supported in their role.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that the programme leader is not currently registered with the HCPC, but that an application for registration is currently in progress. Whilst information regarding the programme leaders' academic qualifications were provided, the visitors require further evidence to confirm that the programme leader is suitably experienced, or that there are appropriate support mechanisms in place within the programme team to support the programme leader in their role.

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 to clearly outline the support that will be available to students.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that students would receive at least 45 minutes of weekly supervision whilst on placement (Practice Curriculum document, page 42). The programme team clarified that this information was incorrect, and that students would receive at least 1.5 hours of supervision per week, and this would be split between the work-based supervisor and the practice educator. The practice curriculum document also referred to 'mentors' who would be available to students, however, students on the current programme were unfamiliar with the term 'mentor', and the documentation did not clearly articulate the role of mentors on the programme. The programme team clarified that this is a role that is specific to the new programme, and a mentor would be made available as a support mechanism for students who required additional support. The visitors therefore require that all documentation relating to the programme is reviewed to ensure that students on the programme are aware of the support they can expect, and that is available to them throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can be sure that the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the attendance requirements, for both the taught and practice elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the student handbook, the visitors noted the requirement for a minimum of 80 per cent attendance for students on the programme (page 39). In discussion with the programme team, they explained that whilst this is a minimum requirement, there is a process that would have been initiated prior to attendance falling to 80 per cent, involving communication with the student face to face and through a letter. The visitors could not see how students will be made aware of this process, and

when a concern would be triggered. Additionally, in discussion with the practice team, the visitors were informed that the expectation for attendance on placement is 100 per cent. The visitors could not see where this was communicated in the documentation, or the process that would be initiated if students fell below this attendance requirement. The visitors therefore require further evidence that any differences in expectations regarding attendance between the taught and practice elements of the programme is reflected in the programme documentation, and that the process regarding attendance is clearly communicated to students.

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 provide further evidence of how the guided independent study approach of learning on the programme is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors noted that 'guided independent study', an approach whereby "students are encouraged to reflect and draw on their own experiences and to view tutors as facilitators to their learning" (page 6, Programme specification) made up a large proportion of time on the programme. From a review of the timetable provided, it was not clear how this amount of guided independent study hours fits into the overall curriculum, or the content of the learning that takes place through this type of study. As such, it was not clear how this teaching approach contributes to meeting the learning outcomes of the programme, and therefore the visitors require further evidence that this approach is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered with the HCPC, and how they will ensure that they remain appropriately registered.

Reason: From discussion with the practice placement team at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider is currently in the process of recruiting practice educators for the programme. The visitors were not provided with any information regarding the policy for the recruitment of practice educators, and therefore it was not clear if it is a requirement that they must be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the policy for the recruitment of practice educators to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the assessment methods for the 'putting the law into practice' module, to ensure that they successfully measure the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the module descriptor for the 'putting the law into practice' module the visitors noted that the learning outcomes for this module are assessed by a two hour written exam. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that this assessment has been recently discussed to assess its

appropriateness, following a lack of integration of discussion regarding ethics in student answers. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how this assessment method successfully measures learning outcome five of this module, that students must "demonstrate a critical understanding of the complex relationship between personal, organisational and professional ethical principles and how these may impact on the exercise of legal powers and duties in practice" to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the requirements for student progression between modules are clearly stated, and what impact re-sits may have on their progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that some of the information presented regarding progression did not relate to this programme, for example the assessment regulations indicated "students who fail their referral work may be permitted to retake the failed module for capped marks during the next Level" (page 17, University policies and regulations). The ability to re-sit certain elements in the following academic year, as this is a 14 month programme, is not applicable. Additionally, the visitors could not see evidence of what would happen if a student were to finish their placement late, and the implications of this for any taught element of the programme. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were informed that a student would have an opportunity to re-sit all modules of the programme, with the exception of 'SW723 Developing Social Work Skills for Practice'. It was not clear from the documentation what the timeframes were for re-sitting these modules. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students have an understanding of the requirements for student progression and achievement on the programme, to ensure that this standard can be met. They also require the documentation to be updated to reflect the processes for this programme.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could not see where the requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register was stated within the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where this is stated to ensure that this is a requirement of the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that the involvement of stakeholders in the marking and assessment of elements of the programme, is quality assured and moderated to ensure that there continues to be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme documentation, and in discussion with the programme team that all assessments are effectively monitored and evaluated, and therefore that the standards in assessment are maintained. In discussion with the service user and carer group, the visitors noted that service users have a positive contribution to many aspects of the programme, and that they are beginning to contribute to some elements of marking students work. Whilst the visitors felt that this was a positive contribution to the programme, they would like to recommend that the programme team ensure that the involvement of stakeholders in the assessment of students is quality assured and moderated to ensure that the current appropriate standards in assessment are maintained.

<div align="right">

Beverley Blythe
Vicki Lawson-Brown

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church 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 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 20 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA in Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	40
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Richard Brown (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Carole Whitehead (Canterbury Christ Church University) Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Felstead (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence that the resources to support students throughout the programme provide accurate and consistent information, particularly in relation to progression and achievement.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the student handbook for the social work pathway within the inter-professional programme provision as well as revalidation documents containing programme details and information for students. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard how the education provider's regulations for resits and repeats of placements are applied to the programme, permitting a retrieval opportunity for placement as long as no breaches of fitness to practice were identified. The programme team confirmed that this is consistent with the education provider's regulations. However, on page 17 of the student handbook and page 16 of the revalidation document for this programme, it states, "If you fail the 1st placement, you will exit with Cert HE and some level 5 credits". Similar details of exiting the programme are given for failure of the final placement. The visitors could not see further information within these student guidance resources, which would indicate that an opportunity to retrieve the failed placement may be permitted. Therefore the visitors considered this may be misleading to students undertaking the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider's website states that the programme "…provides an integrated and innovative health and social care programme equipping Social Work graduates to …gain professional registration as a Social Worker with the HCPC." This does not clearly articulate the fact that completion of approved programmes gives students 'eligibility to apply' for HCPC registration, but students will still need to go through the application process. To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to ensure that details of progression requirements and the outcome of the programme are consistent and accurate throughout.

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to the programme aims within the programme's revalidation document as evidence for this SET. This outlines the programme's overall learning outcomes and states that successful students will be eligible to apply for professional registration with the HCPC. In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were provided with the name of the current external examiner, but were not able to find them on the HCPC Register. They therefore require further information as to the registration or relevant experience and qualification of the current external examiner. This standard also requires the programme's assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. In addition, the visitors therefore 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 will be met.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team look at the administrative support systems in relation to Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) processing and placement provider communications.

Reason: In the meeting with students at the visit, the visitors were informed of some glitches and delays in the system for processing DBS applications for the programme. Some of the practice placement educators also highlighted some minor issues with regards to placement administration (for example, confirmation of placement staff registration details or conflicts of interest in the allocation of placements) that they had experienced when working with the department. The visitors considered that delays or issues in these support systems may affect the students' placement experiences, and therefore recommend that the programme team ensure that this is kept under review to ensure that the programme's systems are appropriately supported.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team keep under review the monitoring and evaluation systems for placements to ensure effective, collaborative and problem-solving relationships, between the programme team and the practice placement staff.

Reason: As stated in the recommendation against SET 3.2, the meeting with practice placement educators brought to light some issues that they had experienced when communicating with the department. The placement educators were not clear as to how the feedback they and students give following placements, was fed into reviews or action planning. However, some placement providers stated that they had experienced good collaboration and discussions with tutors, and that they had recently increased the regularity of more focussed meetings with the relevant individuals, in addition to the overarching forums for more general discussions about practice placements. The programme team outlined that a new system, Practice Education Management System (PEMS), will be introduced next September to enhance the communication, feedback and information sharing between all parties involved with placements. The visitors were assured that the collaboration with practice placement educators was meeting the standard at threshold level and will be enhanced by recent and prospective initiatives. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team monitor these communication and feedback systems to ensure they continue to be effective and build good relationships with these stakeholders.

<div align="right">

Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
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	14 – 15 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 20 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) in Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only). Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 Full time 10 Part time
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Richard Brown (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Carole Whitehead (Canterbury Christ Church University) Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Felstead (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information on the programme structure and route within the programme's revalidation document and student handbook as evidence for this SET. In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted 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 programme's assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team look at the administrative support systems in relation to Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) processing and placement provider communications.

Reason: In the meeting with students at the visit, the visitors were informed of some glitches and delays in the system for processing DBS applications for the programme. Some of the practice placement providers also highlighted some minor issues with some areas of placement administration (for example, confirmation of placement staff registration details or conflicts of interest in the allocation of placements) that they had experienced when working with the department. The visitors considered that delays or issues in these support systems may affect the students' placement experiences, and therefore recommend that the programme team ensure that this is kept under review to ensure that the programme's systems are appropriately supported going forward.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team keep under review the monitoring and evaluation systems for placements to ensure effective, collaborative and problem-solving relationships, between the programme team and the practice placement staff.

