

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	25 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14682-W2W9F6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Gribbens	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08369

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider has shown the current capacity in their existing teaching team. The visitors noted that the education provider is having ongoing discussions with employers to finalize their partnership arrangements. However, the visitors were unable to find relevant information around partnership arrangements in the evidence. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the partnership

agreements with the employers to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Information around the process to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors considered the evidence showing which activities involve service users and carers' contribution on the programme. The visitors understood that the education provider involves service users and carers. However, the visitors were unable to find information about how the education provider actively involves, monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of their involvement. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

Suggested evidence: Information, such as an action plan, which demonstrates how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has informed us through their mapping document that they are implementing joint activities involving other professions. The visitors understood that learners have opportunities to learn with, and from, other professionals and learners during the conference days. However, the visitors could not find relevant evidence in terms of how interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented on the programme, what professions are involved and how IPL is monitored. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will learn with and from, other professionals and learners on the programme. As per the requirements of the revised standard, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the strategy around IPL, how it is structured, how it is monitored and who is involved.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence around the elements of IPL and the strategy to enable learners to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	MSc Social Work, Full time Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Social Work Practice, Work based learning
Date submission received	25 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14684-V0K4C4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Gribbens	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 August 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 28
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08370

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Professional Social Work Practice
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 January 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 46
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08371

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPA annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider has shown the current capacity in their existing teaching team. The visitors noted that the education provider is having ongoing discussions with employers to finalize their partnership arrangements. However, the visitors were unable to find relevant information around partnership arrangements in the evidence. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the partnership agreements with the employers to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Information around the process to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors considered the evidence showing which activities involve service users and carers' contribution on the programme. The visitors understood that the education provider involves service users and carers. However, the visitors were unable to find information about how the education provider actively involves, monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of their involvement. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

Suggested evidence: Information, such as an action plan, which demonstrates how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has informed us through their mapping document that they are implementing joint activities involving other professions. The visitors understood that learners have opportunities to learn with, and from, other professionals and learners during the conference days. However, the visitors could not find relevant evidence in terms of how interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented on the programme, what professions are involved and how IPL is monitored. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will learn with and from, other professionals and learners on the programme. As per the requirements of the revised standard, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the strategy around IPL, how it is structured, how it is monitored and who is involved.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence around the elements of IPL and the strategy to enable learners to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice (integrated), Work based learning
Date submission received	08 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14686-R4H9V8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Gribbens	Social worker
Anne Mackay	Social worker
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Professional Social Work Practice (integrated)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 October 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08372

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	No	In the past the EP produced reports for programmes running for a full academic year. For the academic year 2016-17, the programme only started running the spring semester.
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: The education provider has shown the current capacity in their existing teaching team. The visitors noted that the education provider is having ongoing discussions with employers to finalize their partnership arrangements. However, the visitors were unable to find relevant information around partnership arrangements in the evidence. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. The visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the partnership agreements with the employers to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

Suggested evidence: Information around the process to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors considered the evidence showing which activities involve service users and carers' contribution on the programme. The visitors understood that the education provider involves service users and carers. However, the visitors were unable to find information about how the education provider actively involves, monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of their involvement. Therefore, the visitors require further information about how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

Suggested evidence: Information, such as an action plan, which demonstrates how the education provider monitors and evaluates service user and carer involvement.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has informed us through their mapping document that they are implementing joint activities involving other professions. The visitors understood that learners have opportunities to learn with, and from, other professionals and learners during the conference days. However, the visitors could not find relevant evidence in terms of how interprofessional learning (IPL) is implemented on the programme, what professions are involved and how IPL is monitored. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will learn with and from, other professionals and learners on the programme. As per the requirements of the revised standard, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the strategy around IPL, how it is structured, how it is monitored and who is involved.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence around the elements of IPL and the strategy to enable learners to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Bradford
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science, Full time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science, Part time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science, Part time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science, Part time BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science, Part time
Date submission received	24 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-13750-T0C8X4

Contents

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Houlston	Biomedical scientist
Kathleen Simon	Biomedical scientist
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30

Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07618

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07619

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07620

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07621

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Blood Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07623

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Cellular Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1

