HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	BA (Hons) Social Work, Full time BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work, Full time
Approval visit date	22-24 January 2019
Case reference	CAS-13576-Z8X9D2

Contents

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 approval 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). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). 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
Richard Barker	Social worker
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit
This was a multi-professional visit with four HCPC panels:
- Panel 1 – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
- Panel 2 – BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy and BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
- Panel 3 – BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- Panel 4 – BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science

For the physiotherapy and occupational therapy programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy and

College of Occupational Therapists. For the paramedic and operating department practice programmes there were representatives from their respective bodies, College of Paramedics and College of Operating Department Practitioners. The education provider appointed an internal panel who reviewed each of the programmes.

Internal panel members		
Elaine Buckley	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
Chloe Corbett	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Sheffield Hallam University
David Owen	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Claire Lockwood	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Mary Dawson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Jill LeBihan	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Loraine Cookson	Internal panel member	Sheffield Hallam University
Professional body panel members		
Paul Townsend	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Bob Willis	Professional body representative	College of Paramedics
Nina Paterson	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Barry Pryer	Professional body representative	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Alison Hampson	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Suzie Boyd	Professional body representative	College of Occupational Therapists
Mike Donnellon	Professional body representative	College of Operating Department Practitioners
HCPC Social work panel members		
Richard Barker	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Kate Johnson	Social worker	HCPC visitor
Roseann Connolly	Lay	HCPC visitor
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive	HCPC – observer
HCPC Diagnostic Radiography and Therapeutic Radiography panel members		
Shaaron Pratt	Diagnostic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Burgess	Therapeutic radiographer	HCPC visitor
Susanne Roff	Lay	HCPC visitor
John Archibald	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Occupational therapy and Physiotherapy panel members		
Bernadette Waters	Occupational therapist	HCPC visitor
Kathryn Campbell	Physiotherapist	HCPC visitor
Joanne Watchman	Lay	HCPC visitor

Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead
HCPC Operating Department Practice and Paramedic panel members		
Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner	HCPC visitor
John Donaghy	Paramedic	HCPC visitor
Manoj Mistry	Lay	HCPC visitor
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive	HCPC – panel lead

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2004
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 51
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02008

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 25
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02009

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment.

The education provider informed the HCPC through the major change process that they were making several changes to the programmes to accommodate further curriculum integration. From the information provided, the education provider's approach to the way the programmes will be managed, resourced, delivered and assessed will be significantly different from the currently approved programmes. We decided that the introduction of an integrated curricula could have significant impact on the way the standards will continue to be met. Therefore, we decided the most appropriate way to assess changes to the programmes was via the approval process.

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
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 28 March 2019.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that potential applicants to the programme are given full and clear information about how the foundation year works.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. In meetings, the senior team and the programme team gave some verbal assurances that applicants would be given information about this year. However, from these conversations, the visitors were not clear about what information would be provided, in what format, at what stage of the application process. The initial documentary submission had not included evidence relating to the information about the foundation year provided to applicants. In particular, it was not clear how the education provider would clarify for applicants that there were no credits, and no award, available at the completion of the foundation year, and that it was intended solely as a route on to the degree-level programmes. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require the education provider to submit evidence showing how applicants will have access to all appropriate information about the foundation year.

2.2 The selection and entry criteria must include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Condition: In relation to the proposed foundation year, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programmes have appropriate academic entry standards.

Reason: From discussions at the visit the visitors were aware that the education provider was introducing a foundation year across all the allied health programmes. Information about this had not been included in the initial documentary submission. It was therefore not clear to the visitors how the foundation year would be integrated into the programmes as a whole. During the visit, the programme team and the senior team gave verbal reassurances about how the foundation year would work. This included clarifying that the foundation year was intended to provide an access point to the programmes for learners who did not achieve the necessary grades but who were judged to have the potential to complete the programme. The visitors considered that what they were told about the foundation year seemed appropriate, but as they had not been provided with documentary evidence relating to the foundation year they were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating that learners coming on to the programmes via the foundation year will meet appropriate academic standards.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate there is effective management and clear responsibility for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware the design of the programmes builds on pre-existing inter-professional education and moves towards integrated care curricula (ICC). Under ICC there will be an integrated approach to the programmes' learning, teaching and assessment strategies. Themes which underpin the concept of the ICC will be threaded into the programmes. From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the responsibilities of the various roles