Reason: As stated in the recommendation against SET 3.2, the meeting with practice placement educators brought to light some issues that they had experienced when communicating with the department. The placement educators were not clear as to how the feedback they and students give following placements, was fed into reviews or action planning. However, some placement staff commented that they had experienced good collaboration and discussions with tutors, and that they had recently increased the regularity of more focussed meetings with the academic staff, in addition to the overarching forums for more general discussions about practice placements. The programme team outlined that a new system, Practice Education Management System (PEMS), will be introduced next September to enhance the communication, feedback and information sharing between all parties involved with placements. The visitors were assured that the collaboration with practice placement educators was meeting the standard at threshold level and will be enhanced by recent and prospective initiatives. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team monitor these communication and feedback systems to ensure they continue to be effective and build good relationships with these stakeholders.

<div align="right">

Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	14 – 15 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 20 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) in Social Work and MA in Social Work. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	35 Full time 10 Part time
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Richard Brown (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Carole Whitehead (Canterbury Christ Church University) Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Ian Felstead (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information on the programme structure and route within the programme's revalidation document and student handbook as evidence for this SET. In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to apply to the Register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted 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 programme's assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team look at the administrative support systems in relation to Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) processing and placement provider communications.

Reason: In the meeting with students at the visit, the visitors were informed of some glitches and delays in the system for processing DBS applications for the programme. Some of the practice placement providers also highlighted some minor issues with some areas of placement administration (for example, confirmation of placement staff registration details or conflicts of interest in the allocation of placements) that they had experienced when working with the department. The visitors considered that delays or issues in these support systems may affect the students' placement experiences, and therefore recommend that the programme team ensure that this is kept under review to ensure that the programme's systems are appropriately supported.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team keep under review the monitoring and evaluation systems for placements to ensure effective, collaborative and problem-solving relationships, between the programme team and the practice placement staff.

Reason: As stated in the recommendation against SET 3.2, the meeting with practice placement educators brought to light some issues that they had experienced when communicating with the department. The placement educators were not clear as to how the feedback they and students give following placements, was fed into reviews or action planning. However, some placement staff commented that they had experienced good collaboration and discussions with tutors, and that they had recently increased the regularity of more focussed meetings with the academic staff, in addition to the overarching forums for more general discussions about practice placements. The programme team outlined that a new system, Practice Education Management System (PEMS), will be introduced next September to enhance the communication, feedback and information sharing between all parties involved with placements. The visitors were assured that the collaboration with practice placement educators was meeting the standard at threshold level and will be enhanced by recent and prospective initiatives. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team monitor these communication and feedback systems to ensure they continue to be effective and build good relationships with these stakeholders.

<div align="right">

Dorothy Smith
Gary Dicken

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme name	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Forensic psychologist
Date of visit	10 – 11 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Tuesday 14 January 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Thursday 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Friday 4 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Thursday 15 May 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body also considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology. 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 Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Emcee Chekwas (Forensic psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	7 for full and part time
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Eleri Jones (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Kathryn Livesey (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Jacqueline Wheatcroft (British Psychological Society) Lynn Dunwoody (British Psychological Society) Susan Quinn (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology 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.

Choose one of the following bullet points, depending on overall recommendation.
The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information about the collaborative curriculum for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided stated that interprofessional learning (IPL) was not applicable to the programme. However in conversation with the programme team the visitors heard conflicting statements on whether IPL was present in the programme. The visitors therefore require clarification on the inclusion of IPL, and if this is present require information about which parts of the curriculum are shared, and which are not, with the reasons behind this. This is to ensure that where IPL is present it does not prevent students from learning the skills and knowledge specific to forensic psychology.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the documentation to clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award, if offered, not to provide eligibility to register as a forensic psychologist with the HCPC.

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

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 would encourage the education provider to revisit the admissions documentation to clearly set out the Doctorate pathway.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the admissions procedure gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme and that the documentation stated the Doctorate pathway for prospective applicants. However, they found this difficult to navigate through and it was noted that prospective applicants may also have difficulty in locating the relevant information. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider revisits the admissions documentation to make this pathway clearer to prospective applicants so that they can make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the role play consent form (13f) so that the information provided is clear and easy to understand.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the role play consent form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form to provide more detail about the role play activities. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

Emcee Chekwas
George Delafield

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff Metropolitan University
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Forensic psychologist
Date of visit	10 - 11 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Tuesday 14 January 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Thursday 13 February 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 Friday 4 April 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Thursday 15 May 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology 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 Doctorate in Forensic Psychology. 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	Emcee Chekwas (Forensic psychologist) George Delafield (Forensic psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	35 for full and part time
First approved intake	September 2011
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Eleri Jones (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Kathryn Livesey (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Jaqueline Wheatcroft (British Psychological Society) Lynn Dunwoody (British Psychological Society) Susan Quinn (British Psychological Society)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a 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 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 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 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

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information about the collaborative curriculum for the programme.

Reason: The documentation provided stated that interprofessional learning (IPL) was not applicable to the programme. However in conversation with the programme team the visitors heard conflicting statements on whether IPL was present in the programme. The visitors therefore require clarification on the inclusion of IPL, and if this is present require information about which parts of the curriculum are shared, and which are not, with the reasons behind this. This is to ensure that where IPL is present it does not prevent students from learning the skills and knowledge specific to forensic psychology.

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 would encourage the education provider to revisit the admissions documentation to clearly set out the post graduate progression opportunities.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the admissions procedure gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme and that the documentation stated the post graduate progression opportunities for prospective applicants. However, they found this difficult to navigate through and it was noted that prospective applicants may also have difficulty in locating the relevant information. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider revisits the admissions documentation to make this pathway clearer to prospective applicants so that they can make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the role play consent form (13f) so that the information provided is clear and easy to understand.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the role play consent form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form to provide more detail about the role play activities. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

Emcee Chekwas
George Delafield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Havering College of Further & Higher Education
Validating body / Awarding body	The Open 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	12 – 13 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Richard Barker (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	70
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	March 2014
Chair	John Morris (Havering College of Further & Higher Education)
Secretary	Maureen Curtis (Havering College of Further & Higher Education)
Members of the joint panel	Michael Branicki (The College of Social Work (TCSW) Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work (TCSW)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed. The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 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 a programme.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular the interview.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information at the visit regarding the admissions process, which requires applicants to be subject to an interview before being offered a place on the programme. The information provided indicated that applicants would have their level of written and spoken English assessed throughout this interview. However, from a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see where this was communicated to potential applicants to the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are fully informed of the requirements of the admissions process and in particular, the requirement to undertake an interview at which their proficiency in English will be tested. In this way the visitors can determine how applicants are fully informed about the admissions process before deciding to apply and take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are fully informed about the practice placement elements of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the expectations of placement are communicated to applicants at the selection day for the programme. However, in the admissions documentation provided, the visitors could not see evidence of what information prospective students receive regarding practice placements, for example the length of placement, duration and examples of experience they could expect to get on placement. The visitors articulated that potential applicants may require this information in order to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to identify that this standard can be met.

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

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

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme, whereby a maximum of 50 per cent of academic credit can be transferred, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the

learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the course information leaflet mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs students of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the students, the visitors noted that there was some confusion regarding the roles of members of the teaching team, for example the students were unsure if there was a module leader for each module, and who they should go to if they had any questions about a module. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that there was not one module leader for each programme, but the modules are planned together and more than one member of the team will lead on managing the particular module. From their reading of the documentation the visitors were also not clear on what role the curriculum managers have in relation to providing support and guidance to students, and what the students should approach them for. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team should be approached for which areas of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme works in practice and how students are supported through the programme by the various members of the programme staff.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the student complaints process, and how students are clearly informed about the process.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted in the programme handbook that students were asked to "refer to the college's complaints procedure, which is available at the Campus reception desk" (page 66) if they wished to raise a complaint about any aspect of the programme. When asked, the students indicated that they were not aware of how they could raise a complaint, and were unsure which reception desk the policy would be held at. Additionally, some students indicated that they would not feel comfortable making a formal complaint regarding the programme, as they felt there may be repercussions in regards to their individual progression. In discussion with the programme team, staff members indicated that there may be an understanding amongst students that they should not raise complaints, but that the programme team would not encourage this, and it is unclear where this perception amongst students originated from. From these discussions and the information provided the visitors were unsure how the students were informed about the complaints process, and how the policy and process is made easily accessible to students in order for them to raise any concerns or make a complaint. The visitors were

also unclear as to how the potential outcomes of the complaints process are communicated to students so that they are aware that this would not have an effect on their progress through the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the student complaints process, how it is made easily accessible to students, and how students are informed that they can make a complaint regarding the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain students' consent when they are acting as service users in role play situations.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students that verbal consent had often been sought for participation as a service user in practical role play activities, and that they were often able to choose which role they would like to take on. However, the visitors could not see evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors therefore could not identify how the programme team worked consistently across the programme to identify any potential issues that may arise and how they mitigate any risk of emotional distress involved with students participating as service users. In particular the visitors could not identify how students were informed about the implications of participating in role play, 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 how these protocols are put into practice as part of the programme.

