

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Cambridge)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	40
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Paul Jackson (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Bright (Internal Panel Member) Vanessa Waller (Internal Panel Member) Ian Cummins (External Panel Member) Maxine Fletcher (External Panel Member) Nasreen Hammond (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to clarify if international applicants can apply to the programme, and if so what the requirements are for international applicants.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the programme is not open to international applicants. The visitors also noted, however, that the programme website suggests that there are specific requirements for international students, in that 'the [IELTs] requirement is 7.5'. If the education provider does not accept international applications, this information is contradictory. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation, including advertising materials, is updated to clearly and consistently reflect the education provider's policies about international applications to the programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy in the 'Senate Code of Practice on Admissions', which is a university-wide document. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. From discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there are currently very limited opportunities to transfer to the programme from other universities through AP(E)L, and that this may be why there is little information about it in the programme documentation. The visitors require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L. This will allow applicants to make an informed decision when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and social care professions council' (programme specification, page 6) and the 'Health and professionals care council' (student handbook, page 6) rather than the 'Health and care professions council' (HCPC). The visitors therefore require that the information provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC. Additionally, following the merger of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) into the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), CRB checks are now called DBS checks. Therefore the visitors

require that all references to CRB checks within the admissions and programme documentation are updated to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, and to avoid any potential confusion for applicants and students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that some documents were in draft form, for example Module Definition Forms (MDFs) were provided with a module amendment form. The visitors therefore require that, if any amendments are made to the documentation, the finalised versions are provided, to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with Essex County Council ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close working relationship between the programme team and Essex County Council, for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. This relationship is maintained through regular meetings to determine the number of LA placements available, the learning needs of the students, and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. As such the visitors are unclear how the team ensures that the range of practice learning which each student undertakes effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with Essex County Council and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, it was indicated that the education provider requests confirmation that an agency has an equality and diversity policy as part of the initial and ongoing audit of the placement. Whilst it can be seen that the education provider seeks placements with equality and diversity policies in place, the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are implemented at the placement setting, and how they are monitored. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored at the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular for the 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the addition of a zero credit 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module led to discussions regarding progression following completion of this module. It was not clear if students would be able to progress onto taught modules (as they have achieved the required credits to do so), and how this would work in practice, as they would not be able to go on placement without having passed this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how students progress from level 4 – 5 in this module. Additionally, the new module approval form states that 'in order to pass this module, students are required to achieve an overall mark of 40%' (page 25, Document 2), but in discussion with the programme team it was stated that this would be a pass/fail module. The visitors require that this is clarified within the programme documentation so students understand the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how students give their consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Course Learning Agreement form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form and accompanying guidance so that examples of tasks that students will be giving their consent for are detailed. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussions with the students at the visit, it appeared that their understanding of interprofessional learning was that it happened whilst on placement, rather than as part of a taught module. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that there is interprofessional learning within the 'Practice 1' module, through communication and partnership working with other health and care professionals. The visitors were therefore content that where there is interprofessional learning within the programme, the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are being adequately addressed, and therefore that this standard is met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered within the curriculum, this could impact on the way in which this standard is met, and in this case the HCPC should be informed of any changes to interprofessional learning through the major change process.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the recent increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student

numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

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

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

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

Valerie Maehle
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Chelmsford)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	70 (50 full time, 20 part time)
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Paul Jackson (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Bright (Internal Panel Member) Vanessa Waller (Internal Panel Member) Ian Cummins (External Panel Member) Maxine Fletcher (External Panel Member) Nasreen Hammond (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to clarify if international applicants can apply to the programme, and if so what the requirements are for international applicants.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the programme is not open to international applicants. The visitors also noted, however, that the programme website suggests that there are specific requirements for international students, in that 'the [IELTs] requirement is 7.5'. If the education provider does not accept international applications, this information is contradictory. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation, including advertising materials, is updated to clearly and consistently reflect the education provider's policies about international applications to the programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy in the 'Senate Code of Practice on Admissions', which is a university-wide document. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. From discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there are currently very limited opportunities to transfer to the programme from other universities through AP(E)L, and that this may be why there is little information about it in the programme documentation. The visitors require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L. This will allow applicants to make an informed decision when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and social care professions council' (programme specification, page 6) and the 'Health and professionals care council' (student handbook, page 6) rather than the 'Health and care professions council' (HCPC). The visitors therefore require that the information provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC. Additionally, following the merger of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) into the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), CRB checks are now called DBS checks. Therefore the visitors

