

Visitors' report

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

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 April 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 9 May 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 31 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic and Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	50
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Chris Bland (Coventry University)
Secretary	Sally Sykes (Coventry University) Jon Briggs (Coventry University observing)
Members of the joint panel	Steve Smith (Internal Panel Member) Malcolm Carey (External Panel Member) Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit further information to demonstrate how service user involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit included a Service User and Carer Handbook. Discussions at the visit indicated the service user and carer group work with another education provider in the area and undertake various activities for both education providers. The activities the group participates in for this programme include curriculum delivery, curriculum design and assessment of practice portfolios. In the future they are planning to partake in the admissions processes as well. The visitors considered that with such wide ranging involvement directly relating to students (teaching, assessment and admissions); the programme team needs to have specific guidelines for how service user and carer involvement is managed, how the group is used and how the groups work is monitored to be able to ensure transparency and quality and consistency in the work they provide. The visitors also considered that such guidelines in place would protect the rights and needs of this group whilst they undertake activity with the programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit further information to demonstrate how service user involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide require further evidence to supplement the SOPs mapping document and demonstrate how the programme fully ensures the integration of social work theory to practice within the programme.

Reason: The SOPs mapping document submitted prior to the visit directed the visitors to particular modules to demonstrate how the programme delivers the SOPs. The visitors were unable to determine from the information provided (SOPs mapping, module descriptors and programme handbook) how the programme appropriately ensures the integration of social work theory to practice through the programme. In particular they were unclear as to how the programme delivered and consolidated the students understanding of social work theory including methods of social work intervention. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the students understanding of the theory of social work and methods of social work intervention was introduced outside of the modules on the programme. These elements of learning and teaching were not included within in the standards of proficiency mapping, module descriptors or programme handbook for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to supplement the SOPs mapping document and demonstrate how the programme fully ensures the integration of social work theory to practice within 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 submit further information regarding the online and face to face delivery approaches of the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme has integrated online teaching and learning tools within delivery of the programme. Whilst during the visit the visitors were shown that Skype and Big Blue Button were used for tutorials, seminars and also for meetings with practice placement providers when needed, there was insufficient time to discuss this further. The visitors later considered that communication is central to the profession of social work; communication theories and methods underpin meaningful communication practices and therefore when communicating with students, appropriate consideration needs to be given to the levels of online communication and face to face contact. The visitors highlighted that additional support may be needed for students who constantly experience a high proportion of online communication instead of face to face contact for placement meetings, tutorials and seminars. The visitors require further information regarding the delivery of online teaching and learning and the face to face contact. Particularly this is to ensure the programme team does not place sole focus on one mean of communication over the other and so disadvantage students learning.

Derek Adrian-Harris
Michael Branicki
Deborah Kouzarides

Visitors' report

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

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 April 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 9 May 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 31 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Diagnostic and Therapeutic radiographer) Michael Branicki (Social worker) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Chris Bland (Coventry University)
Secretary	Sally Sykes (Coventry University) Jon Briggs (Coventry University observing)
Members of the joint panel	Steve Smith (Internal Panel Member) Malcolm Carey (External Panel Member) Karen Jones (The College of Social Work) Ann Johnson (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) in Social Work and graduates from a closed MA Social Work (Step up to Social Work) programme as this programme seeking approval 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 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must submit further information to demonstrate how service user involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit included a Service User and Carer Handbook. Discussions at the visit indicated the service user and carer group work with another education provider in the area and undertake various activities for both education providers. The activities the group participates in for this programme include curriculum delivery, curriculum design and assessment of practice portfolios. In the future they are planning to partake in the admissions processes as well. The visitors considered that with such wide ranging involvement directly relating to students (teaching, assessment and admissions); the programme team needs to have specific guidelines for how service user and carer involvement is managed, how the group is used and how the groups work is monitored to be able to ensure transparency and quality and consistency in the work they provide. The visitors also considered that such guidelines in place would protect the rights and needs of this group whilst they undertake activity with the programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit further information to demonstrate how service user involvement within the programme is managed effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide require further evidence to demonstrate how in the programme, students will be taught about, and understand, how to apply social work theory and methods of social work intervention and so will be able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4 upon completion of the programme.

13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the programme ensures students are able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4 upon completion of the programme. In particular they were unclear as to how the programme developed students understanding of social work theory and methods of social work intervention. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the students understanding of the theory of social work and methods of social work intervention was introduced through modules in the first year and then consolidated outside of the academic modules through other aspects of the programme, in particular through Action Learning Sets (ALS). The programme team highlighted that these ALS were planned in a way so that the programme team is able to structure them to enable students to consider social work theory and methods of social work intervention. These elements of learning and teaching were not included within the standards of proficiency mapping, module descriptors or programme handbook for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how in the programme, students will be taught about, and understand, how to apply social work theory and methods of social work intervention. In this way the visitors can be sure the students who successfully complete the programme are able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further information about the design of the Action Learning Sets (ALS) and demonstrate how a consistent approach is maintained for these groups.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the programme integrates and consolidates the development and application of understanding social work theory through the programme. In particular they were unclear as to how the programme allowed students to develop an understanding of how to integrate social work theory and methods of social work intervention to practice. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted this was consolidated outside of the academic modules, in particular through Action Learning Sets (ALS), which have been designed to “act as a forum for enabling students to bridge the gap between theory and practice” (MA Social Work Course Handbook, p23). The programme team highlighted these ALS were planned in a structured way which had not been made apparent within the documentation provided. It was described that the ALS would be made up of small groups of students working with a tutor from the programme. The visitors considered if these groups were the main way in which social work theory to practice would be integrated in the students learning, having separate groups could mean there was the potential that this was being delivered in differing ways. The visitors highlighted there should be a consistent approach to the ALS to ensure the integration of theory to practice for students would be comparable. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further information about the design of the ALS and to demonstrate how a consistent approach is maintained for these groups.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further information regarding the online and face to face delivery approaches of the programme.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme has integrated online teaching and learning tools within delivery of the programme. Whilst during the visit the visitors were shown that Skype and Big Blue Button were used for tutorials, seminars and also for meetings with practice placement providers when needed, there was insufficient time to discuss this further. The visitors later considered that communication is central to the profession of social work; communication theories and methods underpin meaningful communication practices and therefore when communicating with students, appropriate consideration needs to be given to the levels of online communication and face to face contact. The visitors highlighted that additional support may be needed for students who constantly experience a high proportion of online communication instead of face to face contact for placement meetings, tutorials and seminars. The visitors require further information regarding the delivery of online teaching and learning and the face to face contact. Particularly this is to ensure the programme team does not place sole focus on one mean of communication over the other and so disadvantage students learning.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide require further evidence to demonstrate how in the programme, the assessment strategy and design will ensure students understand, how to apply social work theory and methods of social work intervention and so will be able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4 upon completion of the programme.

13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not identify how the programme assessment ensures students are able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4 upon completion of the programme. In particular they were unclear as to how the programme developed and assessed students understanding of social work theory and methods of social work intervention. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the students understanding of the theory of social work and methods of social work intervention was introduced through modules in the first year and then consolidated outside of the academic modules through other aspects of the programme, in particular through Action Learning Sets (ALS). The programme team highlighted that these ALS were planned in a way so that the programme team is able to structure them to enable students to be able to use them to consider social work theory and methods of social work intervention and for the programme team to assess the students understanding. These elements of learning and teaching were not included within the standards of proficiency mapping, module descriptors or programme handbook for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme assesses students understanding and how they apply social work theory and methods of social work intervention. In this way the visitors can be sure the assessment strategy and design ensures students who successfully complete the programme are able to meet SOPs 13.4 and 14.4.