Assessment reference	AM07624
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Genetics Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07625

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Life Sciences) with Infection Science
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07626

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: This is the first annual monitoring audit that the programme has undergone since the revision of the standards of education and training, and so the education provider need to demonstrate how they meet this revised standard regardless of whether they have made any changes in the relevant area or not. The HCPC panel which originally reviewed the programme for the purpose of approving the programme will not have considered the specific issue covered by this standard. As evidence for this standard the education provider submitted the following:

- a copy of a letter to potential placement providers;
- a narrative of how the education provider generally approaches sourcing practice-based learning, and which staff are involved in this; and
- a list of available practice-based learning settings, and the staff involved at these placements.

In the mapping document the education provider referred to difficulties in securing practice-based learning, but they did not give further details. Given this, and the fact that the evidence did not refer to a process to ensure that sufficient practice-based learning was available, the visitors could not determine whether this standard was met. In particular, they were not clear what the education provider would do if placements could not be found for particular learners.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating the working of the process for ensuring that all learners would have access to appropriate practice-based learning.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: This is the first annual monitoring audit that the programme has undergone since the revision of the standards of education and training, and so the education provider need to demonstrate how they meet this revised standard regardless of whether they have made any changes in the relevant area or not. The HCPC panel which originally reviewed the programme for the purposes of approving the programme will not have considered the specific issue covered by this standard. As evidence for

this standard the education provider submitted several documents giving information about how learners would be educated about their own safety and their own support needs. However, the visitors could not see from this information how learners would be enabled to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and so they were unable to determine whether the standard was met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to describe the process which supports and enables learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

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

The visitors considered that the standards were met at threshold. They did note, however, that the evidence submitted concerning co-operation with providers of practice-based learning was not especially clear. Some of the issues mentioned in the request for further evidence above (section 4) were not directly addressed. It would not be proportionate or reasonable at this stage to withhold re-approval because of this lack of clarity, and the education provider might not have appropriate evidence available to address the issue. However, visitors in future review processes may wish to pay particular attention to SET 3.6, and the education provider should consider how best to evidence their meeting of the standard.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Brighton
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma Approved Mental Health Practice, Part time
Date submission received	04 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14688-T0X0V7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

The following is a report on the annual monitoring process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

David Abraham	Approved Mental Health Professional
Paul Bates	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Approved Mental Health Practice
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Approved Mental Health Professional
First intake	01 June 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 19
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08331

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard, which included documents that refer to the whistleblowing and safeguarding policy. The visitors noted the evidence contains information for learners and does not show how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

There was a statement on the mapping document making reference to the new standard 3.17 (There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users). The new standard 3.17 is not applicable for this programme, as this is a post-registration programme. Therefore, the annual monitoring audit for this programme is determined via approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Additionally, as per the new requirement for annual monitoring audits, the visitors could not find any information demonstrating the monitoring of service users and carers for

the last two years. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how service users and carers are involved in this programme,

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how service users and carers are involved in the programme, in addition to showing service users and carers monitoring for the last two years.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University with London and South East Colleges – Bromley
Validating body	Canterbury Christ Church University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work Studies, Full time
Date submission received	08 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14611-Z8R3G2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Luke Tibbits	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work Studies
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08392

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: As evidence, the education provider referred to a University placement audit form and discussed how capacity of practice-based learning was monitored through placement auditing and learner evaluations. From their review of the submitted documents, the visitors noted the template placement audit form which stated it was the ‘practice placement audit to be verified by the HEI’. This gathered information about the individual sites for practice-based learning to ensure they were appropriate for learners to undertake their training in. However, the visitors were unclear how the information gathered through these individual audits fed into the process for ensuring the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate the effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider stated that each cohort has a number of interprofessional teaching sessions in the academic calendar. As evidence, the mapping document referred to the Communication skills Lesson Plan for IPE document, Skills for Interprofessional Development module descriptor and Introduction to Social Work Practice Module Handbook. The visitors noted that the module descriptors discussed how learners are taught by, and taught about, working with professionals from other professions for example psychologists and police officers.. However, the visitors could not find evidence of how learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how, and when, learners learn with other learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Chester
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	28 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14707-F5M8G0