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 provide further evidence of how the teaching approach of splitting the cohort into separate teaching groups for the duration of module delivery, is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that each cohort is divided into smaller teaching groups for the purposes of teaching, and that a module can be delivered by a different lecturer for each teaching group. However, in discussion with the students the visitors noted that students highlighted inconsistencies in the advice provided by the different teaching groups within the same cohort. In particular the students highlighted areas of the programme where they felt that the teaching methods employed suggested one way of demonstrating how they could meet the learning outcomes of a module, but may be assessed differently. From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of how the programme team ensure consistency across the teaching groups, particularly how they maintain consistency in delivery across the cohorts, and how they ensured the curriculum was being delivered and assessed in the same way to each group of students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that the approach of splitting cohorts is appropriately employed by the programme team to ensure effective delivery of the curriculum, to each group of students. In particular the visitors require this evidence to demonstrate how this approach ensures that all students across the programme are

consistently able to meet the required learning outcomes and therefore the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how standards in assessment are ensured through splitting the cohort into separate teaching groups.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that each cohort is divided into smaller teaching groups for the purposes of teaching and assessment. They were also aware that different members of staff were responsible for the teaching and assessment of these groups within the same cohort. However, in discussion with the students, a feeling that there were some inconsistencies in the marking between members of the teaching team was highlighted. From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured consistency in marking across the separate teaching groups of the programme. In particular they were unable to determine what monitoring and evaluation systems were in place to ensure consistency in marking across the different groups within the same cohort. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems the programme has in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment across different teaching groups within the same cohort.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the requirement for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register was included as part of the information for the visitors. However, the visitors could not see where this statement was included within the programme documentation, and as such were unsure how and where students were informed that an aegrotat award would not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register to use the title social worker, in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where it is stated within the programme documentation that an aegrotat award does not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could not see where the requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register was stated within the programme documentation. As such the visitors could

not determine how the programme team ensure that this is the case. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where this is stated to ensure that this is standard is met.

Recommendations

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, other members of the programme team are on the Register. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However the visitors recommend that the team should keep this 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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the level of research input in teaching in the 'Research in Action' module under review, to ensure that that there continues to be an appropriate balance of research input for students completing this module.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that all modules are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, and therefore that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the 'Research in Action' module in the third year of the programme is a new module. As this is a new module the visitors recommend that the education provider continues to review the amount of specialist research expertise being brought to bear on the teaching of this module. In this way the programme team may be able to identify how best to maintain the level of specialist research input, and balance this with the taught elements of the module going forward.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor and develop the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the tour of resources at the visit, the visitors were made aware of the variety and volume of resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, in discussion at the visit a number of students highlighted that they had had difficultly accessing some texts in the library on a number of occasions. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider is currently in

discussion with the validating body regarding allowing students of this programme to have access to the validating bodies' online reading material. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the education provider continue to develop this potential access for students and explore other avenues, to increase students' ability to access the learning resources that will help them successfully complete this programme.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the lines of communication with students in regards to placement arrangement, to ensure that any students starting placements late are kept informed of developments in placing them.

Reason: The visitors noted in the discussion with the students that the majority of students went on placement on time, and are given appropriate information prior to starting placement. Therefore the visitors are content that the programme has demonstrated that it can meet this standard. However, for the few students who started placement late, the visitors were made aware of instances when students were occasionally not aware of what alternative arrangements were being put in place to provide them with a placement, and as such they were unaware of the type of placement they would be placed in. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the programme team consider how best to communicate with students who are late starting placement. In this way the programme may be better placed to ensure that all students are equally well prepared for placement, and have all the information they need about the type of placement they can expect to be placed in.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards for the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors identified from the documentation before the visit that none of the exit awards from the programme include any reference to a protected title or part of the HCPC register in their named award. Therefore the visitors were happy that this standard was met. The visitors also noted that the education provider included this requirement within the documentation provided prior to the visit, however it was only included as information for the visitors, rather than within the programme documentation. Therefore the visitors could not see that it is made clear to students that the exit awards from this programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC

Register. The visitors recommend that the education provider makes this explicit in the programme documentation to avoid any possible confusion for the students. In this way they may be able to enhance students' ability to make an informed decision if deciding to take an exit award from the programme.

Richard Barker
Patricia Higham

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Havering College of Further & Higher Education
Validating body / Awarding body	The Open University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	12 – 13 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Richard Barker (Social worker) Patricia Higham (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	15
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	March 2014
Chair	John Morris (Havering College of Further & Higher Education)
Secretary	Maureen Curtis (Havering College of Further & Higher Education)
Members of the joint panel	Michael Branicki (The College of Social Work (TCSW) Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work (TCSW)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed. The visitors agreed that 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for 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 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 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 a programme.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular the interview.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information at the visit regarding the admissions process, which requires applicants to be subject to an interview before being offered a place on the programme. The information provided indicated that applicants would have their level of written and spoken English assessed throughout this interview. However, from a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see where this was communicated to potential applicants to the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are fully informed of the requirements of the admissions process and in particular, the requirement to undertake an interview at which their proficiency in English will be tested. In this way the visitors can determine how applicants are fully informed about the admissions process before deciding to apply and take up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are fully informed about the practice placement elements of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the expectations of placement are communicated to applicants at the selection day for the programme. However, in the admissions documentation provided, the visitors could not see evidence of what information prospective students receive regarding practice placements, for example the length of placement, duration and examples of experience they could expect to get on placement. The visitors articulated that potential applicants may require this information in order to make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to identify that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the information provided to part time applicants, which ensures they are given the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the course information leaflet provided, part time applicants are required to "contact Threshold Services for an application pack" (page 1). The visitors were not provided with the application pack that part time students are given,

and therefore were unsure about the information that is provided to applicants considering the part time route through the programme. As such the visitors could not determine how applicants to the part time route were given all of the information they require in order to make an informed decision regarding whether to apply to the programme. In particular information about the duration of the programme, and any differences in the study pattern between the full time route through the programme and the part time route. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the information provided to part time applicants at the admissions stage to determine how they are given all of the information they require in order to make a fully informed decision about applying to the programme.

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

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

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme, whereby a maximum of 50 per cent of academic credit can be transferred, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the course information leaflet mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs students of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the students, the visitors noted that there was some confusion regarding the roles of members of the teaching team, for example the students were unsure if there was a module leader for each module, and who they should go to if they had any questions about a module. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that there was not one module leader for each programme, but the modules are planned together and more than one member of the team will lead on managing the particular module. From their reading of the documentation the visitors were also not clear on what role the curriculum managers have in relation to providing support and guidance to students, and what the students should approach them for. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team should be approached for which areas of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme works in

practice and how students are supported through the programme by the various members of the programme staff.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information regarding the student complaints process, and how students are clearly informed about the process.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted in the programme handbook that students were asked to "refer to the college's complaints procedure, which is available at the Campus reception desk" (page 66) if they wished to raise a complaint about any aspect of the programme. When asked, the students indicated that they were not aware of how they could raise a complaint, and were unsure which reception desk the policy would be held at. Additionally, some students indicated that they would not feel comfortable making a formal complaint regarding the programme, as they felt there may be repercussions in regards to their individual progression. In discussion with the programme team, staff members indicated that there may be an understanding amongst students that they should not raise complaints, but that the programme team would not encourage this, and it is unclear where this perception amongst students originated from. From these discussions and the information provided the visitors were unsure how the students were informed about the complaints process, and how the policy and process is made easily accessible to students in order for them to raise any concerns or make a complaint. The visitors were also unclear as to how the potential outcomes of the complaints process are communicated to students so that they are aware that this would not have an effect on their progress through the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the student complaints process, how it is made easily accessible to students, and how students are informed that they can make a complaint regarding the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain students' consent when they are acting as service users in role play situations.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students that verbal consent had often been sought for participation as a service user in practical role play activities, and that they were often able to choose which role they would like to take on. However, the visitors could not see evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors therefore could not identify how the programme team worked consistently across the programme to identify any potential issues that may arise and how they mitigate any risk of emotional distress involved with students participating as service users. In particular the visitors could not identify how students were informed about the implications of participating in role play, 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 how these protocols are put into practice as part of the programme.

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 provide further evidence of how the teaching approach of splitting the cohort into separate teaching groups for the duration of module delivery, is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that each cohort is divided into smaller teaching groups for the purposes of teaching, and that a module can be delivered by a different lecturer for each teaching group. However, in discussion with the students the visitors noted that students highlighted inconsistencies in the advice provided by the different teaching groups within the same cohort. In particular the students highlighted areas of the programme where they felt that the teaching methods employed suggested one way of demonstrating how they could meet the learning outcomes of a module, but may be assessed differently. From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of how the programme team ensure consistency across the teaching groups, particularly how they maintain consistency in delivery across the cohorts, and how they ensured the curriculum was being delivered and assessed in the same way to each group of students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that the approach of splitting cohorts is appropriately employed by the programme team to ensure effective delivery of the curriculum, to each group of students. In particular the visitors require this evidence to demonstrate how this approach ensures that all students across the programme are consistently able to meet the required learning outcomes and therefore the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how standards in assessment are ensured through splitting the cohort into separate teaching groups.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that each cohort is divided into smaller teaching groups for the purposes of teaching and assessment. They were also aware that different members of staff were responsible for the teaching and assessment of these groups within the same cohort. However, in discussion with the students, a feeling that there were some inconsistencies in the marking between members of the teaching team was highlighted. From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured consistency in marking across the separate teaching groups of the programme. In particular they were unable to determine what monitoring and evaluation systems were in place to ensure consistency in marking across the different groups within the same cohort. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation systems the programme has in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment across different teaching groups within the same cohort.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the requirement for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register was included as part of the information for the visitors. However, the visitors could not see where this statement was included within the programme documentation, and as such were unsure how and where students were informed that an aegrotat award would not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register to use the title social worker, in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where it is stated within the programme documentation that an aegrotat award does not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could not see where the requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register was stated within the programme documentation. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensure that this is the case. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where this is stated to ensure that this is standard is met.