Derek Adrian-Harris
Michael Branicki
Deborah Kouzarides

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool Hope 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	7 – 8 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 April 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 6 June 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 July 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Graeme Currie (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Samantha Herelle
Proposed student numbers	25
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Bart McGettrick (Liverpool Hope University)
Secretary	Jane Blackmore (Liverpool Hope University)
Members of the joint panel	Atulya Nagar (Internal Panel Member) Daniel Jeyaraj (Internal Panel Member) Jane Watkins (Internal Panel Member) Peter Beresford (External Panel Member) Ann Davis (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the additional documents for HCPC validation document 3 BA Social Work and MA Social Work states 'Successful completion leads to the university award of MA Social Work and eligibility for entry to the GSCC Register of Social Work', in document 4 for BA and MA in Social Work, it includes that 'The programme is accredited by the General Social Care Council and leads to qualified social worker status'. The Social work profession (in England) came onto HCPC Register on 1 August 2012 after the GSCC was closed; therefore any reference to the GSCC is incorrect and could be misleading for students and potential applicants. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used and references to the previous regulatory body (GSCC) throughout the documentation submitted. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions and programme documentation to clearly articulate the information potential applicants and students require to support their learning in all settings.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly state attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting. The visitors also noted that that information about the equality and diversity policy was not clearly articulated in the student handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary and policies about equality and diversity in place within the education provider. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed there was an expected attendance of 100% for all components of the programme with allowances made for reasonable absences and students were made aware of the different policies in place. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied that equality and diversity policies and information about attendance requirements were fully communicated to the students. The visitors also noted that if students were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect students' learning and development. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation including the student handbook to be revised to communicate the equality and diversity policy and the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting 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 evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought for participation as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. But there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed 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 in students participating 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 and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included detail about 'structured themes' in the curriculum, with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each structured theme. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed that the education provider is moving towards this holistic approach by introducing the structured themes and so integrating their curriculum. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities to demonstrate how all the SOPs were met. However the visitors were not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that graduates of the programme would meet all of the SOPs for the profession, and therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with their concerns against SET 4.1, the visitors noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not detail how students who successfully completed the programme demonstrate that they meet all of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all of the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

Christine Stogdon
Graeme Currie
Derek Adrian-Harris

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool Hope University
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	7 – 8 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 April 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 6 June 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 July 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Graeme Currie (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Samantha Herelle
Proposed student numbers	25 (Inclusive of Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only))
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Bart McGettrick (Liverpool Hope University)
Secretary	Jane Blackmore (Liverpool Hope University)

Members of the joint panel	Atulya Nagar (Internal Panel Member) Daniel Jeyaraj (Internal Panel Member) Jane Watkins (Internal Panel Member) Peter Beresford (External Panel Member) Ann Davis (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)
----------------------------	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the additional documents for HCPC validation document 3 BA Social Work and MA Social Work states 'Successful completion leads to the university award of MA Social Work and eligibility for entry to the GSCC Register of Social Work', in document 4 for BA and MA in Social Work, it includes that 'The programme is accredited by the General Social Care Council and leads to qualified social worker status'. The Social work profession (in England) came onto HCPC Register on 1 August 2012 after the GSCC was closed; therefore any reference to the GSCC is incorrect and could be misleading for students and potential applicants. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used and references to the previous regulatory body (GSCC) throughout the documentation submitted. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions and programme documentation to clearly articulate the information potential applicants and students require to support their learning in all settings.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly state attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting. The visitors also noted that that information about the equality and diversity policy was not clearly articulated in the student handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary and policies about equality and diversity in place within the education provider. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed there was an expected attendance of 100% for all components of the programme with allowances made for reasonable absences and students were made aware of the different policies in place. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied that equality and diversity policies and information about attendance requirements were fully communicated to the students. The visitors also noted that if students were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect students' learning and development. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation including the student handbook to be revised to communicate the equality and diversity policy and the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting 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 evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought for participation as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. But there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed 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 in students participating 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 and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included detail about 'structured themes' in the curriculum, with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each structured theme. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed that the education provider is moving towards this holistic approach by introducing the structured themes and so integrating their curriculum. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities to demonstrate how all the SOPs were met. However the visitors were not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that graduates of the programme would meet all of the SOPs for the profession, and therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with their concerns against SET 4.1, the visitors noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not detail how students who successfully completed the programme demonstrate that they meet all of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all of the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

Christine Stogdon
Graeme Currie
Derek Adrian-Harris

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Liverpool Hope University
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	7 – 8 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 April 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 6 June 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 July 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer) Graeme Currie (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Samantha Herelle
Proposed student numbers	25 (Inclusive of Masters in Social work)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Bart McGettrick (Liverpool Hope University)
Secretary	Jane Blackmore (Liverpool Hope University)
Members of the joint panel	Atulya Nagar (Internal Panel Member) Daniel Jeyaraj (Internal Panel Member) Jane Watkins (Internal Panel Member) Peter Beresford (External Panel Member) Ann Davis (External Panel Member) Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Amanda Hatton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the additional documents for HCPC validation document 3 BA Social Work and MA Social Work states 'Successful completion leads to the university award of MA Social Work and eligibility for entry to the GSCC Register of Social Work', in document 4 for BA and MA in Social Work, it includes that 'The programme is accredited by the General Social Care Council and leads to qualified social worker status'. The Social work profession (in England) came onto HCPC Register on 1 August 2012 after the GSCC was closed; therefore any reference to the GSCC is incorrect and could be misleading for students and potential applicants. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used and references to the previous regulatory body (GSCC) throughout the documentation submitted. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions and programme documentation to clearly articulate the information potential applicants and students require to support their learning in all settings.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did not clearly state attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting. The visitors also noted that that information about the equality and diversity policy was not clearly articulated in the student handbook. Discussions with the students indicated they knew the procedures to follow when absences were necessary and policies about equality and diversity in place within the education provider. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed there was an expected attendance of 100% for all components of the programme with allowances made for reasonable absences and students were made aware of the different policies in place. From the evidence received the visitors were not satisfied that equality and diversity policies and information about attendance requirements were fully communicated to the students. The visitors also noted that if students were not aware of the threshold requirement, it would be difficult for the education provider to monitor and step in to take action to ensure absence does not affect students' learning and development. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation including the student handbook to be revised to communicate the equality and diversity policy and the minimum attendance requirements for the academic setting and the practice placement setting 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 evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought for participation as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. But there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed 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 in students participating 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 and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included detail about 'structured themes' in the curriculum, with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each structured theme. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed that the education provider is moving towards this holistic approach by introducing the structured themes and so integrating their curriculum. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities to demonstrate how all the SOPs were met. However the visitors were not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that graduates of the programme would meet all of the SOPs for the profession, and therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with their concerns against SET 4.1, the visitors noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not detail how students who successfully completed the programme demonstrate that they meet all of the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all of the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

Christine Stogdon
Graeme Currie
Derek Adrian-Harris

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam 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	13 – 14 February 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 April 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 9 May 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 3 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Kim Bown (Social worker) Caroline Jackson (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Maria Burke
Proposed student numbers	76 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Graham Holden (day 1) (Sheffield Hallam University) Clive Woodman (day 2) (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Purvis (Internal Panel Member) Mike Purdy (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Young (Internal Panel Member) Nicky Sampson (Internal Panel Member)

	<p>Emma Stockdale (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Karen Booker (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Kiefer Lee (External Faculty Panel Member)</p> <p>Wijaya Mallikaaratchi (External Panel Member)</p> <p>Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work)</p>
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

The education provider tabled further information at the visit, but the HCPC was unable to review all of this documentation in detail due to time constraints.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the programme specification states 'The HCPC (2012) does not allow APL in relation to the 170 days of practice learning and the 30 skills days' (page 23) and on page 31, There are references to 'HCPC codes' which do not exist. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. The visitors also noted inconsistencies around the levels of Criminal Record checks/clearance required from potential applicants and students. They also noted the education provider has referenced previous regulatory body (GSCC) in the documentation submitted. Such incorrect and inconsistent statements create confusion and have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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 revise the admissions and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the website and programme handbook indicated that applicants could apply to enter stages of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no clear detailed information about the scheme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that prior certificated credit or prior experiential credit may be used within the programme, and any evidence of prior learning and experience is assessed during short listing and during interview. Also evaluated are each applicant's knowledge of social work roles and responsibilities, social work values and service user perspectives. The team considered how prior experience mapped onto the programme's learning outcomes and determined an appropriate entry point. However, the visitors were unable to determine that enough information was available to potential applicants about APEL. In order to meet this standard, information about APEL should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly indicate how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively.