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Luke Tibbits	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08393

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referred to the Programme Leader Recruitment Policy and Programme Leader Role Profile as evidence. The Programme Leader Recruitment Policy showed a diagram of how they appoint a new programme leader every 3 years and the Programme Leader Role Profile discussed the responsibilities of the programme lead. From the evidence, the visitors were clear about the process to appoint a new programme leader. However, they were unable to identify information about the relevant qualifications and experience an individual was expected to hold to lead the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: As evidence, the education provider referred to three module descriptors and the whistleblowing lecture slides within their supporting documents. The mapping document discussed that whistleblowing guidelines are issued to all learners in their induction and revisited within the different teaching levels. In the whistleblowing guidelines, the visitors found evidence of where learners are taught about their professional responsibilities and were clear learners were referred to British Association of Social Workers and the public interest disclosure act (1998). However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of the information provided to learners that ensures they understand the education providers internal processes to support and enable them to raise concerns regarding the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence of an effective process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Chester
Name of programme(s)	MA Social Work, Full time Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date submission received	01 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14708-G2R6V1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Luke Tibbits	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08394

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2006
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08395

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the mapping document, the education provider referred to the Programme Leader Recruitment Policy and Programme Leader Role Profile as evidence. The Programme Leader Recruitment Policy showed a diagram of how they appoint a new programme leader every 3 years and the Programme Leader Role Profile discussed the responsibilities of the programme lead. From the evidence, the visitors were clear about the process to appoint a new programme leader. However, they were unable to identify information about the relevant qualifications and experience an individual was expected to hold to lead the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced, and unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure the person holding overall professional responsibility is appropriately qualified and experienced and on the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: As evidence, the education provider referred to three module descriptors and the whistleblowing lecture slides within their supporting documents. The mapping document discussed that whistleblowing guidelines are issued to all learners in their induction and revisited within the different teaching levels. In the whistleblowing guidelines, the visitors found evidence of where learners are taught about their professional responsibilities and were clear learners were referred to British Association of Social Workers and the public interest disclosure act (1998). However, the visitors were unable to find evidence of the information provided to learners that ensures they understand the education providers internal processes to support and enable them to raise concerns regarding the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence of an effective process to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BA (Hons) Social Work, Work based learning BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	03 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14619-K0R1G5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Luke Tibbits	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08396

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 65
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08397

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	AM08402

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The mapping document discussed how the person appointed as course leader is social work qualified and registered with the HCPC. To evidence this, the education provider referred to the course handbook. The handbook contained the name of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and their contact details. This is a new standard and requires the education provider to demonstrate the process in place to identify a suitable person and if, it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors could not find evidence of this process. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the education provider appoints an appropriately qualified and experienced individual, who unless other arrangements are appropriate, is on the relevant part to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further documentation of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

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

Reason: The education provider provided the external examiners reports for the last two academic years. Upon reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted the following:

- An external examiners report for the 2016 – 17 academic year was submitted.
- A response to an external examiners report for the 2016 – 17 academic year was submitted, however, this was not sent to the same individual who submitted the external examiners report which had been submitted for that academic year.

From the information submitted, the visitors were unable to cross reference the comments made by the external examiner with the comments within the response sent by the education provider. As the corresponding documents above were not within the submission, the visitors are unclear about how the external examiners report had been responded to and what information the education provider was responding to. As such, the visitors were unclear about how the programme continues to deliver overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures there is regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure there is regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The mapping document referred to a Practice Learning Agreement, Report Templates for Final Placement document, Service Users & Carers overview documents and an Organisational Study Template document. The mapping document also included a statement about a Congress Day, which is organised each year by the Service User and Care Academic Group (SUCAG). This day is built into learner's requirements and mandatory skills development days within the Preparation for Social Work Practice module. From the information provided in the Organisational Study Template document and the Practice Learning Agreement, the visitors were clear on how learners learned with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions. Also within the mapping document, the visitors learnt that the Congress Day has developed into a faculty wide event which enables learners to learn alongside other relevant professions. However, the visitors could not see additional evidence within the submission of how learners learnt with, or from, other learners. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must evidence how learners learn, with and from, other learners in other relevant professions on the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Full time MA in Social Work, Work based learning Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Work based learning
Date submission received	03 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14630-Z0R6H6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Claire Brewis	Occupational therapist
Luke Tibbits	Social worker in England
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08398