Recommendations

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, other members of the programme team are on the Register. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However the visitors recommend that the team should keep this 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.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the level of research input in teaching in the 'Research in Action' module under review, to ensure that that there continues to be an appropriate balance of research input for students completing this module.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that all modules are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, and therefore that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the 'Research in Action' module in the third year of the programme is a new module. As this is a new module the visitors recommend that the education provider continues to review the amount of specialist research expertise being brought to bear on the teaching of this module. In this way the programme team may be able to identify how best to maintain the level of specialist research input, and balance this with the taught elements of the module going forward.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor and develop the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the tour of resources at the visit, the visitors were made aware of the variety and volume of resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, in discussion at the visit a number of students highlighted that they had had difficultly accessing some texts in the library on a number of occasions. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider is currently in

discussion with the validating body regarding allowing students of this programme to have access to the validating bodies' online reading material. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the education provider continue to develop this potential access for students and explore other avenues, to increase students' ability to access the learning resources that will help them successfully complete this programme.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Recommendation: The education provider should consider the lines of communication with students in regards to placement arrangement, to ensure that any students starting placements late are kept informed of developments in placing them.

Reason: The visitors noted in the discussion with the students that the majority of students went on placement on time, and are given appropriate information prior to starting placement. Therefore the visitors are content that the programme has demonstrated that it can meet this standard. However, for the few students who started placement late, the visitors were made aware of instances when students were occasionally not aware of what alternative arrangements were being put in place to provide them with a placement, and as such they were unaware of the type of placement they would be placed in. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the programme team consider how best to communicate with students who are late starting placement. In this way the programme may be better placed to ensure that all students are equally well prepared for placement, and have all the information they need about the type of placement they can expect to be placed in.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards for the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors identified from the documentation before the visit that none of the exit awards from the programme include any reference to a protected title or part of the HCPC register in their named award. Therefore the visitors were happy that this standard was met. The visitors also noted that the education provider included this requirement within the documentation provided prior to the visit, however it was only included as information for the visitors, rather than within the programme documentation. Therefore the visitors could not see that it is made clear to students that the exit awards from this programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC

Register. The visitors recommend that the education provider makes this explicit in the programme documentation to avoid any possible confusion for the students. In this way they may be able to enhance students' ability to make an informed decision if deciding to take an exit award from the programme.

<div align="right">
Richard Barker
Patricia Higham
</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	North West Midlands Regional Partnership / Staffordshire University
Validating body / Awarding body	Staffordshire University
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Step Up to Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	17 – 18 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 February 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The awarding body validated the programme. The awarding 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 awarding body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Patricia Higham (Social worker) Shaaron Pratt (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	32
Proposed start date of programme approval	24 February 2014
Chair	Noel Morrison (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Andrea Jones (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Jacob Daly (External Panel Member) Stella Mills (Internal Panel Member) Nigel Thomas (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit. This programme is a new programme and therefore there are no past external examiners' reports.

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

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

The HCPC met with graduates from the previous MSc level step-up to social work programme (cohort two).

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are able to make informed decisions about the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion indicated the application process for this programme is managed at the outset through the Department for Education (DfE). Shortlisted applicants are then sent through the education provider where a further round of the application process is managed. The visitors noted there was no specific programme information available online. This standard requires the education provider to ensure potential applicants have information they require to make an informed decision about whether to apply for this programme. This includes details of the intense nature of the programme, the admission requirements (such as required qualifications, criminal conviction checks, health requirements), the bursary arrangements and details of how the programme is managed and delivered. The programme team identified they were aware of the need to develop online advertising materials. They also highlighted this would be made available before future cohorts were recruited. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are able to make informed decisions about the programme. They require an indication of the content of the advertising materials and the timescales for making this available online.

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 programme, the HCPC and HCPC requirements. Firstly the visitors noted there were references to the HCPC, as a regulatory body, stipulating the number of days / hours required for students to complete the programme (programme handbook, page 17; Practice learning, first placement module handbook, page 11; Practice learning, second placement module handbook, page 11; module descriptors – practice learning – first and second placements, Indicative content). The HCPC does not specify required days / hours for academic or practice learning and therefore needs correcting within the documents. Secondly, the visitors noted references to the HCPC as a professional body (Programme handbook, page 16; Practice learning, second placement module handbook, page 20). The HCPC is not a professional body, it is a regulatory and therefore this needs correcting. Thirdly the visitors noted a reference to the "BA Honours social work award" (Practice learning, second placement module handbook, page 20). The handbook is not for the undergraduate programme and so should be revised to accurately reflect this programme. The visitors considered these inaccuracies will need to be corrected for the students to have accurate information. The visitors therefore require the programme

team to review the programme documentation taking into account the above detail to ensure it is accurate and reflects the status of current regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the practice placement documentation clearly articulates the role the practice educator / supervisor has in ensuring practice learning, teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: The visitors noted the practice placement documentation concentrated on the role the practice educator has in assessing the student on the achievement of their learning outcomes. The documentation does discuss supervision however the visitors were unable to determine the arrangements for supervision, particularly details of how recordings should be undertaken. The practice educator (who may also be the supervisor) role is crucial in providing a safe and supportive environment for the student to develop safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. The visitors considered the emphasis on this aspect of the role of the practice educator / supervisor was missing from the documentation. The visitors consider it important for the documentation to refer to this so students are aware of the responsibilities of the practice educator / supervisor that underpins their placement learning experience. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the practice placement documentation to clearly articulate the role the practice educator / supervisor has in ensuring practice learning, teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme handbook be revised to include detailed information regarding programme policies and procedures.

Reason: The visitors received evidence that there are various processes in place for raising any concerns, complaints or other issues. The visitors noted there was a link to these processes within the programme handbook and so were satisfied these standards were met. The visitors noted the programme handbook does not provide further explanations as to the separate processes and in what circumstances they can be used. The visitors feel this information would further support students on this programme and recommend the information about these processes be expanded to include the circumstances in which they can be used and which individual is the correct person to raise any issue with. This includes the:

- Students complaints process;
- process for raising academic or practice concerns informally;
- process for raising academic or practice concerns formally;
- formal process in place for considering students fitness to practise;
- process for academic misconduct; and
- process for the right of appeals for students.

Patricia Higham
Shaaron Pratt

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes 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	5 – 6 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work – Part time, MA Social Work – Full time and Part time, and PG Dip Social Work – Full time and Part time. 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	Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker) Annie Mitchell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	40 for both full and part time
Chair	Brian Marshall (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Nicola Kirk (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member) Ailsa Clarke (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation.

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 material and website, to ensure that potential applicants have contemporary information about changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are very aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. Students gave very detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them according to the students was up to date. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and website if and how information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants. 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 are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admission information to clarify the IELTS requirements to get on to the programme.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Evidence was provided to the visitors regarding the generic website information. However, the visitors noted in the programme specification (Section six) that general information is provided to applicants about International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores but this did not include specific information to this programme. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programmes are informed of the English language requirements. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about how applicants are provided with information about IELTS process. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about the education provider's health requirements and how this is consistent with the equality and diversity policy in place.

Reason: Reason: From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors also discussed the health requirement with the programme team and it was highlighted that applicants declare their health requirements at the interview. Once a declaration was made by applicant it was then discussed by the interview team who made a discussion on the health declaration. However, the visitors, could not determine the process that the education provider has in place to make such decision, how the process is applied and how it is used to identify what adjustments could or could not reasonable be made if health conditions were disclosed. As such the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the health declarations and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with in a manner that is consistent with the equality and diversity policy. Therefore the visitors require further information about the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of how equality and diversity is ensured in regards to health declaration at the point of admission and how this application is consistently and equitably applied.

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

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

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Evidence was provided to the visitors regarding the generic website information that is provided to applicants but this did not include the specific information about this programme. The visitors noted in the programme specification (Section six) that there may be an AP(E)L policy and process in relation to this programme but were unclear how this was communicated to applicants. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the potential to gain accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and how they can engage with this process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about how applicants are provided with information about the relevant AP(E)L policies and how applicants can engage with this process. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for students attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. Within the documentation, the visitors noted that for in house lectures 'attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance' and that poor attendance would be followed up. However, the visitors were unsure how attendance is followed up if attendance sheets are sporadic. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team who highlighted the expectation of students on the programmes. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. 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.

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 documentation provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding criminal conviction checks. However, the visitors would like to recommend to the programme team to amend their documentation and website to ensure that potential applicants and students are given information that is current and consistent. For example, the programme specification (Section six) still makes references to Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) instead of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). Therefore, the visitors would like to encourage the education provider to revise their documentation to ensure that students continue to be given information that is current.

Jane McLenachan
Graham Noyce
Annie Mitchell

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work – Full time and Part time, MA Social Work – Part time, and PG Dip Social Work – Full time and Part time. 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	Jane McLenachan (Social worker)
	Graham Noyce (Social worker)
	Annie Mitchell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	20 for both full and part time
Chair	Brian Marshall (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Nicola Kirk (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work)
	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)
	Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member)
	Ailsa Clarke (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation.