Reason: This condition relates to SET 6.6 which refers to external examiner's concerns about 'standards of marking feedback to the students'. The visitors noted that there is inconsistency in assessments feedback to the students which may impact measurement of student performance and fitness to practise. However, during discussions with the programme team it was mentioned that the assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. No information about how this system will work was provided to the visitors. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that there are mechanisms in place to deal with the measurement of student performance. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively and consistent feedback is given to the students around assessments.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students on assessments to ensure that feedback is timely, consistent and sufficiently detailed to inform their learning and performance.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided (External Examiner Report 2010-11) included reference to external examiner's concerns about 'the persistent inconsistencies in standards of marking feedback: some scripts are annotated / corrected, others are not; some scripts offer extensive summative feedback, others offer only brief comment; some scripts clearly indicate how second marking / moderation has been undertaken, others do not'. During discussions with the programme team, it was revealed that the issue of feedback and annotation is an area of continued activity towards improvement. The assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. Limited information about how this system will work in practice was provided to the visitors and they remain uncertain whether the education provider has a strategy in place for monitoring feedback on assessments that would identify and address the concerns raised by external examiners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students to make sure that students receive assessment feedback, which is timely, sufficiently detailed and consistent, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Kim Bown
Caroline Jackson
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Nursing (Learning Disability) and Generic Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 February 2012

Contents

Executive summary	2
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	5
Recommended outcome	6
Conditions.....	7

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 April 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 9 May 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 3 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) John Taylor (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
HCPC observer	Maria Burke
Proposed student numbers	25 per year
First approved intake	September 2013
Chair	Graham Holden (day 1) (Sheffield Hallam University) Clive Woodman (day 2) (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Purvis (Internal Panel Member) Mick Purdy (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Young (Internal Panel Member) Nicky Sampson (Internal Panel Member) Emma Stockdale (Internal Panel Member)

	Member) Karen Booker (Internal Panel Member) Kiefer Lee (External Faculty Panel Member) Wijaya Mallikaaratchi (External Panel Member) Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Kath Morris (The College of Social Work) Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work) Peter Griffin (The Nursing and Midwifery Council) Tony Bottiglieri (The Nursing and Midwifery Council)
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

The education provider tabled further information at the visit, but the HCPC was unable to review all of this documentation in detail due to time constraints.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 30 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 27 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.

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 revise all programme and admissions documentation to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted a number of instances where out of date or incorrect terminology is used. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme and admissions documentation to ensure it is accurate, current and consistent. For example, the documents state that 'students have to meet HCPC Standards' (page 60 of the submission document), but does not state which standards, or by when. There is also a statement here that students must comply with 'HCPC (2012b) Standards of education and training (SETs)'. These are standards that the education provider must comply with, rather than students themselves. There are statements in the documents that by the end of the programme students will meet 'all standards required for registration for Social Work (HCPC 2012)' (eg page 20 of the course handbook). Information for prospective students also states that graduates will be 'fully qualified as a social worker'. We expect students to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession when they complete the programme, but the HCPC makes a health and character judgment at the point of registration. Therefore we ask education providers to use the term 'eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC'. There are references to an 'HCPC code of practice' (eg page 6 of the 'Practice Learning & Placement Approval Audit' document), which does not exist. There are also incorrect statements that HCPC registration means an individual can practice as a social worker in the UK, when the HCPC's regulatory responsibility for social workers is England only and several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England. There are also incorrect references to HCPC requirements about the timings and durations of placements (eg page 20 of the submission document) in the documentation. The HCPC does not have specific requirements about length of placement as stated in the documentation. Therefore, the education provider must revisit the programme documentation and update all instances of the use of incorrect and inconsistent terminology.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide clear information about the health requirements for prospective students in their admissions documentation, and set out the process for dealing with any health issues.

Reason: The documentation sets out health requirements, but the visitors noted that this information is nursing focused. The statement 'applicants will be required to undergo health screening to assess their fitness to commence the course within the field of nursing' (page 35 of the submission document) makes it unclear whether these health requirements also apply to the social work elements of the programme. The visitors also noted that there was no information about how the education provider deals with health issues identified as part of the screening, or if there is a declaration process at the point of application. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clarify

the information given to students, to ensure they are aware any health requirements apply to all aspects of the programme. The visitors also require further information about how the education provider deals with any issues with health at the point of application, and that this is clearly reflected in the information given to applicants.

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 revise the admissions and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the website and programme handbook indicated that applicants could apply to enter stages of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no clear detailed information about the scheme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that prior certificated credit or prior experiential credit may be used within the programme, and any evidence of prior learning and experience is assessed during short listing and during interview. Also evaluated are each applicant's knowledge of social work roles and responsibilities, social work values and service user perspectives. The team considered how prior experience mapped onto the programme's learning outcomes and determined an appropriate entry point. However, the visitors were unable to determine that enough information was available to potential applicants about APEL. In order to meet this standard, information about APEL should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there was an equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students, but were not clear how this policy works, or how it is implemented and monitored. Specifically, the visitors were unclear how student progression is monitored in relation to equality and diversity. The education provider tabled information at the visit regarding equality and diversity policies, including annual reports, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored in order to determine whether this standard has been met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

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

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors were unsure how several aspects of the programme are managed. They were unclear of the formal lines of responsibility of the programme team, and how the team interacts with practice placements and the senior team. In the documentation, there is information which defines specific roles at the education provider and at the practice placements (page 6-11 of the course handbook), but it is not always clear how these roles interact with each other, or how these roles are structured in terms of lines of responsibility. The visitors met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement supervisors and discussed this interaction. From these meetings, the visitors were satisfied that these groups understood their roles and responsibilities, but the visitors require this information to be clearly reflected in the documentation.

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

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

Reason: The visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme with the programme team. They discussed some monitoring and evaluation systems in place, but these systems were not always clearly reflected in the programme documentation. Some of the information referenced in the SETs mapping provided was focused on the monitoring of students, rather than monitoring the programme itself, for example, page 54 of the submission document relates to monitoring student progress. The visitors also noted the academic quality framework document titled 'Routine Monitoring and Review', which gives an overview of the ongoing programme review process at the education provider. The visitors were unclear about several aspects of the monitoring and evaluation systems in place, however. Specifically, the visitors were unclear exactly how student feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to students. The visitors also noted the feedback forms for students, practice placement educators and practice placement providers in the practice learning documentation, but were unclear how this feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to stakeholders. Much of the information in the practice learning documentation relates to information about the domains of the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF), information about how to complete placement documentation, and the documentation itself. There is limited information in this document about the procedures behind these feedback mechanisms, or how feedback is considered by the programme team, and the visitors were therefore unclear how this standard is met. The visitors require information which clearly articulates how student feedback is implemented and that robust quality assurance procedures for practice placements are in place to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the individual with overall responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: When reviewing the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine who has overall professional responsibility for the programme and were therefore unable to make a judgment of their suitability for the position. The education provider tabled information at the visit regarding the programme leader, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. In order for this standard to be met, the visitors require details of the individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme, which could include their CV including any registration details, and information about how this individual is supported in their role.

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

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

Reason: Upon reviewing the documentation, and from discussion with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors could not fully determine the staff resources that were in place for the programme. Although the education provider included staff CVs with the documentation, the visitors were unsure which staff were full time, and which were part time or guest lecturers, and were unsure about the level of staffing (full time equivalent) that was in place. The visitors noted from the submission document that 'all... social work lecturers are qualified social workers' but the staff CVs did not state which individuals are registered as social workers in England with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require clarification from the education provider concerning the staffing levels of the programme, to include details of the full and part time members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. The education provider should also provide information on any additional staffing resources that are in place to support the delivery of an effective programme. The education provider should detail how the staffing levels are reviewed in relation to the number of students on the programme and the education provider's strategy for ensuring that an adequate number of staff is in place to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that staff with specialist expertise and knowledge are in place to deliver the programme.

Reason: Upon reviewing the documentation, and from discussion with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors could not fully determine the staff resources that were in place for the programme. Although the education provider included staff CVs with the documentation, the visitors could not determine which of the teaching staff had input into each module, and were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether

subject areas were being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require clarification from the education provider concerning the staffing levels of the programme, to include details of the full and part time members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. The education provider should also provide information on any additional staffing resources that are in place to support the delivery of an effective programme. The education provider should detail how they ensure that staff have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct and how it may be implemented.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation provided, and from discussions with the programme team, practice placement team and the students, the visitors were clear that there are mechanisms in place to deal with any misconduct of students in the education setting. The visitors were unclear, however, how concerns about students' profession-related conduct while on placement are relayed to the programme team, or how any issues would be dealt with by the education provider. The visitors were also unclear how any non-academic conduct issues would be dealt with by the education provider, or whether the students are aware how any issues could impact on future registration. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms by which the education provider manage any concerns with students' profession-related conduct on placement to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure that there is balance between requirements for social work and requirements for nursing.