within the programmes, such as course leader and clinical liaison officer, and the skills and expertise of those staff members involved in the programmes. However, from the information provided beforehand and discussions at the visit, the visitors could not determine whether there was a programme management structure in place with clear roles and responsibilities for the ICC constituents of the programmes. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the programme was effectively managed. The visitors require more information about the lines of responsibility for decisions relating to ICC components of the programmes.

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.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the process for identifying and appointing an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriate.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the curriculum vitae of the current programme leaders for the programmes. From the information provided, the visitors were aware of the individuals who will have overall professional responsibility of the programmes. The visitors noted that the staff identified were appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the relevant part of the Register. In the programme team meeting, the visitors were informed that there is a process in place to ensure that they identify and appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme. The visitors were informed that this process includes selecting a programme leader from the current staff provision, and the role is recruited to on a rotating basis. However, the visitors were not given the process, and therefore could not determine that it is appropriate to ensure that the education provider will continue to appoint a suitable person and, if necessary, a suitable replacement. As such, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process for ensuring that the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the BA (Hons) Social Work programme effectively.

Reason: For this standard, the SETs mapping document explains that members of the Department of social work, social care and community studies play key roles in the design and delivery of the programme. The documentation also noted that the teaching team are all registered social workers. From the information provided, the visitors noted that the staff profiles presented on the website were inconsistent in terms of amount of information about the members of staff on the programme. For example, minimal information was given regarding Jane Foggin, Caroline Mulrooney and Louise Whitehead, who were identified as part of the teaching team. In addition to limited information provided about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individual's workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the

programme, so the visitors were still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the staffing resources on the programme to determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme effectively.

Reason: For this standard, the SETs mapping document explains that members of the Department of social work, social care and community studies play key roles in the design and delivery of the programme. The documentation also noted that the teaching team are all registered social workers. For this programme, the SETs mapping notes that there are two members of the teaching team who are also registered nurses (learning disability).The visitors found that the information presented on the website for teaching staff did not precisely match the curricula vitae that were provided as part of the documentary submission. The documentation provided showed five staff, two of whom are registered social workers and nurses, whilst the other three appear to be nurses, not social workers. It was not clear to the visitors whether other members of the social work teaching team also have any involvement on this programme. In addition to not being provided with clear information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individuals' workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it was still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the staffing resources on the programme to determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: For the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: For the BA (Hons) Social work programme, the visitors noted that the staff profiles presented on the website were inconsistent in terms of amount of information about the members of staff on the programme. For example, minimal information was given regarding Jane Foggin, Caroline Mulrooney and Louise Whitehead who were identified as part of the teaching team. In addition to not being provided with detailed information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individuals workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it was still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Without sufficient detail about the staff who are contributing to the programme, and without information about

which modules the staff contribute to, the visitors could not determine whether subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates that subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Reason: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social work programme, the visitors found that the information presented on the website for teaching staff did not precisely match the curricula vitae that were provided as part of the documentary submission. The documentation provided showed five staff, two of whom are registered social workers and nurses, whilst the other three appear to be nurses not social workers. It was not clear to the visitors whether other members of the social work teaching team also have involvement on this programme. In addition to not being provided with detailed information about the staff, the visitors did not have information about how much of each individuals workload is dedicated to the programme, or which modules they contribute to. At the visit, the visitors did not meet with the full teaching team for the programme, so it will still unclear who was delivering what parts of the programme, and how much of their workload was dedicated to the programme. Without sufficient detail about the staff who are contributing to the programme, and without information about which modules the staff contribute to, the visitors could not determine whether subject areas are delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. Therefore, the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Recommendation: For the BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programmes lead to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: On review of the submission document for the BA (Hons) Social work programme, the visitors noted that the section on 'Learning outcomes for all intermediate awards…' includes a 'Pre-amble', which at the end clearly states that none of the awards would enable a graduate eligibility to apply for admission to the Register. On review of the submission document for BSc (Hons) Nursing (Learning Disability) and Social Work programme, the visitors note that under the same section, the 'Pre-amble' is not included, and it therefore does not clearly state that these intermediate awards do not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the HCPC register as a social worker in England. Therefore, the visitors found this document would not ensure that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programmes leads to eligibility for admission to the Register. The validation document also states that graduates have only 5 years to apply for registration with the HCPC