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08399

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08400

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08401

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our

standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The mapping document discussed how the person appointed as course leader is social work qualified and registered with the HCPC. To evidence this, the education provider referred to the course handbook. The handbook contained the name of the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme and their contact details. This is a new standard and requires the education provider to demonstrate the process in place to identify a suitable person and if, it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors could not find evidence of this process. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the education provider appoints an appropriately qualified and experienced individual, who unless other arrangements are appropriate, is on the relevant part to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require further documentation of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The mapping document referred to a Practice Learning Agreement, Report Templates for Final Placement document, Service Users & Carers overview documents and an Organisational Study Template document. The mapping document also included a statement about a Congress Day, which is organised each year by the Service User and Care Academic Group (SUCAG). This day is built into learner's requirements and mandatory skills development days within the Preparation for Social Work Practice module. From the information provided in the Organisational Study Template document and the Practice Learning Agreement, the visitors were clear on how learners learned with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions. Also within the mapping document, the visitors learnt that the Congress Day has developed into a faculty wide event which enables learners to learn alongside other relevant professions. However, the visitors could not see additional evidence within the submission of how learners learnt with, or from, other learners. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must evidence how learners learn, with and from, other learners in other relevant professions on the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) in Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	01 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14626-L8J7F7

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Anne Mackay	Social worker
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08428

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals in other relevant professions. The visitors were also made aware of discussions with programme leads from occupational therapy and learning disability nursing programmes. The visitors considered these discussions indicated the intentions of the programme for interprofessional education (IPE) between learners. However, the visitors were not able to see clear and definite plans of where in the programme IPE was going to take place, and what types of learning activities IPE was going to consist of. Therefore, the visitors were not able to determine whether and how learners engage with other learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Information to demonstrate how learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Leeds
Name of programme(s)	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time MA in Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	01 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14709-J8K4L2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Cathrine Clarke	Social worker
Jennifer Caldwell	Occupational therapist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08448

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	01 July 2009
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08585

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes	
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes	
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	N/A	The education provider notes that no specific responses to external examiner reports were required.
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: The education provider has informed us through their mapping document that they are implementing joint activities with other professions. The visitors understood that learners are able to learn with, and from, other learners. However, the visitors could not find relevant evidence in terms of how interprofessional learning is implemented on the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine how learners will learn with, and from, other learners on the programme. As per the requirements of the revised standard, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the strategy around interprofessional learning and how it is structured.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence around the elements of interprofessional learning and the strategy to enable learners to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Lincoln
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Social Work, Full time BSc (Hons) Social Work, Part time
Date submission received	01 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14733-T8N2R5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Kate Johnson	Social worker
Susan Bell	Social worker
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 22
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08449

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08450

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider provided a weblink that showed the staff profile of the programme leader for the programme. This standards is intended to ensure that the education provider (not the HCPC) ensures that the

individual fulfilling this role is suitably qualified, and the visitors were not clear how the profile for the current programme lead ensures this. The visitors noted that the current programme lead had the appropriate qualifications and experience to manage the programme and is also from the relevant part of the register. The visitors however did not see any information to demonstrate that there is an effective process in place to identify and secure a suitable person for this role if it becomes necessary in the future. In particular, the visitors did not receive any evidence which articulates the requirements for fulfilling this role, or what the appointment process for this role would be.

The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate that policies and procedures are in place which ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified, experienced and from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are appropriate.

Suggested evidence: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider's process ensures the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Reason: The visitors were able to see from the documentation provided that service users and carers are involved in the programme. However, the visitors could not determine from the documents that there were regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place for service users and carers. This standard is related to the programmes ongoing quality and effectiveness as well as how the education provider responds to any identified risks, challenges or changes. The education provider must demonstrate that the service user and carer involvement is being monitored and evaluated to ensure the ongoing quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that there are regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place for service user and carer's involvement.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider provided flyers for the international student conference, the Michael Pickles award and the keynote speaker series. The visitors noted the international student conference provided an opportunity for learners observe lectures from the teaching staff at Moscow State Pedagogical University in regards to culture and cultural differences. The visitors could see that these guest lectures were provided by experts in the relative field but could not see that they were relevant professionals to the practice of social work. This standard is about how learners are prepared to work with other professionals and across professions to the benefit of service users and carers. Therefore, the visitors need to see how learners are learning with, and from, other learners and professionals in other relevant professions.