Reason: The programme intends to deliver graduates that are eligible to apply to the HCPC Register as a social worker in England, and the NMC Register as a nurse. The visitors noted from reading the documentation and from discussions with the students, that the programme is nursing focused. The visitors acknowledge that the students felt prepared as both a social worker and a learning disabilities nurse, however, and noted the work the education provider has done to ensure students are learning skills from both professions while on placement. The visitors also acknowledged the education

provider's work with ensuring students feel like joint practitioners, rather than learning two professions. This work is not reflected clearly enough in the documentation, however, which is often focused on the nursing aspects of the programme. As the visitors were unable to make a judgment about how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England, they were unsure whether all aspects of social work were being adequately covered by the curriculum. Specifically, the visitors were unsure how students were taught about the relationship between social workers and other professional groups. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation to ensure that there is a balance between requirements for social work and nursing, and to ensure all aspects of social work are demonstrated in the learning outcomes for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt that students are taught about the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics during the programme. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find specific reference to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics publication, evidence to outline where exactly the standards of conduct, performance and ethics would be taught in the curriculum or how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and suggest that this document is specifically referenced in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure students' placements are appropriate to support the students' achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, and from discussions with the practice placement team, students, and the programme team, the visitors were unclear how the education provider manages placements to ensure students undertake a sufficient range of practice placements. From their discussions with students, the visitors noted that students were more likely to attend placements focused on learning disabilities nursing. The visitors agreed that social work competencies could be covered in a learning disabilities nursing focused placement, but were unclear about the structure of placements and of the learning outcomes that students are expected to meet when completing all placements. The students also stated that they were expected to manage their own achievement of learning outcomes on placement, and on occasion had to swap placements with their peers to ensure they were able to do so. The practice learning documentation has a 'practice learning agreement' which includes a section

about the student's 'learning needs'. The visitors were unclear how these forms were used to support students' needs on placements, or how they help to manage learning outcomes required of students. The visitors were unclear how the education provider manages this process beyond the audit forms provided. Therefore, the visitors did not have clear evidence that there was a sufficient breadth of social work experience on placement to support students meeting the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. The visitors require further information about the number, duration and range of placements, and how the education provider effectively manages the learning of the students on placement, to support them meeting the SOPs.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation which shows how they ensure a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensured a thorough and effective system was in place for approving and monitoring all placements. In their evidence for meeting this SET, the education provider referenced a quality assurance of practice learning (QAPL) document. The visitors noted that this document is from January 2010 and refers to requirements of the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The education provider also referenced their 'Social Work Practice Learning document' in the SETs mapping document, but it was not clear how this document related to the approval and monitoring of placements. Much of the information in the practice learning documentation relates to information about the domains of the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF), information about how to complete placement documentation, and the documentation itself. There is limited information in this document about the procedures behind these feedback mechanisms, or how feedback is considered by the programme team. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, these groups were clear that there are policies and procedures in place to ensure that placements are monitored. With the documentary information provided however, it was unclear whether the systems in place have been reviewed following the transfer of regulation to the HCPC, and therefore difficult for the visitors to make a judgment about whether they are effective. The visitors were unclear how the education provider approves placements, how this approval is recorded, how they monitor the placement, and how they deal with any issues arising from the monitoring. The visitors require revised documentation which demonstrates how the education provider ensures a thorough and effective system is in place for approving and monitoring all placements.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must submit revised documentation to show how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, and how they are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: From the documents submitted prior to the visit and from discussions with the programme team the visitors were not able to determine what mechanisms are in place to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place, or how

these policies are implemented and monitored. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Social Work Practice Learning document' in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard was met. The education provider also provided a document titled 'Partnership Practice Learning Agreement' to support its meeting of this standard, but the visitors noted that it refers to requirements of the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The visitors were unclear whether this partnership agreement is still in effect in its current form, considering the GSCC has been disbanded. The education provider tabled some information at the visit regarding equality and diversity policies, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors were unclear whether the systems in place have been reviewed following the transfer of regulation to the HCPC, and therefore difficult for the visitors to make a judgment about whether they are effective. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide revised documentation outlining how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place, implemented and monitored within practice placements.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Social Work Practice Learning document' in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, the visitors understood that there are policies and procedures in place to manage staffing levels at practice placements, but these policies and procedures were not reflected in the documentation provided prior to the visit. The education provider tabled documentation at the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems in place to ensure that all practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this standard, the education provider referenced the submission document in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard is met. This document includes a list of job roles which support students at placement, but it is unclear how the education provider ensures that individuals who fill these roles have relevant knowledge, skills and

experience. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, the visitors understood that there are policies and procedures in place to manage this, but these policies and procedures were not reflected in the documentation provided prior to the visit. The education provider tabled documentation at the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience for the delivery of practice placements on an approved social work programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to outline the systems in place to ensure that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate training.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training, including initial training and refresher training. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Social Work Practice Learning document' in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard was met. The education provider also provided a page from their intranet space for practice educations titled 'Training and professional development', but the visitors were unclear whether this training was mandatory, or what it would encompass. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, the visitors understood that there are some policies and procedures in place to manage practice placement education training, such as workshops to support assessors and recall days, but policies and procedures such as these were not reflected sufficiently in the documentation provided prior to the visit. The visitors therefore require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate training.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Practice Learning & placement Approval Audit' document in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document covered this area. Part of the form asks for details of all 'registered social workers' at the placement, but it does not ask for registration numbers. There is also no clear procedure for the continuing audit of practice placement educator's registration. The education provider tabled some documentation at the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, it was clear that there are some policies and procedures in place to manage this, including a database of placements,

but these policies and procedures were not reflected in the documentation provided prior to the visit. The visitors therefore require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide documentation which details the expected placement structure at each stage of the programme and how this information is provided to fully prepare practice placement educators and student for placements.

Reason: From discussions with the students, the visitors understood that they were expected to demonstrate several competencies at each placement. The visitors were unclear about how the demonstration of the ability to meet the competencies led to clear progression through the programme and how progression is communicated to students and practice placement educators. The visitors also could not determine what broad set of competencies each student would be expected to meet after each placement to enable them to progress to the next stage of the programme. The documentation provided states that there is a collaborative approach between students and the education provider with the identification of competencies to be achieved on placement. It was not clear from the documents how the education provider would keep records of the competencies achieved, however. The visitors therefore require further information about the broad set of competencies the programme team would expect a student to have met after each placement. This evidence should also include information about how students and practice placement educators are informed of these requirements to prepare them for placement. This is to ensure that students and practice placement educators are aware of the requirements for successful completion of each placement and that this standard is met.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to ensure that lines of responsibility and expected communication between the programme team and the practice placement team are clearly reflected.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement team, the visitors noted that both groups were clear about lines of responsibility at placements and expectations around communication channels. For example, the practice placement team is involved with a strategic group which manages placements. There is some information regarding the 'hub and spoke' nature of the placements in the submission document, but the visitors were unclear about formal lines of responsibility for placements, and were unsure how the 'hub and spoke' nature of the placements would impact upon this. The visitors were also unclear how the rationale of the hub and spoke placement structure translates into practice, and how the education provider ensures the learning plans agreed by students are met. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Social Work Practice Learning document' in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this document ensured this standard was met. The visitors require a clear explanation of the lines of responsibility on placement, and how effective communication, such as frequency of formal communication, expectations about informal communication and initial communication to new practice placement providers, is maintained to be satisfied that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly indicate how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students on assessments to ensure that feedback is timely, consistent and sufficiently detailed to inform their learning and progression.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided (External Examiner Report 2010-11) included reference to external examiner's concerns about 'the persistent inconsistencies in standards of marking feedback: some scripts are annotated / corrected, others are not; some scripts offer extensive summative feedback, others offer only brief comment; some scripts clearly indicate how second marking / moderation has been undertaken, others do not.' During discussions with the programme team, it was evident that the issue of feedback and annotation is an area of continued activity towards improvement. The assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided

and published to students, so that expectations are clear. Limited information about how this system will work in practice was provided to the visitors and they remain uncertain whether the education provider has a strategy in place for monitoring feedback on assessments that would identify and address the concerns raised by external examiners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students to make sure that students receive assessment feedback, which is timely, sufficiently detailed and consistent, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register, unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From documentation tabled at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the current external examiners for the programme are appropriately registered. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirement that at least one external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC. The visitors noted the 'statement of compliance with university standard assessment regulations and procedures' documentation in the submissions document (page 55-61), but there was no specific reference to the requirement for at least one external examiner to be appropriately registered in this document. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the assessment regulations to ensure that this standard is met.