require that all references to CRB checks within the admissions and programme documentation are updated to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, and to avoid any potential confusion for applicants and students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that some documents were in draft form, for example Module Definition Forms (MDFs) were provided with a module amendment form. The visitors therefore require that, if any amendments are made to the documentation, the finalised versions are provided, to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with Essex County Council ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close working relationship between the programme team and Essex County Council, for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. This relationship is maintained through regular meetings to determine the number of LA placements available, the learning needs of the students, and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. As such the visitors are unclear how the team ensures that the range of practice learning which each student undertakes effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with Essex County Council and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, it was indicated that the education provider requests confirmation that an agency has an equality and diversity policy as part of the initial and ongoing audit of the placement. Whilst it can be seen that the education provider seeks placements with equality and diversity policies in place, the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are implemented at the placement setting, and how they are monitored. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored at the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular for the 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the addition of a zero credit 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module led to discussions regarding progression following completion of this module. It was not clear if students would be able to progress onto taught modules (as they have achieved the required credits to do so), and how this would work in practice, as they would not be able to go on placement without having passed this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how students progress from level 4 – 5 in this module. Additionally, the new module approval form states that 'in order to pass this module, students are required to achieve an overall mark of 40%' (page 25, Document 2), but in discussion with the programme team it was stated that this would be a pass/fail module. The visitors require that this is clarified within the programme documentation so students understand the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how students give their consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Course Learning Agreement form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form and accompanying guidance so that examples of tasks that students will be giving their consent for are detailed. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussions with the students at the visit, it appeared that their understanding of interprofessional learning was that it happened whilst on placement, rather than as part of a taught module. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that there is interprofessional learning within the 'Practice 1' module, through communication and partnership working with other health and care professionals. The visitors were therefore content that where there is interprofessional learning within the programme, the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are being adequately addressed, and therefore that this standard is met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered within the curriculum, this could impact on the way in which this standard is met, and in this case the HCPC should be informed of any changes to interprofessional learning through the major change process.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the recent increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student

numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

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

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

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

Valerie Maehle
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work (Peterborough)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	20
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Paul Jackson (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Bright (Internal Panel Member) Vanessa Waller (Internal Panel Member) Ian Cummins (External Panel Member) Maxine Fletcher (External Panel Member) Nasreen Hammond (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to clarify if international applicants can apply to the programme, and if so what the requirements are for international applicants.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the programme is not open to international applicants. The visitors also noted, however, that the programme website suggests that there are specific requirements for international students, in that 'the [IELTs] requirement is 7.5'. If the education provider does not accept international applications, this information is contradictory. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation, including advertising materials, is updated to clearly and consistently reflect the education provider's policies about international applications to the programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy in the 'Senate Code of Practice on Admissions', which is a university-wide document. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. From discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there are currently very limited opportunities to transfer to the programme from other universities through AP(E)L, and that this may be why there is little information about it in the programme documentation. The visitors require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L. This will allow applicants to make an informed decision when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and social care professions council' (programme specification, page 6) and the 'Health and professionals care council' (student handbook, page 6) rather than the 'Health and Care Professions Council' (HCPC). The visitors therefore require that the information provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC. Additionally, following the merger of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) into the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), CRB checks are now called DBS checks. Therefore the visitors