The visitors noted that the keynote speaker flyer and the Michael Pickles award did not confirm that attendance was mandatory and therefore there was a possibility of learners not taking part in this teaching. The education provider must show that interprofessional learning is mandatory in the programme so that all learners have the opportunity to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that all learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Middlesex University
Name of programme(s)	Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up), Full time accelerated
Date submission received	27 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14683-R8C1Y4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Kate Johnson	Social worker
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Post-Graduate Diploma Social Work (Step Up)
Mode of study	Full time accelerated
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 29
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08462

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	No	Programme started January 2018 so documents only available for one year.
External examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	No	As above
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	No	As above
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	No	As above

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: As part of the expanded evidence required for this audit, the education provider is required to demonstrate how they monitor service user and carer involvement. The education provider stated they had made no changes to how the programme continued to meet this standard. However, the visitors noted in Appendix 3 – Course Delivery Meeting minutes (January 2018) – a section about the involvement of service users in teaching. In this section, the education provider stated that CAIS will be included in service user involvement components of the taught programme. From this

information, the visitors were unclear what 'CAIS' stood for and the systems the education provider had in place to monitor service user and carer involvement. The visitors considered that the information provided did not demonstrate effective monitoring and evaluation of the programme in relation to service user and carer involvement. As the visitors were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that demonstrates this, they therefore require additional evidence that demonstrates how service user and carer involvement is regularly and effectively monitored.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide additional evidence to demonstrate the system in place to effectively monitor service user and carer involvement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation review, the visitors noted that the education provider stated there had been no change as to how they continued to meet this standard and that service users and carers were involved at all stages of the programme. The visitors noted in Appendix 3 document – Course Delivery Meeting minutes (January 2018) – a section about the involvement of service users in teaching. In this section, the education provider stated that CAIS will be included in service user involvement in components of the taught course. From this information, the visitors were unclear what 'CAIS' stood for and how service users and carers are involved in the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme to ensure learners who complete the programme are fit to practise. They therefore considered that this information did not demonstrate how service users and carers contribute to the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence to determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence which demonstrates the involvement of service users and carers in the overall quality and effectiveness of the programme.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider stated in their mapping document that learners are centrally involved in the Step Up programme via student feedback and termly Student Voice Group meetings, where student representatives meet with staff to feedback on their experience of the programme. However the visitors noted that the education provider did not provide any evidence to support this statement. This standard is new and is being assessed via annual monitoring this academic year. As the education provider provided no evidence to support their statement, the visitors were unsure how this learner feedback was used within different areas of the programme such as the design, delivery or review. As such, they could not identify how the learners' experience contributes to the quality and effectiveness of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence that demonstrates how the learners' experience contributes to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider stated in their mapping document, “Learners are offered opportunities to engage in inter-professional learning with colleagues from different professions, while on practice placement.” They also stated that Symposia are organised for the learners to meet and learn with learners from different professional disciplines. To further evidence this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to Appendix 7 document – Indicative IPL workshop. From the documentation review, the visitors noted that this document had not been included in the submission and they were unable to identify further information elsewhere within the documentation that demonstrates how the programme meets this new / revised standard. The visitors were also not clear who the education provider referred to as “colleagues” - whether this meant professionals or other learners within the practice-based learning environment. As such, the visitors could not identify how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates how learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	28 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14664-N7R5X6

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Sheila Skelton	Social worker
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 48
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08463

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the programme lead is an experienced and qualified social worker and experienced academic lead who had been in post for a number of years. The visitors were informed the education provider is designing a role descriptor for programme leadership. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors did not clearly see how the education provider appoints an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	MA Social Work, Full time PG Dip Social Work (Employment based), Work based learning PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14675-V6Q2Y8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Pradeep Agrawal	Biomedical scientist
Sheila Skelton	Social worker
John Archibald	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 48
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08464