Gordon Burrow
Vicki Lawson-Brown
John Taylor

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	Masters in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 February 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 April 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 9 May 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 3 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Kim Bown (Social worker) Caroline Jackson (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Maria Burke
Proposed student numbers	29 per year (Inclusive of Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only))
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Graham Holden (day 1) (Sheffield Hallam University) Clive Woodman (day 2) (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Purvis (Internal Panel Member) Mick Purdy (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Young (Internal Panel Member)

	<p>Nicky Sampson (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Emma Stockdale (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Karen Booker (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Kiefer Lee (External Faculty Panel Member)</p> <p>Wijaya Mallikaaratchi (External Panel Member)</p> <p>Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work)</p>
--	---

Sources of evidence

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

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

The education provider tabled further information at the visit, but the HCPC was unable to review all of this documentation in detail due to time constraints.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the programme specification states 'The HCPC (2012) does not allow APL in relation to the 170 days of practice learning and the 30 skills days' (page 23) and on page 31, There are references to 'HCPC codes' which do not exist. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. The visitors also noted inconsistencies around the levels of Criminal Record checks/clearance required from potential applicants and students. They also noted the education provider has referenced previous regulatory body (GSCC) in the documentation submitted. Such incorrect and inconsistent statements create confusion and have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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 revise the admissions and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the website and programme handbook indicated that applicants could apply to enter stages of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no clear detailed information about the scheme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that prior certificated credit or prior experiential credit may be used within the programme, and any evidence of prior learning and experience is assessed during short listing and during interview. Also evaluated are each applicant's knowledge of social work roles and responsibilities, social work values and service user perspectives. The team considered how prior experience mapped onto the programme's learning outcomes and determined an appropriate entry point. However, the visitors were unable to determine that enough information was available to potential applicants about APEL. In order to meet this standard, information about APEL should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly indicate how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively.

Reason: This condition relates to SET 6.6 which refers to external examiner's concerns about 'standards of marking feedback to the students'. The visitors noted that there is inconsistency in assessments feedback to the students which may impact measurement of student performance and fitness to practise. However, during discussions with the programme team it was mentioned that the assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. No information about how this system will work was provided to the visitors. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that there are mechanisms in place to deal with the measurement of student performance. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively and consistent feedback is given to the students around assessments.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students on assessments to ensure that feedback is timely, consistent and sufficiently detailed to inform their learning and performance.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided (External Examiner Report 2010-11) included reference to external examiner's concerns about 'the persistent inconsistencies in standards of marking feedback: some scripts are annotated / corrected, others are not; some scripts offer extensive summative feedback, others offer only brief comment; some scripts clearly indicate how second marking / moderation has been undertaken, others do not'. During discussions with the programme team, it was revealed that the issue of feedback and annotation is an area of continued activity towards improvement. The assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. Limited information about how this system will work in practice was provided to the visitors and they remain uncertain whether the education provider has a strategy in place for monitoring feedback on assessments that would identify and address the concerns raised by external examiners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students to make sure that students receive assessment feedback, which is timely, sufficiently detailed and consistent, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Kim Bown
Caroline Jackson
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 February 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 April 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 9 May 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 3 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Kim Bown (Social worker) Caroline Jackson (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Maria Burke
Proposed student numbers	29 per year (Inclusive of Masters in Social work)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Graham Holden (day 1) (Sheffield Hallam University) Clive Woodman (day 2) (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Purvis (Internal Panel Member) Mick Purdy (Internal Panel Member) Barbara Young (Internal Panel Member) Nicky Sampson (Internal Panel Member)

	<p>Emma Stockdale (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Karen Booker (Internal Panel Member)</p> <p>Kiefer Lee (External Faculty Panel Member)</p> <p>Wijaya Mallikaaratchi (External Panel Member)</p> <p>Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Kath Morris (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work)</p>
--	--

Sources of evidence

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

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

The education provider tabled further information at the visit, but the HCPC was unable to review all of this documentation in detail due to time constraints.

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the programme specification states 'The HCPC (2012) does not allow APL in relation to the 170 days of practice learning and the 30 skills days' (page 23) and on page 31, There are references to 'HCPC codes' which do not exist. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. The visitors also noted inconsistencies around the levels of Criminal Record checks/clearance required from potential applicants and students. They also noted the education provider has referenced previous regulatory body (GSCC) in the documentation submitted. Such incorrect and inconsistent statements create confusion and have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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 revise the admissions and programme documentation to articulate clearly the scheme for the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (APEL) or other inclusion mechanisms that are in place for programme entry.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that, while the website and programme handbook indicated that applicants could apply to enter stages of the programme and be admitted through an accreditation procedure, there was no clear detailed information about the scheme. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that prior certificated credit or prior experiential credit may be used within the programme, and any evidence of prior learning and experience is assessed during short listing and during interview. Also evaluated are each applicant's knowledge of social work roles and responsibilities, social work values and service user perspectives. The team considered how prior experience mapped onto the programme's learning outcomes and determined an appropriate entry point. However, the visitors were unable to determine that enough information was available to potential applicants about APEL. In order to meet this standard, information about APEL should be clearly articulated to potential applicants. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the students and the programme team that there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical sessions. The visitors were concerned that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles. The education provider did not provide any further detailed mapping to show how the programme's learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

Reason: In line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit did not clearly indicate how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively.

Reason: This condition relates to SET 6.6 which refers to external examiner's concerns about 'standards of marking feedback to the students'. The visitors noted that there is inconsistency in assessments feedback to the students which may impact measurement of student performance and fitness to practise. However, during discussions with the programme team it was mentioned that the assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. No information about how this system will work was provided to the visitors. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that there are mechanisms in place to deal with the measurement of student performance. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively and consistent feedback is given to the students around assessments.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students on assessments to ensure that feedback is timely, consistent and sufficiently detailed to inform their learning and performance.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided (External Examiner Report 2010-11) included reference to external examiner's concerns about 'the persistent inconsistencies in standards of marking feedback: some scripts are annotated / corrected, others are not; some scripts offer extensive summative feedback, others offer only brief comment; some scripts clearly indicate how second marking / moderation has been undertaken, others do not'. During discussions with the programme team, it was revealed that the issue of feedback and annotation is an area of continued activity towards improvement. The assessment officer is taking a lead on developing and implementing a system that means the feedback format for each module will be decided and published to students, so that expectations are clear. Limited information about how this system will work in practice was provided to the visitors and they remain uncertain whether the education provider has a strategy in place for monitoring feedback on assessments that would identify and address the concerns raised by external examiners. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further information about how it monitors the processes for providing feedback to students to make sure that students receive assessment feedback, which is timely, sufficiently detailed and consistent, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Kim Bown
Caroline Jackson
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Swansea University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of visit	6 – 7 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 April 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 9 May 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 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 July 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Elizabeth Ross (Hearing aid dispenser) Patricia Fillis (Diagnostic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
HCPC observer	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	8
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Mary Paget (Swansea University)
Secretary	Jayne Walters (Swansea University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as external examiners' reports have not been produced for this programme as the programme is new. The HCPC reviewed external examiner reports from the approved BSc (Hons) Audiology programme.

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Audiology 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that there were inconsistent references to the programme title through the documentation. For example, the cover page of the Programme handbook refers to the programme title as 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)'. Elsewhere in this document, and in other documentation, such as the education provider's prospectus for 2013, the programme is referred to as 'BSc Healthcare Science (Audiology)'. The visitors also noted there were statements through the documentation that upon graduating from the programme students would be 'eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC', but it was not always clear as which profession. The visitors also noted that the education provider's prospectus stated there were '50 weeks of placement'. Other documents indicated planned placement provision for the programme is 61 weeks, which was reinforced by the programme team. Upon discussion with the programme team, the visitors understood that there were two proposals for the programme when the prospectus was produced, and that one proposal would have included 50 weeks of placement. The proposal that was agreed has 61 weeks of practice placements, however. This information is potentially misleading to prospective students, as they may need to attend placements for longer than expected. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that future advertising materials produced state the correct number of placement weeks, and require the documentation to be revised to ensure consistency of terminology.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that they have a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place before the programme commences in September 2013.