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 material and website, to ensure that potential applicants have contemporary information about changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are very aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. Students gave very detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them according to the students was up to date. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and website if and how information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants. 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 are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about the education provider's health requirements and how this is consistent with the equality and diversity policy in place.

Reason: From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors also discussed the health requirement with the programme team and it was highlighted that applicants declare their health requirements at the interview. Once a declaration was made by applicant it was then discussed by the interview team who made a decision on the health declaration. However, the visitors, could not determine the process that the education provider has in place to make such decision, how the process is applied and how it is used to identify what adjustments could or could not reasonable be made if health conditions were disclosed. As such the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the health declarations and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with in a manner that is consistent with the equality and diversity policy. Therefore the visitors require further information about the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of how equality and diversity is ensured in regards to health declaration at the point of admission and how this application is consistently and equitably applied.

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

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

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Evidence was provided to the visitors regarding the generic website information that is provided to applicants but this did not include the specific information about this programme. The visitors noted in the programme specification (Section six) that there may be an AP(E)L policy and process in relation to this programme but were unclear how this was communicated to applicants. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the potential to gain accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and how they can engage with this process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about how applicants are provided with information about the relevant AP(E)L policies and how applicants can engage with this process. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for students attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. Within the documentation, the visitors noted that for in house lectures 'attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance' and that poor attendance would be followed up. However, the visitors were unsure how attendance is followed up if the use of attendance sheets were sporadic. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team who highlighted the expectation of students on the programmes. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. 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.

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 documentation provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding criminal conviction checks. However, the visitors would like to recommend to the programme team to amend their documentation and website to ensure that potential applicants and students are given information that is current and consistent. For example, the programme specification (Section six) still makes references to Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) instead of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). Therefore, the visitors would like to encourage the education provider to revise their documentation to ensure that students continue to be given information that is current.

Jane McLenachan
Graham Noyce
Annie Mitchell

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Oxford Brookes University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 December 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 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work – Full time and Part time, MA Social Work – Full time and Part time, and PG Dip Social Work – Full time. 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	Jane McLenachan (Social worker)
	Graham Noyce (Social worker)
	Annie Mitchell (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	20 for full and part time
Chair	Brian Marshall (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Nicola Kirk (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work)
	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)
	Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member)
	Ailsa Clarke (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation.

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 material and website, to ensure that potential applicants have contemporary information about changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are very aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. Students gave very detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them according to the students was up to date. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and website if and how information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants. 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 are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about the education provider's health requirements and how this is consistent with the equality and diversity policy in place.

Reason: From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors also discussed the health requirement with the programme team and it was highlighted that applicants declare their health requirements at the interview. Once a declaration was made by applicant it was then discussed by the interview team who made a decision on the health declaration. However, the visitors, could not determine the process that the education provider has in place to make such decision, how the process is applied and how it is used to identify what adjustments could or could not reasonable be made if health conditions were disclosed. As such the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the health declarations and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with in a manner that is consistent with the equality and diversity policy. Therefore the visitors require further information about the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of how equality and diversity is ensured in regards to health declaration at the point of admission and how this application is consistently and equitably applied.

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

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

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. Evidence was provided to the visitors regarding the generic website information that is provided to applicants but this did not include the specific information about this programme. The visitors noted in the programme specification (Section six) that there may be an AP(E)L policy and process in relation to this programme but were unclear how this was communicated to applicants. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the potential to gain accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and how they can engage with this process. Therefore the visitors require further evidence about how applicants are provided with information about the relevant AP(E)L policies and how applicants can engage with this process. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that a robust monitoring system for students attendance is in place; to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that there was no explicit reference to where and when attendance is mandatory for students on the programme. Within the documentation, the visitors noted that for in house lectures 'attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance' and that poor attendance would be followed up. However, the visitors were unsure how attendance is followed up if attendance sheets are sporadic. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team who highlighted the expectation of students on the programmes. However, the visitors were unsure how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. 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.

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 documentation provided through the admissions procedures is consistent and current.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation provided and in discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied with the information provided for applicants regarding criminal conviction checks. However, the visitors would like to recommend to the programme team to amend their documentation and website to ensure that potential applicants and students are given information that is current and consistent. For example, the programme specification (Section six) still makes references to Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) instead of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). Therefore, the visitors would like to encourage the education provider to revise their documentation to ensure that students continue to be given information that is current.

Jane McLenachan
Graham Noyce
Annie Mitchell

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	27 – 28 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has 3 January 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 13 February 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 17 January 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 13 February 2013.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Social work – Part time and MSc Social work – Full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker) Steve Benson (Social worker) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	24 for Full time and Part time
Chair	Phil Mandy (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Rebecca Mitchell (University of Brighton)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 and the website, to ensure potential applicants and students have information about changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures potential applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. From the documentation and programme website, the visitors were unable to determine if, and how, information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants. Therefore they require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring potential applicants and students have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

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: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that in the SETs mapping document under SET 3.14 the education provider put 'not applicable'. The visitors noted from discussion with the programme team that verbal consent has be sought from students when they were required to participate as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. However, there was no evidence provided of any appropriate protocols in place for obtaining consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved when students participate as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, or how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. The visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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

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

Reason: From the advertising materials and programme documentation provided, the visitors considered there to be insufficient clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. The visitors considered it to be important that students understand the awards available and which lead to eligibility for HCPC registration. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure it is clearly articulated for students to understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which awards do not.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires it to be clearly articulated that the programme meets HCPC requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit evidence to demonstrate recognition of this standard within the programme documentation to determine this standard is met.

Gary Hickman
Steve Benson
Paul Bates

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Brighton
Programme name	MSc Social work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	27 – 28 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has 3 January 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 13 February 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 17 January 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 13 February 2013.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Social work – Full time and Part time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker)
	Steve Benson (Social worker)
	Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	30 – 32
Chair	Phil Mandy (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Rebecca Mitchell (University of Brighton)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 and the website, to ensure potential applicants and students have information about changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures potential applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. From the documentation and programme website, the visitors were unable to determine if, and how, information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants. Therefore they require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring potential applicants and students have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

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: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that in the SETs mapping document under SET 3.14 the education provider put 'not applicable'. The visitors noted from discussion with the programme team that verbal consent has be sought from students when they were required to participate as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. However, there was no evidence provided of any appropriate protocols in place for obtaining consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved when students participate as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate, or how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. The visitors could also not determine how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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

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

Reason: From the advertising materials and programme documentation provided, the visitors considered there to be insufficient clarity for students that exit awards do not lead to HCPC registration. The visitors considered it to be important that students understand the awards available and which lead to eligibility for HCPC registration. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure it is clearly articulated for students to understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which awards do not.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires it to be clearly articulated that the programme meets HCPC requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require the programme team to submit evidence to demonstrate recognition of this standard within the programme documentation to determine this standard is met.

<div align="right">

Gary Hickman
Steve Benson
Paul Bates

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Physiotherapists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlements	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	13 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards for prescribing. 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 visitor role	Nick Haddington (Independent prescribing) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	25 two cohorts a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Jenifer Lewis-Smith (University of Derby)
Secretary	Zoe Pritchett (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Val Poultney (Internal Panel Member) Richard Self (Internal Panel Member) James Beech(Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for education providers	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC reviewed draft documentation for this programme at the visit.

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

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 standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one standard.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

B.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 revisit programme documentation to clarify the programme requirements for students.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with draft documentation for this programme which was the allied health professional version of the non-medical prescribing programme which also had versions for nurses and pharmacists. The visitors noted that there were instances within the draft programme handbook that referred to the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). It was discussed at the visit that the programme team plan to use NMC requirements for students' undertaking this programme. It was also highlighted the HCPC does not have any specific requirements (such as admissions requirements, practice hours requirements or attendance requirements). The visitors considered the references to the NMC in the documents may cause confusion for students who are registered with the HCPC. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revisited to clarify for students the programme requirements and provide a rationale for them if necessary. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit programme documentation that has been revised to take into account the above.

B.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 provide final draft programme documentation that reflects this new programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with draft documentation (programme handbook, module descriptor level 7) for this programme which is the allied health professional version of the non-medical prescribing programme. The visitors heard that programme documentation would be further finalised before the programme would commence (programme handbook, practice assessment handbook, programme specification and module descriptors for level 6 and 7). The visitors highlight that the programme documentation needs to be clear when referring to the learning outcomes to be achieved for allied health professionals as these will be different for this version of the non-medical prescribing programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit the final draft programme documentation for this programme so that they can be satisfied it supports the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

B.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 clarify which professional registrants can enrol on this programme and clearly articulate the subsequent annotation on their registration record.