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Employment based)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2014

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 42
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08465

Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 46
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08466

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HPCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware the programme lead is an experienced and qualified social worker and experienced academic lead who had been in post for a number of years. The visitors were informed the education provider is designing a role descriptor for programme leadership. This standard requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided, the visitors did not clearly see how the education provider appoints an individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were made aware the education provider continues to have class representatives from each year on the programme committee, and all learners are asked to complete end of unit evaluations which are considered during Programme Committees. The visitors were made aware of a 'learner involvement' document. However, the visitors were not able to access this document. The visitors were therefore unsure how learners are able to contribute to the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence how the education provider involves learners in the programme.

Suggested evidence: The education provider needs to provide information about the involvement of learners in the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	24 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14712-R0Z7V1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	2
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Gribbens	Social worker in England
Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2013
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 32
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08469

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to a role profile and a recruitment process document. The role profile discussed the roles and responsibilities for the programme lead. From this information, the visitors were clear about the areas the programme leader would be responsible for. The recruitment process document provided information on academic administration roles and a link to the internal recruitment process which the visitors were unable to access. From this information, they learnt that all academic staff are expected to hold at least one administrative role in addition to their teaching and research responsibilities. However, this document did not provide further information about the recruitment process specifically in place for the appointment of the programme leader. In addition, as the visitors were unable to access the information online, they could not determine how the process in place ensures an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence

which demonstrates the effective process in place for recruiting a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme which ensures they will be appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the Values statement in the admissions handbook. The document talked about applicants meeting HCPC standards and checks, such as criminal convictions and health screenings prior to admission onto the programme. They also referred to their Fitness to Practice Procedures which discussed how learners should seek guidance from the HCPC guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors noted the documents referred to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE), however they could not see how the assessment of learners would demonstrate they were able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. While reviewing other documentation, the visitors noted the Introduction to social work module specification document. This discusses the learning outcomes for professional behaviour, however there is no mention of how the learning outcomes are assessed. From this information, the visitors could not determine how assessment throughout the programme ensures that learners are able to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPE. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how this standard is met

Suggested evidence: Evidence of where, and how, learners are assessed to demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Nottingham
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Full time MA in Social Work, Work based learning PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Work based learning
Date submission received	25 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14713-Z3X2R8

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Gribbens	Social worker in England
Catherine Smith	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Lawrence Martin	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08470

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 4
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08471

Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08472

Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	Work based learning
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 June 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 3
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08473

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our

standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to a role profile and a recruitment process document. The role profile discussed the roles and responsibilities for the programme lead. From this information, the visitors were clear about the areas the programme leader would be responsible for. The recruitment process document provided information on academic administration roles and a link to the internal recruitment process which the visitors were unable to access. From this information, they learnt that all academic staff are expected to hold at least one administrative role in addition to their teaching and research responsibilities. However, this document did not provide further information about the recruitment process specifically in place for the appointment of the programme leader. In addition, as the visitors were unable to access the information online, they could not determine how the process in place ensures an appropriately qualified and experienced person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates the effective process in place for recruiting a person with overall professional responsibility for the programme which ensures they will be appropriately qualified and experienced.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred to the Values statement in the admissions handbook. The document talked about applicants meeting HCPC standards and checks, such as criminal convictions and health screenings prior to admission onto the programme. They also referred to their Fitness to Practice Procedures which discussed how learners should seek guidance from the HCPC guidance on conduct and ethics for students. The visitors noted the documents referred to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE), however they could not see how the assessment of learners would demonstrate they were able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. While reviewing other documentation, the visitors noted the Introduction to social work module specification document. This

discusses the learning outcomes for professional behaviour, however there is no mention of how the learning outcomes are assessed. From this information, the visitors could not determine how assessment throughout the programme ensures that learners are able to demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPE. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence on how this standard is met

Suggested evidence: Evidence of where, and how, learners are assessed to demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	MSc Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	04 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14639-X7X8N9

Contents	
Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Angela Duxbury	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Kate Johnson	Social worker in England
Temilolu Odunaike	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 July 2007
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08484