Reason: From communication with the education provider before the visit, and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that one of the experienced members of staff will shortly be leaving the programme team. This individual was joint programme leader for the programme and was also the module lead for several modules. At the visit, the senior team discussed a timetable for replacing this member of staff, and stated that they expected to have someone in post by the start of the new programme. The visitors were not given a formal recruitment plan however, so they were unable to make a judgement about whether the new member of staff will have appropriate skills and experience to ensure that this standard is met. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of how the programme and senior team will ensure that the new member of staff is appropriately qualified and experienced, and how they will ensure a new staff member is in place before the programme starts in September 2013.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all students have sufficient access to core texts throughout the programme and in all settings.

Reason: From discussion with the students, the visitors noted that access to the main recommended texts from the module descriptors could be problematic, especially when on placement and during busy times of the year. Students may be placed several hours away from the main Swansea campus for extended periods. The visitors noted that the programme team is proactive with providing IT support to students when on placement, and has given students access to other institution's libraries. However, the students did not feel that they always had access to the main recommended texts when on placement, and were not clear of all of the resources available to them. The students were also concerned that there was limited access to the main recommended texts in the main campus library, as there were low numbers of certain books (for example Dillon (2012) Hearing Aids), especially at busy times of the year, such as when dissertations are being written. The visitors require the education provider to address the shortfall of student access to the main recommended texts in all settings, and at all times of the year.

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 revise the programme documentation to clearly articulate procedures for students withholding consent from participating as a service user in practical or clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted that there is a consent form in place for students participating as service users, which is completed on an annual basis. This form states: 'if you feel for any reason that you are unable at any given time to undertake a practical skill, seek the guidance of the programme manager immediately'. The students and programme team were clear that students could withhold consent on an ad hoc and informal basis in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were not clear how this may impact on the student who withholds consent. There was no method of formally recording students who opt out of these sessions, and no policy to address how the education provider manages any impact of students opting out of these sessions. The visitors require information which details formal procedures for students opting out of participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching, which also demonstrates how the programme team ensures that there is no detriment to the academic or clinical progression of students who choose to opt out.

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 that all parties are clear about the attendance policies, and how and whether students should make up any missed time.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there were monitoring systems in place for student attendance. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider manages students making up time when it is missed. For example, the programme

team stated that it is their responsibility to make decisions about students making up time when on placement. The students, however, suggested that practice placement educators make this decision. The visitors were also unclear how the education provider ensures consistency across these decisions. The students noted that decisions about making up time could depend on which practice placement educator the student was dealing with. The visitors also noted that the programme handbook states that 'attendance is COMPULSORY AT ALL Clinical Placements and other practical classes' (page 28), but then states that 'in the event of sickness or unplanned absence from placement you MUST telephone the placement department within 30 minutes of the start of the working day to explain why you will be absent and to discuss how long you are likely to be absent for.' This information is inconsistent and could be confusing to students when considering attendance. The visitors were also unclear whether time would need to be made up in these situations. The visitors therefore require information which demonstrates the education provider's ownership of the making back time policy, and clarification of the attendance policies in the programme handbook.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where 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 hearing aid dispenser. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is accessible to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how they provide profession specific support to external examiners if they are not HCPC registered hearing aid dispensers.

Reason: From discussions with the senior team, and from the documentation provided, the visitors were satisfied that the current external examiner is appropriately experienced as an external examiner. They noted that, although their background was in audiology, they were not an HCPC registered hearing aid dispenser. The visitors were unclear of the support mechanisms in place for the external examiner in areas where they have limited experience of the profession. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how they provide support to external examiners if they are not HCPC registered hearing aid dispensers.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider ensures students fully understand how to resolve any issues with accommodation when on placement before they are in the placement setting.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are policies and procedure in place to manage the problems that students have with their accommodation while on placement, and therefore that this standards is met. The visitors were also clear that the education provider gives students advice about the policies and procedures in place. In discussions with the students, the visitors also noted that the students understood what to do if there were any issues on placements. The students were only familiar with these procedures from experience with problems with accommodation, however, rather than from the advice given by the education provider. The visitors recommend that the programme team strengthens the advice it gives to students, so they understand policies and procedures for problems with accommodation before they need to address any issues.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to develop its links with practice placements in the private setting.

Reason: From the documentation and from discussions with the programme team, the visited noted that there is currently no opportunity for students to work formally and directly with a hearing aid dispenser in the private setting when on placement. The visitors noted the work that the education provider is doing to formalise contact time for students with hearing aid dispensers in the placement setting. Although the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met, they noted that placement experience with a private hearing aid dispenser would be beneficial to students. The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to develop their work in this area, so that students have mandatory contact with hearing aid dispensers in the practice placement setting.

Elizabeth Ross
Patricia Fillis

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of visit	19 - 20 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'Speech and language therapist' or 'Speech therapist' 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 19 April 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 9 May 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 April 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

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 - 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy, MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration) and Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy. The education provider, the professional bodies 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	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	20
First approved intake	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Peter Luther (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Adam Brown (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists and External Panel Member) Martin Colley (Internal Panel Member) Tery Killick (Internal Panel Member) Alan Wyatt (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise advertising materials for the programme to clarify whether a relevant degree is an essential or a desirable entry requirement.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation provided prior to the visit and the programmes online advertising materials indicated an entry requirement for the programme was “a relevant degree”. Upon discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme would admit persons who did not have a relevant degree, and an example was provided of a successful application of a student with a previous qualification unrelated to one of the specified areas of study “psychology; language and linguistics; social science; biological sciences; medical sciences or equivalent” (Recruitment and selection process and strategy - Appendix ASLT Information Flyer). The visitors considered further clarity should be provided to applicants and potential applicants about whether a relevant degree was an ‘essential’ requirement or a ‘desirable’ one to ensure that when making informed decisions about whether to apply for a place on the programme or not, all the necessary information is available. The visitors require the education provider to revise the advertising materials to clarify whether a relevant degree is an essential or a desirable entry requirement for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to monitor equality and diversity through the admissions procedures and continue to make efforts, where possible, to increase the diversity of the cohorts.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted the programme’s cohorts have a tendency to be from a particular profile which they identified as being not unusual for this profession. The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the equality and diversity of applicants and those admitted onto the programme. The visitors recommend the programme team use this to continue to identify, where possible, if further efforts can be made to increase the diversity of the cohorts through admissions.

Anthony Power
Lucy Myers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Essex
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Speech and Language Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time accelerated
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Speech and language therapist
Date of visit	19 - 20 March 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 April 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 9 May 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 April 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration), MSc Physiotherapy (pre registration) and Post Graduate Diploma in Physiotherapy. The education provider, the professional bodies 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	Anthony Power (Physiotherapist) Lucy Myers (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	20
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Peter Luther (University of Essex)
Secretary	Kirstie Sceats (University of Essex)
Members of the joint panel	Adam Brown (Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists and External Panel Member) Martin Colley (Internal Panel Member) Tery Killick (Internal Panel Member) Alan Wyatt (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit for this programme. This programme is a new step off award from the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme. The visitors reviewed the external examiners reports from the last two years for the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme.

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

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

This programme is a new step off award from the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme. The HCPC met with students from the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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 revise advertising materials for the programme to clarify whether a relevant degree is an essential or a desirable entry requirement.

Reason: This programme is an exit award for the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme, students do not apply directly to this programme, they apply for the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme. Therefore the advertising materials refer to the MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre registration) programme and not directly to this programme. The visitors noted the documentation provided prior to the visit and the programmes online advertising materials indicated an entry requirement for the programme was “a relevant degree”. Upon discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme would admit persons who did not have a relevant degree, and an example was provided of a successful application of a student with a previous qualification unrelated to one of the specified areas of study “psychology; language and linguistics; social science; biological sciences; medical sciences or equivalent” (Recruitment and selection process and strategy - Appendix ASLT Information Flyer). The visitors considered further clarity should be provided to applicants and potential applicants about whether a relevant degree was an ‘essential’ requirement or a ‘desirable’ one to ensure that when making informed decisions about whether to apply for a place on the programme or not, all the necessary information is available. The visitors require the education provider to revise the advertising materials to clarify whether a relevant degree is an essential or a desirable entry requirement for the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider continue to monitor equality and diversity through the admissions procedures and continue to make efforts, where possible, to increase the diversity of the cohorts.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied this standard is met. The visitors noted the programme’s cohorts have a tendency to be from a particular profile which they identified as being not unusual for this profession. The visitors recommend the programme team continue to monitor the equality and diversity of applicants and those admitted onto the programme. The visitors recommend the programme team use this to continue to identify, where possible, if further efforts can be made to increase the diversity of the cohorts through admissions.