Reason: The visitors noted this programme is one of the versions of the non-medical prescribing programme. At the visit the visitors were provided with draft documentation for this programme. The visitors noted the documentation inaccurately and inconsistently referred to the award the students would achieve. The programme

handbook says students will be awarded the Practice Certificate in Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Physiotherapists, Podiatrists & Radiographers (Level 6 or Level 7). The programme handbook also states "This [award] will result in the eligibility of the Physiotherapist, Podiatrist & Radiographer to prescribe as an independent/supplementary prescriber within their area of competence"(page 5). The visitors noted that this is unclear and could create confusion for students because radiographers are only able to act as supplementary prescribers. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation refers to physiotherapists, podiatrists and radiographers on the programme inconsistently. The module specification does not include radiographers whereas the programme handbook does. The visitors considered this could be confusing for students. The visitors require the programme team clarify which professional registrants can enrol on this programme and clearly articulate the subsequent annotation on their registration record.

Recommendations

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider designating a specific individual who is an allied health professional to contribute to the development and teaching on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied the provision of staff and expertise that could be utilised for this programme was sufficient to deliver the programme appropriately and so considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted the introduction of this new programme to the portfolio of non-medical prescribing programmes would extend the professional registrants who can enrol on this programme. The visitors recommend the programme team to look to secure a dedicated individual or group of individuals who can contribute to the development and teaching on this programme and consider the allied health professional perspective in a more structured and formal way.

B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider combining the programme handbooks into one unified document for students from all professions undertaking the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has a portfolio of non-medical prescribing programmes. The education provider currently supplies separate programme handbooks for each group of professional students undertaking the programme (pharmacists, nurses, allied health professionals). The visitors considered this may create problems when there are multiple sources of different information for the programme team to maintain. The visitors suggest the programme team consider combining the programme handbooks. The visitors suggested that the aspects of the programme which are the same across all professions and then the differences across the professions could be clearly laid out in one handbook. The visitors felt this could be an easier way to maintain the accuracy and consistency of information being provided to students.

Nick Haddington
Paul Blakeman

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Derby
Programme name	Practice Certificate in Independent / Supplementary Prescribing (Podiatrists)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Supplementary prescribing Independent prescribing
Date of visit	13 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards for prescribing. 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 visitor role	Nick Haddington (Independent prescribing) Paul Blakeman (Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	25 two cohorts a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Jenifer Lewis-Smith (University of Derby)
Secretary	Zoe Pritchett (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Val Poultney (Internal Panel Member) Richard Self (Internal Panel Member) James Beech(Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for education providers	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC reviewed draft documentation for this programme at the visit.

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

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

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of our standards for prescribing for education providers and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards for prescribing for all prescribers and / or independent prescribers.

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 standards have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one standard.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain standards for prescribing 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 for prescribing has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

B.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 revisit programme documentation to clarify the programme requirements for students.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with draft documentation for this programme which was the allied health professional version of the non-medical prescribing programme which also had versions for nurses and pharmacists. The visitors noted that there were instances within the draft programme handbook that referred to the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). It was discussed at the visit that the programme team plan to use NMC requirements for students' undertaking this programme. It was also highlighted the HCPC does not have any specific requirements (such as admissions requirements, practice hours requirements or attendance requirements). The visitors considered the references to the NMC in the documents may cause confusion for students who are registered with the HCPC. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revisited to clarify for students the programme requirements and provide a rationale for them if necessary. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit programme documentation that has been revised to take into account the above.

B.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 provide final draft programme documentation that reflects this new programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with draft documentation (programme handbook, module descriptor level 7) for this programme which is the allied health professional version of the non-medical prescribing programme. The visitors heard that programme documentation would be further finalised before the programme would commence (programme handbook, practice assessment handbook, programme specification and module descriptors for level 6 and 7). The visitors highlight that the programme documentation needs to be clear when referring to the learning outcomes to be achieved for allied health professionals as these will be different for this version of the non-medical prescribing programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit the final draft programme documentation for this programme so that they can be satisfied it supports the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

B.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 clarify which professional registrants can enrol on this programme and clearly articulate the subsequent annotation on their registration record.

Reason: The visitors noted this programme is one of the versions of the non-medical prescribing programme. At the visit the visitors were provided with draft documentation for this programme. The visitors noted the documentation inaccurately and inconsistently referred to the award the students would achieve. The programme

handbook says students will be awarded the Practice Certificate in Independent/Supplementary Prescribing for Physiotherapists, Podiatrists & Radiographers (Level 6 or Level 7). The programme handbook also states "This [award] will result in the eligibility of the Physiotherapist, Podiatrist & Radiographer to prescribe as an independent/supplementary prescriber within their area of competence"(page 5). The visitors noted that this is unclear and could create confusion for students because radiographers are only able to act as supplementary prescribers. The visitors also noted that the programme documentation refers to physiotherapists, podiatrists and radiographers on the programme inconsistently. The module specification does not include radiographers whereas the programme handbook does. The visitors considered this could be confusing for students. The visitors require the programme team clarify which professional registrants can enrol on this programme and clearly articulate the subsequent annotation on their registration record.

Recommendations

B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider designating a specific individual who is an allied health professional to contribute to the development and teaching on the programme.

Reason: From the documentation and discussion at the visit the visitors were satisfied the provision of staff and expertise that could be utilised for this programme was sufficient to deliver the programme appropriately and so considered this standard to be met. The visitors noted the introduction of this new programme to the portfolio of non-medical prescribing programmes would extend the professional registrants who can enrol on this programme. The visitors recommend the programme team to look to secure a dedicated individual or group of individuals who can contribute to the development and teaching on this programme and consider the allied health professional perspective in a more structured and formal way.

B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider combining the programme handbooks into one unified document for students from all professions undertaking the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has a portfolio of non-medical prescribing programmes. The education provider currently supplies separate programme handbooks for each group of professional students undertaking the programme (pharmacists, nurses, allied health professionals). The visitors considered this may create problems when there are multiple sources of different information for the programme team to maintain. The visitors suggest the programme team consider combining the programme handbooks. The visitors suggested that the aspects of the programme which are the same across all professions and then the differences across the professions could be clearly laid out in one handbook. The visitors felt this could be an easier way to maintain the accuracy and consistency of information being provided to students.

Nick Haddington
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – MA Social Work and PG Dip Social Work. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) Richard Barker (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers (day two only)	Brendon Edmonds Liz Craig
Proposed student numbers	27 for full and part time
First approved intake	August 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Martin Snowden (University of Greenwich)
Secretary	Kim Oliver (University of Greenwich)
Members of the joint panel	Corine Delage (Internal Panel Member) Jim Demetre (Internal Panel Member) Marilyn Gregory (External Panel Member) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the attendance and lateness policies that apply to students on the programme are communicated clearly and consistently in the resources provided to support students.

Reason: The visitors noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In the submission document, it states that students may be admitted to a class up to 15 minutes after it starts (page 56). However, in the programme handbook, page 28, it indicates that ten minutes is the cut off, after which students can enter during a natural break in the session. Discussions with students indicated that they were aware of the overall attendance policy, but there was some confusion as to what is acceptable where lateness for sessions is concerned. The visitors noted that ambiguity in this aspect of how the attendance policy is applied may affect students' attendance records, or lead to their missing large parts of the curriculum's delivery incrementally. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence as to how they ensure that students on the programme are accurately informed as to the relevant processes and policies applicable to them on the programme. They therefore require the programme team to update the information held in resources to support student learning to ensure they are sufficiently clear and consistent.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the resources provided to support students throughout the programme are clear and consistent regarding compensation and condonement regulations throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the final project. At the visit, the programme team explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided, and were unclear as to how this is communicated to students. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that some course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed, some outline that assignments only require a minimum of 30 per cent, and some did not have a clear statement (for example, SOCW1181). The visitors considered that the information given to students does not sufficiently communicate the compensation and condonement policy specific to this programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the achievement and progression requirements for this programme are communicated consistently and clearly to students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that where students participate as service users in practical teaching, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent was sought for participation as a service user in practical and role play activities. The submission document (page 51) also outlined that, "Participation relies on the implied consent on the students' behalf", but the visitors could not find evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students participate as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating 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 (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarity as to the policy regarding compensation and condonement for the programmes, to demonstrate how all standards of proficiency are assessed.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the final project. At the visit, the programme team explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that some course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed, some outline that assignments only require a minimum of 30 per cent, and some did not have a clear statement (for example, SOCW1181). Where there are assignments which do not need to be passed in order to complete the programme, the visitors will need information as to the justification for this to ensure that the assessment of all standards of proficiency for social workers in England (SOPs) is not compromised. They therefore require further clarity as to compensation and condonement arrangements for the programme, in order to ensure that all SOPs will be met by students upon graduation.

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information within the assessment regulations as evidence for this SET, which stated that "…Aegrotat may be recommended when a Progression and Award Board does not have enough evidence of the student's performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate."(5.31(d)). In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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 programme team should keep under review the attendance and lateness policies to ensure they are implemented consistently.

Reason: As noted in the condition against SET 3.8, the visitors noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In discussions with students at the visit, the visitors noted some confusion as to the rules amongst different cohorts and heard that there appeared to be differences in the way that various lecturers dealt with students who arrived late for sessions. The visitors were content that there was an appropriate attendance policy in place and were satisfied that the programme team were aware of the correct policy for each programme. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team keep the monitoring of attendance under review in order to ensure consistency of implementation of the attendance policy across the programme.