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

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

Reason: From the documentation review, the visitors learned that the education provider previously had experienced issues around staffing. In their 2017-18 Annual Standards and Quality Evaluation Review document, the education provider highlighted a shortage in staffing due to members of staff on sabbatical, reduced hours and imminent redundancy. They explained that this had placed particular pressure on remaining tutors delivering the programme and there had been heavy reliance on other staff to cover gaps. The education provider stated further in the document that recruitment processes for new staff had been delayed. However, if successful, these issues should be resolved by September 2018. From this information, the visitors

understood the education provider had identified issues around staffing and intended to have addressed them by September 2018. However, the visitors could not see any further information in the documentation that showed this has now been resolved and there is now an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively. As such the visitors could not determine if this SET is met.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence which demonstrates that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider referred the visitors to a unit descriptor on their website. From following the link provided, the visitors noted that the webpage related to the unit descriptor for the BSc Social Work programme and which did not provide information about interprofessional education for the MSc Social Work programme. From reviewing the full submission, the visitors could not find information that demonstrated how the education provider ensures that learners benefit from interprofessional education. The visitors therefore require the education provider evidences how they ensure learners are able to learn with, and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Suggested evidence: Further information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures learners are able to learn with, and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Sheffield
Name of programme(s)	MA in Social Work, Full time Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only), Full time
Date submission received	26 June 2019
Case reference	CAS-14637-W0L4B5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review	3
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Mackay	Social worker
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	3/1/2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 35
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08351

Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England

First intake	3/1/2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08352

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In the mapping document for this standard the education provider has stated that there is no change in this area as the current Director of Social Work education

(DoSW) has not changed. However, this revised standard is designed to not make decisions based on individuals but rather the education provider's approach to ensuring that any person in this role is appropriately qualified. The education provider also indicated that the DoSW has the "requirement for 'professional responsibility' designated within the role descriptor for the post. Therefore, it is a requirement that anyone occupying the role of DoSW would need to be able to perform this duty which would be checked during the recruitment process". The visitors were unable to view what the "professional responsibility" requirement would be so could not determine that it would be appropriate for the role. Furthermore, the education provider highlighted a summary of the roles of social work staff in the document titled Submission Narrative Document. From this summary the visitors were able to confirm the main duties of the roles within the programme. However, the visitors could not confirm that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register. Furthermore, the visitors observed that the DoSW and programme lead had very similar duties. This made the visitors unclear on who holds "overall professional responsibility". The education provider must confirm the position that holds overall professional responsibility for the programme. They must also show how they ensure that the person holding this position, not the individual, is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show how the education provider ensures the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the register.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East London
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time
Date submission received	02 July 2019
Case reference	CAS-14694-Y2G7L3

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	4

Executive Summary

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

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

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

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

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

How we make our decisions

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

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

HCPC panel

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

Anne Mackay	Social worker
Luke Tibbits	Social worker
Patrick Armsby	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	8/1/2003
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 60
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM08361

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

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

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

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

Further evidence required

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

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

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider guided the visitors to the documents titled Readiness to Practice Module Guide, placement Handbook and Placement Portfolio Documents. However, these documents were not included in the submission provided and the visitors were unable to determine from the other documents available that this standard had been met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider guided the visitors to the documents titled placement Handbook and Programme Handbook. However, these documents were not included in the submission provided and the visitors were unable to determine from the documents available that this standard had been met. The education provider also provided a link to the institution suitability procedure. The visitors were unable to determine from these regulations how learners have the opportunity to learn about professional conduct, including the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs), and to demonstrate an understanding of them. Therefore they could not confirm that the standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the learning outcomes ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider guided the visitors to the documents titled Readiness to Practice Module Guide and Programme Handbook. However, these documents were not included in the submission provided and the visitors were unable to determine from the other documents available that this standard had been met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to show that the programme is ensuring that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: To evidence this standard the education provider guided the visitors to the document titled BA Programme Handbook. However, these documents were not included in the submission provided. The education provider also flagged their external examiner responses for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 to evidence this standard. However the visitors could not see in the documentation provided that assessments throughout the programme covered the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs.

Suggested evidence: Evidence to that assessment throughout the programme ensures that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

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

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 06 November 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).