after completing the programme, which is not correct information. Therefore, the education provider must revise their documentation to demonstrate that learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must provide clarification about the process for learners who wish to withdraw their consent, to demonstrate how this is effective.

Reason: On their review of the documentation, the visitors read in the programme handbooks for both programmes, section 15 under consent, that if learners "have a genuine reason for not wishing to participate as a model in a particular session or in general then you need to discuss this with your course leader as soon as possible. You may withdraw that consent at any time in writing to the course leader". On reading this, the visitors agreed that withdrawing consent for personal reasons may be a sensitive topic for learners, one which they may not feel comfortable discussing with their course leader directly. The visitors found this could impact on a learner's ability to withdraw their consent, if they did not feel they could do this in any other way. As such, the visitors found this could impact on the effectiveness of the consent procedure for learners. At the visit, the visitors discussed this with the programme team. The programme team explained that learners would have the opportunity to discuss with other staff if they did not feel comfortable discussing this with the programme leader, and agreed that the wording in the programme handbook could explain that more clearly. The visitors therefore require further information that this is made clear to learners, which demonstrates an effective consent procedure for learners on the programme.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for both programmes.

Reason: For this standard, the education provider explains that arrangements agreed with the local authority partners, and the teaching partnership includes a commitment to provide practice-based learning for learners on the programmes along with appropriately trained staff. From the information provided, the visitors were not clear on what number of staff would be involved in practice-based learning for each programme. From discussions at the visit, it was clear that the education provider ensures that practice educators involved in practice-based learning would be appropriately qualified and experienced. However, from the information provided and through discussions at the visit, the visitors were not clear how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of staff involved in practice-based learning for both programmes, which is appropriate to the number of learners. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the number of staff involved in practice-based learning on both programmes to determine whether this standard is met.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the assessment load for the 40 credit modules is a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: On their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the assessment load for the 40 credit modules, at level four and level five, were comparatively low to other modules on both the programmes. For example, a poster presentation and an essay of 1500 words being the assessment load for some modules. The visitors noted this for the 'Preparing for social work practice module' at level four, and for the 'Assessing and addressing complexity' modules at level five, which is a shared module for all programmes within the Integrated Care Curricula.

The visitors discussed this with the programme team at the visit, who acknowledged they were unaware of the details of assessment load on those modules and could not give a rationale without looking further into it. As such, from the information provided, the visitors could not determine what the rationale was for the assessment load on the 40 credit modules, which would ensure a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement. By 'reliable' we mean that assessments are consistent and thorough enough to allow learners to demonstrate how far they have progressed during the course of the programme and achieve the learning outcomes. Without understanding the rationale for the assessment on these modules, the visitors could not determine how the assessment load would ensure a thorough enough assessment. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the rationale for the assessment load for the 40 credit modules, which demonstrates that the assessment will provide a reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Recommendations
We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

3.11 An effective programme must be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider offering continuing professional and academic development to on-site supervisors that is appropriate to their role in the programme.

Reason: On review of the documentation, and through discussions at the visit about continuing professional and academic development of staff on the programme, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, through discussions with the practice educators at the visit, the visitors heard their concerns about on-site supervisors not receiving adequate training about the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF). The visitors heard that while the on-site supervisors are not asked to assess learners on the PCF, it would be appropriate for their role on the programme to have a better understanding of it. From these discussions with the practice educators, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider offering continuing

professional and academic development to on-site supervisors that is appropriate to their role in the programme.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 22 May 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.