<div align="right">

Richard Barker
Vicki Lawson-Brown

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and PG Dip Social Work. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) Richard Barker (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers (day two only)	Brendon Edmonds Liz Craig
Proposed student numbers	31 per year inclusive of students from the PG Dip Social Work programme
First approved intake	August 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Martin Snowden (University of Greenwich)
Secretary	Kim Oliver (University of Greenwich)
Members of the joint panel	Corine Delage (Internal Panel Member) Jim Demetre (Internal Panel Member) Marilyn Gregory (External Panel Member) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the processes and policies that apply to students on the programme are communicated clearly and consistently in the resources provided to support students.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors were provided with a copy of the student complaints process. However, they were unable to find evidence as to where students are informed of this process, its purpose and how to access it. In discussion with the senior team at the visit, the visitors heard that students can access the complaints process through the online student portal. However, from discussion with students, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence that they were aware of how to access the student complaints process. The visitors also noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In the submission document, it states that students may be admitted to a class up to 15 minutes after it starts (page 48). However, in the programme handbook (page 18), it indicates that students cannot be more than ten minutes late. Discussions with students indicated that they were aware of the overall attendance policy, but there was some confusion as to what is acceptable where lateness for sessions is concerned. The visitors noted that ambiguity in this aspect of how the attendance policy is applied may affect students' attendance records, or lead to their missing large parts of the curriculum's delivery incrementally. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that students on the programme are accurately informed as to the relevant processes and policies applicable to them on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the resources provided to support students throughout the programme are clear and consistent regarding compensation and condonement regulations throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the research project. At the visit, the education provider explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided, and were unclear as to how this is communicated to students. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that the course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed. However, on page 30 of the programme handbook, it states that if a course assessment does not meet the 50 per cent pass mark, the Progression and Award Board will consider whether other marks can compensate to average out the marks. The visitors

considered that the information given to students does not sufficiently communicate the compensation and condonement policy specific to this programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the achievement and progression requirements for this programme are communicated consistently and clearly to students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that where students participate as service users in practical teaching, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent was sought for participation as a service user in practical and role play activities. The submission document (page 51) also outlined that, "Participation relies on the implied consent on the students' behalf", but the visitors could not find evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students participate as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating 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 (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarity as to the policy regarding compensation and condonement for the programmes, to demonstrate how all standards of proficiency are assessed.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the final project. At the visit, the programme team explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that the course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed. However, on page 30 of the programme handbook, it states that if a course assessment does not meet the 50 per cent pass mark, the Progression and Award Board will consider whether other marks can compensate to average out the

marks. If there are assignments which do not necessarily need to be passed in order to complete the programme, the visitors will need information as to the justification for this to ensure that the assessment of all standards of proficiency for social workers in England (SOPs) is not compromised. They therefore require further clarity as to compensation and condonement arrangements for the programme, in order to ensure that all SOPs will be met by students upon graduation.

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information within the assessment regulations as evidence for this SET, which stated that "…Aegrotat may be recommended when a Progression and Award Board does not have enough evidence of the student's performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate."(5.31(d)). In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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 programme team should keep under review the attendance and lateness policies to ensure they are implemented consistently.

Reason: As noted in the condition against SET 3.8, the visitors noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In discussions with students at the visit, the visitors noted some confusion as to the rules amongst different cohorts and heard that there appeared to be differences in the way that various lecturers dealt with students who arrived late for sessions. The visitors were content that there was an appropriate attendance policy in place and were satisfied that the programme team were aware of the correct policy for each programme. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team keep the monitoring of attendance under review in order to ensure consistency of implementation of the attendance policy across the programme.

<div align="right">

Richard Barker
Vicki Lawson-Brown

</div>

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Greenwich
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time (In Service)
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 17 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) Richard Barker (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observers	Brendon Edmonds Liz Craig
Proposed student numbers	31 per year inclusive of students from the MA Social Work programme
First approved intake	August 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2014
Chair	Martin Snowden (University of Greenwich)
Secretary	Kim Oliver (University of Greenwich)
Members of the joint panel	Corine Delage (Internal Panel Member) Jim Demetre (Internal Panel Member) Marilyn Gregory (External Panel Member) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors 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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the processes and policies that apply to students on the programme are communicated clearly and consistently in the resources provided to support students.

Reason: Within the documentation, the visitors were provided with a copy of the student complaints process. However, they were unable to find evidence as to where students are informed of this process, its purpose and how to access it. In discussion with the senior team at the visit, the visitors heard that students can access the complaints process through the online student portal. However, from discussion with students, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence that they were aware of how to access the student complaints process. The visitors also noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In the submission document, it states that students may be admitted to a class up to 15 minutes after it starts (page 48). However, in the programme handbook (page 18), it indicates that students cannot be more than ten minutes late. Discussions with students indicated that they were aware of the overall attendance policy, but there was some confusion as to what is acceptable where lateness for sessions is concerned. The visitors noted that ambiguity in this aspect of how the attendance policy is applied may affect students' attendance records, or lead to their missing large parts of the curriculum's delivery incrementally. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that students on the programme are accurately informed as to the relevant processes and policies applicable to them on the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the resources provided to support students throughout the programme are clear and consistent regarding compensation and condonement regulations throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the research project. At the visit, the education provider explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided, and were unclear as to how this is communicated to students. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that the course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed. However, on page 30 of the programme handbook, it states that if a course assessment does not meet the 50 per cent pass mark, the Progression and Award Board will consider whether other marks can compensate to average out the marks. The visitors

considered that the information given to students does not sufficiently communicate the compensation and condonement policy specific to this programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that the achievement and progression requirements for this programme are communicated consistently and clearly to students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that where students participate as service users in practical teaching, appropriate protocols are used to obtain their consent.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent was sought for participation as a service user in practical and role play activities. The submission document (page 51) also outlined that, "Participation relies on the implied consent on the students' behalf", but the visitors could not find evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved where students participate as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating 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 (such as a consent form to be signed prior to commencing the programme or annually) and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching or role play.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarity as to the policy regarding compensation and condonement for the programmes, to demonstrate how all standards of proficiency are assessed.

Reason: The visitors noted from the programme submission document that compensation or condonement will not be applicable to practice based assessments or the final project. At the visit, the programme team explained that condonement for all other courses was permitted under assessment regulations, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. It was then further clarified that in exercising this discretion the Progression and Award Board choose not to condone at all for this programme. However, the visitors could not find any indication of this in the documentation provided. The education provider also explained that compensation for assessments within modules ('courses') is also permitted under assessment regulations, unless the course specification indicates that students are required to pass all components. The visitors noted that the course specifications indicate that all elements must be passed. However, on page 30 of the programme handbook, it states that if a course assessment does not meet the 50 per cent pass mark, the Progression and Award Board will consider whether other marks can compensate to average out the

marks. If there are assignments which do not necessarily need to be passed in order to complete the programme, the visitors will need information as to the justification for this to ensure that the assessment of all standards of proficiency for social workers in England (SOPs) is not compromised. They therefore require further clarity as to compensation and condonement arrangements for the programme, in order to ensure that all SOPs will be met by students upon graduation.

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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors were referred to information within the assessment regulations as evidence for this SET, which stated that "…Aegrotat may be recommended when a Progression and Award Board does not have enough evidence of the student's performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate."(5.31(d)). In discussion at the visit, it was confirmed that the education provider are able to give aegrotat awards. However, from the evidence provided the visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement that aegrotat awards would not provide eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not lead to eligibility to register as a social worker in England. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to where the policy for aegrotat awards in relation to professional registration is laid out, and how students are informed about this.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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 programme team should keep under review the attendance and lateness policies to ensure they are implemented consistently.

Reason: As noted in the condition against SET 3.8, the visitors noted some inconsistency in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding lateness to teaching and the resulting implications for the attendance records of students. In discussions with students at the visit, the visitors noted some confusion as to the rules amongst different cohorts and heard that there appeared to be differences in the way that various lecturers dealt with students who arrived late for sessions. The visitors were content that there was an appropriate attendance policy in place and were satisfied that the programme team were aware of the correct policy for each programme. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team keep the monitoring of attendance under review in order to ensure consistency of implementation of the attendance policy across the programme.

Richard Barker
Vicki Lawson-Brown

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	11 – 12 December 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 January 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 13 February 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 13 February 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. 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	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	27
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Dina Lewis (University of Hull)
Secretary	Sue Murphy (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Phil Ashwell (College of Operating Department Practitioners) Sarah Frankish (Internal Panel Member) Steve Himsworth (Internal Panel Member) Lucy Hurst (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The external examiner reports' from the last two years related to the approved DipHE Operating Department Practice 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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students and graduates from the DipHE Operating Department Practice 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 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the criminal conviction checks required for the admissions procedures.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit demonstrated criminal conviction checks were undertaken appropriately through the admissions processes. The visitors noted the programme advertising materials online did not include explicit information about the required criminal conviction checks. The visitors consider information about the criminal conviction checks to be important to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the criminal conviction check, information about the level required and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the criminal conviction checks required for the admissions procedures.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme's documentation does not inaccurately refer to HCPC setting the attendance requirements.