Anthony Power
Lucy Myers

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	13 – 14 February 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	15

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Wednesday 10 April 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 9 May 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 19 April 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 Thursday 6 June 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 and validating body validated the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) Part time programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Christine Murphy (Biomedical scientist) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Catherine Rendell (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jo Cahill (Internal Panel Member) Dominic Bygate (Internal Panel Member) Aristides Mapouras (Internal Panel Member) Melan Kurera (Internal Panel Member) Paul Watson (External Panel Member) David Parkinson (External Panel Member) Wendy Leversuch (The Institute of Biomedical Science) Jim Cunningham (The Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BSc Biomedical sciences and BSc Applied Biomedical Sciences programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved. The visitors agreed that 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 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/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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the entry requirements, process for admission and any additional financial requirements that students may have to cover.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the advertising materials for the education provider's existing biomedical science programmes prior to the visit, and further draft advertising materials specific to the healthcare science programme were provided at the visit. The visitors noted that information will be provided on the university website following the programme's validation. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were made aware that as part of the admissions process, the programme requires students to attend at least one interview, and undertake numeracy and literacy tests. Students will also be required to self-declare any health issues and anything that may show up on an enhanced criminal records bureau (CRB) check. The visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how applicants will be informed about the interview, the nature of the questions they will be asked when applying and the requirements around the CRB and occupational health. The visitors were also unable to determine from the documentation, who will bear the cost of any CRB checks or relevant inoculations that may be required. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the details about the admissions procedures and any additional costs applicants may be required to cover. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme team ensures that applicants can make an informed choice 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 programme team must revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the progression routes through the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the advertising materials for the education provider's existing biomedical sciences programmes prior to the visit, and further draft advertising materials specific to the healthcare science programme were provided at the visit. The visitors noted that information will be provided on the university website following the programme's validation. In the meeting with the programme team the visitors were made aware that there will be two routes on to the healthcare science programme, through direct entry or through a transfer from one of the biomedical science programmes after the completion of the first semester of year one of the programme. The visitors were also made aware that students who are direct entrants to the programme may be subjected to an additional interview at the end of semester one, alongside the students transferring from other biomedical science programmes. It was suggested that students who had directly applied to the programme may not be able to continue based on their performance at this interview and would be transferred to an

alternative biomedical science programme if required. The visitors could not determine, from the documentary evidence provided, how applicants will be informed about the routes through the programme and the possible requirements for an additional interview at the end of semester one. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation and advertising materials to ensure they clearly articulate the required details about the progression routes through the programme, to ensure that applicants can make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation showing which staff will be teaching on which modules.

Reason: The visitors reviewed staff curriculum vitae and a document showing module coordinators prior to the visit as part of the education providers' documentary submission. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided which members of staff would be teaching on each of the modules. As such the visitors were unable to determine if the programme was being taught by staff with relevant expertise and knowledge. In order to ensure that the teaching staff have sufficient expertise and knowledge for the modules' subject areas, the visitors require further evidence which articulates which members of staff will be responsible for teaching which modules. In this way the visitors will be able to determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for biomedical scientists and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit contained occurrences of incorrect or misleading information. The visitors noted that there should be more clarity around the process of registering as a biomedical scientist with the HCPC. There are frequent references to the necessity of students' completing the 'certificate of competence' in order to register as a biomedical scientist and the requirement for the completion of a 'portfolio'. The documentation also refers to registration with the 'HPC' as a 'Healthcare Science Practitioner' (student handbook, p8) and at various points in the documentation refers to 'state registration' as a biomedical scientist. The HCPC does not require the certificate of competence, or a portfolio to be completed in addition to an already approved programme in order for a student to become eligible to apply to the Register. The HCPC also does not protect the title of 'healthcare science practitioner' and does not confer 'state registration'. The health and care professions council (HCPC) has also recently changed its name from the health professions council (HPC) due to legislative requirements. The visitors require these errors in the use of terminology to be rectified in order to ensure that they do not unintentionally mislead or confuse students. The visitors also require the terminology around the use of 'portfolio' and certificate of competence to be clarified in order for students to clearly understand the requirements for successful completion of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide any documentation that is revised as a result of the upcoming event to validate the programme against Medical Education England's (MEE) modernising scientific careers (MSC) standards.

Reason: The visitors noted, in conversation with the programme team, that the programme was due to be visited by MEE to determine if the programme meets the standards required for MSC accreditation. The visitors were also aware that due to the specific requirements of MEE there may be a number of changes that will need to be made to the programme documentation to meet these additional standards. If this is the case the visitors will require further evidence of these changes to ensure that the documentation they have reviewed is the final documentation that will be used by the programme team.

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 the visitors with a copy of the student consent form.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the education provider has a mechanism in place for obtaining student consent, but need to see an example of the form in order to ensure that all the aspects of student participation as service users in practical and clinical teaching are appropriately addressed. Therefore the visitors require a copy of the LEC2 consent form as specified in the programme documentation. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the attendance requirements for students throughout the course of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation provided that an outline of the mechanisms that will be in place to monitor attendance was provided to students. However, the visitors were aware that while 'low attendance' for levels four or five of the programme would be dealt with through the process as articulated in the student handbook, there was no clarity about what 'low attendance' was. There was also a lack of clarity around which aspects of the programme were mandatory and carried a 100% attendance requirement. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme documentation will articulate to students the required attendance levels for the different aspects of the programme and what the consequences of missing these requirements will be on their progression through the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify how professionalism issues raised at the entrance interview or on practice placements will feed into the student suitability scheme that is in place.

Reason: The documentation outlined that a student suitability scheme will be used to ensure that issues raised about a student's professionalism or fitness to practice would be handled fairly and effectively. The programme team also informed the visitors that an interview at application would measure the student's suitability for the programme, and that practice placement educators would report to the education provider on the student's professionalism on placements. However, the visitors could not determine how the mechanisms at interview or on placement will feed into the main suitability scheme in place for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to how these separate mechanisms for determining students' suitability will feed into each other to ensure a uniform and clear approach to dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the formal processes in place for approving placements are thorough and effective.

Reason: The visitors noted that the documentary evidence provided for SET 5.4 was a pre-placement agreement. It asks for the Clinical Pathology Accreditation (CPA) status and Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) clinical laboratory pre-registration training status of the placements and any upcoming dates for review, as a way of ensuring the placements are suitable. Through discussion with the programme team, it was established that visits to the placement provider by the programme team, and an audit would also assess the placement prior to approval. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how these processes are undertaken, recorded and monitored. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider uses the information gathered through their formal processes to ensure that approved placements are suitable for their students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the formal processes in place which ensure that practice placements are thoroughly and effectively monitored.

Reason: The documentary evidence provided for SET 5.4 was a pre-placement agreement, which asks for the CPA accreditation status and IBMS clinical laboratory pre-registration training status of the placements and any upcoming dates for review, as a way of ensuring the placements are suitable. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were also made aware that the university link tutor will be visiting the student in placement and reviewing student feedback. It was highlighted that the purpose of this visit is principally to assess the students' progress, and may highlight issues with the

placement too late for them to be effectively addressed or resolved. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors questioned what would be done with the information provided in the pre-placement agreement. The programme team indicated that the information would feed into monitoring and that if the placement provider was under review from CPA or IBMS then this would be taken into consideration when placing students. However the visitors were not provided with evidence of formal monitoring procedures detailing, for example, what happens when difficulties arise with placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence that clearly demonstrates that the education provider takes overall responsibility for the practice placements on the programme, including the measures taken to monitor placements.

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

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

Reason: For evidence against SET 5.6, the education provider referenced the pre-placement agreement with the placement provider, particularly Section 3.1.3; “The Placement Provider will support the Placement Student by: Providing adequate supervision and guidance such that the student may undertake the responsibilities required by placement.” This indicates that the placement provider will determine what is deemed as ‘adequate’ supervision and guidance. The visitors did not see sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of staff, with the relevant qualifications and experience to support the students in placements. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly articulates the criteria for practice placement providers, in terms of the requirements for appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and the steps taken by the education provider to check that these criteria are met by each placement provider.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure the placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience needed to work with students from this programme.

Reason: For evidence against SET 5.7, the education provider referenced the pre-placement agreement with the placement provider. As noted in the condition against SET 5.6, the visitors were unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitable practice placement educators were in place, including whether they have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken to check that these criteria are met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the initial training and refresher training that will be provided to practice placement educators, on the particular requirements of the programme.