Reason: Before the visit, the visitors received information confirming the programme handbook for this new programme would not be created until after the approval event. The visitors were provided with the existing DipHE Operating Department Practice programme handbook. It was confirmed this would be updated to ensure relevance to the new BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The visitors noted the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme handbook includes an incorrect statement; that the HCPC have "regulations that specify the required number of hours for both theory and practice within the approval of this programme" (DipHE ODP Programme Handbook, p16). HCPC programme approval does not set the number of hours for either theory or practice that students' need to complete. This is a programme administrative decision. In order to determine this standard is met the visitors require the education provider to ensure the programme's documentation does not inaccurately refer to HCPC setting the attendance requirements.

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 ensure programme documentation accurately refers to HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were presented with module descriptors for the programme that had updated reading lists. The visitors noted all module descriptors (except module: Fundamentals of Operating Department Practice) refer to an "HCPC Student

Code of Conduct (2012)" (section T throughout). The visitors also noted the module descriptors do correctly refer to the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (section U3 throughout). The HCPC additionally has a publication for students regarding these standards - HCPC's Student guidance on conduct and ethics. To ensure students are being given accurate information about the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics the visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to ensure the correct references are being made throughout. This will support the curriculum in ensuring students understand the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and the implications of the standards on their practise.

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 recommend the programme team monitor closely the assessment of the clinical learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors were assured the programme team would fully prepare all parties for placement and so considered this standard to be met. Through the visit, the visitors heard the assessment of clinical learning outcomes for the DipHE programme had students submitting varied and large amounts of written work. The revised assessment for the BSc programme has an observational rather than a written focus. The visitors are aware the revisions to the method of assessing clinical learning outcomes are a significant change for existing practice placement providers. The visitors recommend the programme team monitor closely how the new assessment method is used to ensure students and practice mentors understand the changes and so the programme team can intervene where necessary to offer further guidance and support the assessment.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team monitor the assessment of the clinical learning outcomes to ensure effectiveness.

Reason: The visitors were assured the measurement of student performance would be objective and ensure fitness to practise and so considered this standard to be met. Through the visit, the visitors heard the assessment of clinical learning outcomes for the DipHE programme had students submitting varied and large amounts of written work. The revised assessment for the BSc programme has an observational rather than a written focus. The visitors considered this change to be appropriate, they considered that demonstrating fitness to practise through written work was difficult and an observational approach is more effective at demonstrating a students' fitness to practise. The visitors are aware the change is a substantial change for mentors to accommodate and will need support from the programme team. The visitors recommend the programme team monitor closely the new assessment method to:
- ensure assessments are carried out objectively and consistently;
- ensure students' fitness to practise is being appropriately demonstrated; and
- to ensure support is provided for mentors if necessary.

Penny Joyce
Julie Weir

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	20 – 21 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 27 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Thursday 13 February 2014 At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Thursday 20 February 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Thursday 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and the professional body (The College of Social Work (TCSW)) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the MA Social Work, full time and PG Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), full time TCSW 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	Michael Branicki (Social Worker) Gary Dicken (Social Worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	60 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Kay Biscomb
Secretary	Toby Roy
Members of the joint panel	Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 and criminal record checks, via the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students had changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that there was intent to speak with new applicants regarding bursaries and that current first year students had been updated, however no formal process was in place. The visitors were also unable to find evidence of information about the costs for criminal record checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that one student had been required to pay for the criminal record check and two had not. The programme team presented correspondence that was sent to all applicants advising them of the requirement to self-fund a criminal records check through the DBS, however, this was sent after a place had been offered and accepted. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants before applying so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure this information is included, along with information about bursaries. In this way the visitors can be sure that potential applicants and students are made aware of any likely additional costs associated with the programme and information about new bursary arrangements.

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 programme admissions documentation to ensure consistency in the information provided to both potential applicants and internal staff.

Reason: Throughout the documentation the visitors noted a number of inconsistencies in the required UCAS points. For example students are advised: "Applicants will normally need to achieve a minimum of 260 UCAS points…" Course Specification, page 10. This contradicts the recruitment process which states "Social work requires applicants to have or be in line to achieve; 3 'A' Levels or equivalent 280 UCAS points…" Recruitment process for social work, page 1. In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors were advised that the UCAS requirement was previously 280 but had since been reviewed and changed to 260 points. The visitors therefore require the programme team to update all programme documentation to provide consistency with the new UCAS requirements.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided it states that; "The course is accredited by the following professional body/ies The HCPC…" BA Social Work Course Guide, page 12. This is incorrect as the HCPC do not accredit programmes, we approve them. It was also noted that there were references to the previous regulatory body, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). For example students are directed to a web link for the GSCC suitability document; "Other Associated Policies & Codes of Conduct: …The General Social Care Council (Suitability for Social Work)…". Fitness to practice procedure policy, page 6. This reference to the previous regulatory body could be misleading to students as the social work profession (in England) came onto the HCPC Register on 1 August 2012. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal protocols in place for gaining students informed consent prior to them partaking in role play sessions, along with information informing them of their right to confidentiality.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. In a meeting with the students, however, it was evident that they had not been given the opportunity to "opt out" of role play activities. The visitors were shown a copy of the education provider's consent form which outlined provisions for gaining students consent to be photographed and / or filmed. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly specify in assessment regulations the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Michael Branicki
Gary Dicken
Joanna Jackson

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	20 – 21 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 27 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Thursday 13 February 2014 At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Thursday 20 February 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Thursday 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and the professional body (The College of Social Work (TCSW)) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social Work, full time and PG Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), full time TCSW 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	Michael Branicki (Social Worker) Gary Dicken (Social Worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	15 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Kay Biscomb
Secretary	Toby Roy
Members of the joint panel	Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 and criminal record checks, via the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students had changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that there was intent to speak with new applicants regarding bursaries and that current first year students had been updated, however no formal process was in place. The visitors were also unable to find evidence of information about the costs for criminal record checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that one student had been required to pay for the criminal record check and two had not. The programme team presented correspondence that was sent to all applicants advising them of the requirement to self-fund a criminal records check through the DBS, however, this was sent after a place had been offered and accepted. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants before applying so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure this information is included, along with information about bursaries. In this way the visitors can be sure 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 programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided it states that; "The course is accredited by the following professional body/ies The HCPC…" BA Social Work Course Guide, page 12. This is incorrect as the HCPC do not accredit programmes, we approve them. It was also noted that there were references to the previous regulatory body, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). For example students are directed to a web link for the GSCC suitability document; "Other Associated Policies & Codes of Conduct: …The General Social Care Council (Suitability for Social Work)…". Fitness to practice procedure policy, page 6. This reference to the previous regulatory body could be misleading to students as the social work profession (in England) came onto the HCPC Register on 1 August 2012. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate,

reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal protocols in place for gaining students informed consent prior to them partaking in role play sessions, along with information informing them of their right to confidentiality.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. In a meeting with the students, however, it was evident that they had not been given the opportunity to "opt out" of role play activities. The visitors were shown a copy of the education provider's consent form which outlined provisions for gaining students consent to be photographed and / or filmed. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly specify in assessment regulations the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

Michael Branicki
Gary Dicken
Joanna Jackson

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Wolverhampton
Programme name	PG Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	20 – 21 November 2013

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 27 December 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Thursday 13 February 2014 At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Thursday 20 February 2014 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Thursday 27 March 2014.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and the professional body (The College of Social Work (TCSW)) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social Work, full time and the MA Social Work, full time TCSW 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	Michael Branicki (Social Worker) Gary Dicken (Social Worker) Joanna Jackson (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	15 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Kay Biscomb
Secretary	Toby Roy
Members of the joint panel	Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 and criminal record checks, via the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students had changed. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information around the new bursary will be communicated to potential applicants and students. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that there was intent to speak with new applicants regarding bursaries and that current first year students had been updated, however no formal process was in place. The visitors were also unable to find evidence of information about the costs for criminal record checks. During discussions with the students it was evident that one student had been required to pay for the criminal record check and two had not. The programme team presented correspondence that was sent to all applicants advising them of the requirement to self-fund a criminal records check through the DBS, however, this was sent after a place had been offered and accepted. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants before applying so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials to ensure this information is included, along with information about bursaries. In this way the visitors can be sure 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 programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided it states that; "The course is accredited by the following professional body/ies The HCPC…" BA Social Work Course Guide, page 12. This is incorrect as the HCPC do not accredit programmes, we approve them. It was also noted that there were references to the previous regulatory body, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). For example students are directed to a web link for the GSCC suitability document; "Other Associated Policies & Codes of Conduct: …The General Social Care Council (Suitability for Social Work)…". Fitness to practice procedure policy, page 6. This reference to the previous regulatory body could be misleading to students as the social work profession (in England) came onto the HCPC Register on 1 August 2012. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate,

reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the formal protocols in place for gaining students informed consent prior to them partaking in role play sessions, along with information informing them of their right to confidentiality.

Reason: Through discussion with the students and programme team, the visitors noted that consent from students when participating as service users in practical teaching was discussed with students verbally at the beginning of the programme. In a meeting with the students, however, it was evident that they had not been given the opportunity to "opt out" of role play activities. The visitors were shown a copy of the education provider's consent form which outlined provisions for gaining students consent to be photographed and / or filmed. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence of clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining and recording consent from students, and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly specify in assessment regulations the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

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

<div align="right">

Michael Branicki
Gary Dicken
Joanna Jackson

</div>