Reason: The documentation (Information for practice educators document) indicates that the programme team provides a half day of training each year for new placement assessors / educators and mentors. In discussion with the programme team, it was confirmed that this would include an overview of the programme, placements, learning outcomes, the portfolio, roles of the placement staff and support structures. In addition, it will prepare the placement staff for undertaking assessments and supervising projects. It was unclear from the documentation if this would also act as annual refresher training for placement educators who were already involved with the programme. As practice placement educators are involved in assessing student performance it is imperative that all practice placement educators are orientated towards the programme and its requirements. The visitors were unsure from the evidence provided how the programme team covered the breadth of information in the identified half day of training, particularly given the criteria for assessments and the complexities of level six students' project supervision will need to be covered. The visitors therefore need further evidence to show how the programme team will ensure that all practice placement educators are appropriately trained in advance of receiving students. In addition, the visitors require clarification regarding what refresher training requirements there are for established placement educators. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must articulate clearly in programme documentation how they check that placement educators are HCPC registered and, where this is not the case, the steps that will be taken to ensure that appropriate arrangements are agreed.

Reason: As for the condition against SET 5.6, the evidence provided for this standard is the pre-practice agreement with the placement provider. Through discussion with the programme team, it was indicated that the practice placement staff will be checked for HCPC registration. However, the pre-practice agreement and the Information for practice educators document do not clearly outline the requirements for staff acting as practice placement educators. The visitors were also unclear about this from evidence provided at the visit as there was no clear articulation of the system that would be used by the education provider to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process that will be in place to ensure that this standard can be met.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of the expected placement experience at each stage of the programme, and how this information is provided to fully prepare practice placement educators to supervise students.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided to placement providers in preparation for placements. The visitors also heard from the programme team about the broad set of competencies that a student will be expected to have met after each placement block. As noted in the condition against SET 5.9, the visitors did not see sufficient evidence to demonstrate how the current proposed communications and training provided to placement educators will provide them with sufficient understanding of the placement learning outcomes and assessments. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will ensure that practice placement educators will have a full understanding of the requirements and assessment procedures for each placement block prior to taking students. In this way the visitors can determine if this standard can be met.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide further detail of the how the information about assessment procedures on placement, including the implications of failure to progress at each stage, is provided to students to fully prepare them.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided to students which is provided to prepare them for placements. The visitors also heard from the programme team about the broad set of competencies that a student will be expected to have met after each placement block. It was made clear during this meeting that if a student fails to achieve competencies during the placement weeks, this may have implications on their progression, and may result in them not having a full summer vacation as they undertake further assessments to demonstrate all competencies. The visitors also noted that, particularly for the level 5 placement, there is a very small window for students to re-sit their placement in cases where all competencies have not been met within the fifteen weeks, due to the proximity to the exam board. The visitors could not

see where in the documentation the requirements for successful completion of each placement are highlighted to students. They could also not identify where the detail about how the relative achievement, or failure, to meet the required competencies at each stage will affect students' progression. Further evidence is therefore required to demonstrate that students are made aware of the requirements for each placement and implications for them of any failure to meet the required competencies within the time allocated for placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the external verification process for the assessment students' practical experiences will work in practice.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team confirmed to the visitors that the external verification process for the assessment of their practical experience will be managed by the education provider towards the end of level six. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how and when the process around external verification process would be carried out. The visitors were also unclear about what this process for engaging external verifiers entails and how it is managed to ensure that any external verification dovetails with relevant examination boards at the education provider, to ensure that students can progress and graduate in good time. The programme team must therefore provide further evidence that the process for external verification is rigorous and effective, clearly stating the timing and details for external verification.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression, the timings for assessments and procedures for a failing student throughout the programme.

Reason: From reading the education provider-wide academic regulations the visitors were clear that students must pass 120 credits at each year of an undergraduate degree in order to progress to the next year and graduate in year three. However, from the documentation provided and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that there were 135 credits associated with the first year of this programme. The programme team clarified that students would be able to progress with 120 credits, if they miss 15 credits from elsewhere in the first year. However the visitors were unclear which credits these could be, which modules could be failed and how this would affect a student's ability to progress through the programme and meet all of the learning outcomes required. In discussion with the programme team, further details were given on the procedures and timings for re-assessing students who have not met all of the required competencies in placements. The visitors noted that, particularly for the level 5 placement, there is a very small window for students to 're-sit' their placement in cases where all competencies have not been met within the fifteen weeks, due to the proximity to the exam board. The visitors were unsure how students on the programme were informed about the requirements for achievement and progression in these cases and in particular what impact the failure to meet certain competencies may have on their ability to graduate. The visitors therefore require further evidence which

demonstrates that the criteria for progression and achievement throughout the programme is clearly articulated in the programme documentation. This should include the procedures that will be used to deal with failure, relevant step-off points for students, what chances are available to re-sit or complete further practice placement experience and how these feed into the timings of examination boards throughout the programme. In this way the visitors can determine if the programme can meet this standard.

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

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

Reason: The programme specification (p14) states that an external examiner will be appointed who is a registered biomedical scientist. The visitors require further evidence of the policies for appointing external examiners in order to ensure that the requirements guarantee that the external examiner is appropriately experienced and qualified.

Recommendations

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider are reminded to inform the HCPC if there are significant changes to student recruitment to the programme.

Reason: The visitors' recommendation for approval of the programme is based on an expected cohort of ten students, where they are satisfied that this standard can be met. However, the education provider should keep the HCPC informed through the major change process if the actual recruitment to the programme is significantly higher or lower than ten students in order for the programme's ability to continue to meet the SETs under the new conditions to be considered.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider adjustments to the external verification process for students' placement experiences, to more evenly distribute the verification throughout the programme.

Reason: During the visit, the programme team confirmed to visitors that the external verification process will be managed by the education provider at a point near the end of level six of the programme. In discussion, the visitors highlighted that this could uncover issues with the students' placement experiences too late in the programme for them to be addressed effectively. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider consider dispersing the external verification process throughout the duration of the programme.

Christine Murphy
Peter Ruddy

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Huddersfield
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	21 – 22 February 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 10 April 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 9 May 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 3 May 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 6 June 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Maria Burke
Proposed student numbers	60 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Carl Meddings (University of Huddersfield)
Secretary	Sue Ford (University of Huddersfield)
Members of the joint panel	Janet Hargreaves (Internal Panel Member) Martyn Walker (Internal Panel Member) Hazel Parkinson (External Panel Member) Deborah Robinson (External Panel Member) Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practice)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. However HCPC did review external examiners' report from the last two years for the 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators/mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 4 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the programme handbook on page 49 states 'the HPC require evidence of the student completing a minimum of 3000 course hours' and on page 65 under appendix two student agreement, it states 'I understand I am required to record at least 3000hrs of appropriate attendance for Professional and Statutory Body requirements'. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. The HCPC does not have any specific requirements for attendance of students in the clinical or academic setting. Such incorrect statements could create confusion and mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation to ensure it effectively supports student learning in all settings.

Reason: Through reviewing programme documentation the visitors were aware the documentation will be provided to students to support their learning in all settings. However, the visitors noted in discussion with the joint panel that the education provider's internal panel and the professional body have set certain conditions on the programme as part of the validation process. As part of these conditions several aspects of the programme documentation may be changed to fit the professional body and education providers' requirements. In particular the education provider's internal panel and the professional body highlighted areas in the module descriptors for the programme that will need amendments to meet conditions set. The visitors noted that if the programme documentation changes as a result of the professional body and education provider's conditions this may affect how the programme meets this standard. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide finalised programme documentation to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to show formal protocols to obtain informed consent for when students participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought for participation as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. But there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed 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 in trainees participating 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 and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);

1b.3 be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and carers

- be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7.0 of the International English Language Testing System, with no element below 6.5

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the admission policy states 'You should offer the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) at a score of 6.5 with no lower than 6.0 in any single component'. The visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet standards of proficiency 1b.3 upon completion of the programme. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the modules on the programme do not cover skills which will ensure this standard of proficiency is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate mechanisms are in place to ensure that the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet standard of proficiency 1b.3.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team may wish to consider monitoring development of assessors in practice placements for the final year of the programme.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that all practice placements assessors are suitable to assess students on their placements. The education provider provides training to practice placement assessors and holds their professional records. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted during discussions it was evident that in the final year of this programme the programme team will require suitable assessors in practice placements to assess more complex skills. The visitors recommend the programme team carefully monitor the development of suitable assessors for the more complex skills in final year of the programme in practice placements.

Penny Joyce
Andrew Steel