require that all references to CRB checks within the admissions and programme documentation are updated to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, and to avoid any potential confusion for applicants and students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that some documents were in draft form, for example Module Definition Forms (MDFs) were provided with a module amendment form. The visitors therefore require that, if any amendments are made to the documentation, the finalised versions are provided, to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with Essex County Council ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close working relationship between the programme team and Essex County Council, for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. This relationship is maintained through regular meetings to determine the number of LA placements available, the learning needs of the students, and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. As such the visitors are unclear how the team ensures that the range of practice learning which each student undertakes effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with Essex County Council and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, it was indicated that the education provider requests confirmation that an agency has an equality and diversity policy as part of the initial and ongoing audit of the placement. Whilst it can be seen that the education provider seeks placements with equality and diversity policies in place, the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are implemented at the placement setting, and how they are monitored. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored at the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular for the 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the addition of a zero credit 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module led to discussions regarding progression following completion of this module. It was not clear if students would be able to progress onto taught modules (as they have achieved the required credits to do so), and how this would work in practice, as they would not be able to go on placement without having passed this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how students progress from level 4 – 5 in this module. Additionally, the new module approval form states that 'in order to pass this module, students are required to achieve an overall mark of 40%' (page 25, Document 2), but in discussion with the programme team it was stated that this would be a pass/fail module. The visitors require that this is clarified within the programme documentation so students understand the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how students give their consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Course Learning Agreement form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form and accompanying guidance so that examples of tasks that students will be giving their consent for are detailed. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussions with the students at the visit, it appeared that their understanding of interprofessional learning was that it happened whilst on placement, rather than as part of a taught module. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that there is interprofessional learning within the 'Practice 1' module, through communication and partnership working with other health and care professionals. The visitors were therefore content that where there is interprofessional learning within the programme, the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are being adequately addressed, and therefore that this standard is met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered within the curriculum, this could impact on the way in which this standard is met, and in this case the HCPC should be informed of any changes to interprofessional learning through the major change process.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the recent increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student

numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

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

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

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

Valerie Maehle
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	MA Social Work (Cambridge)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Paul Jackson (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Bright (Internal Panel Member) Vanessa Waller (Internal Panel Member) Ian Cummins (External Panel Member) Maxine Fletcher (External Panel Member) Nasreen Hammond (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information provided to potential applicants regarding the requirements for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English to ensure that they are consistent.

Reason: The visitors noted from a review of the admissions information, that whilst there were stated IELTS requirements for the programme, that these appeared contradictory. On one page of the website, it was stated that the requirement was 6.5, whilst on other pages of the website it stated that the requirement was 7.0 and 7.5. Additionally, in discussion with the programme team there was some confusion as to what the requirements of the programme were. The visitors therefore require that the education provider reviews the information provided to potential applicants to clarify the IELTS requirements for the programme to ensure that requirements for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English are applied, and that that they are consistent.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy in the 'Senate Code of Practice on Admissions', which is a university-wide document. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. From discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there are currently very limited opportunities to transfer to the programme from other universities through AP(E)L, and that this may be why there is little information about it in the programme documentation. The visitors require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L. This will allow applicants to make an informed decision when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and social care professions council' (programme specification, page 6) and the 'Health and professionals care council' (student handbook, page 6) rather than the 'Health and Care Professions Council' (HCPC). The visitors therefore require that the information provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC. Additionally, following the merger of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) into the Disclosure and

Barring Service (DBS), CRB checks are now called DBS checks. Therefore the visitors require that all references to CRB checks within the admissions and programme documentation are updated to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, and to avoid any potential confusion for applicants and students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that some documents were in draft form, for example Module Definition Forms (MDFs) were provided with a module amendment form. The visitors therefore require that, if any amendments are made to the documentation, the finalised versions are provided, to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with Essex County Council ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close working relationship between the programme team and Essex County Council, for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. This relationship is maintained through regular meetings to determine the number of LA placements available, the learning needs of the students, and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. As such the visitors are unclear how the team ensures that the range of practice learning which each student undertakes effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with Essex County Council and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, it was indicated that the education provider requests confirmation that an agency has an equality and diversity policy as part of the initial and ongoing audit of the placement. Whilst it can be seen that the education provider seeks placements with equality and diversity policies in place, the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are implemented at the placement setting, and how they are monitored. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the

education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored at the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular for the 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the addition of a zero credit 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module led to discussions regarding progression following completion of this module. It was not clear if students would be able to progress onto taught modules (as they have achieved the required credits to do so), and how this would work in practice, as they would not be able to go on placement without having passed this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how students progress from level 4 – 5 in this module. Additionally, the new module approval form states that 'in order to pass this module, students are required to achieve an overall mark of 40%' (page 25, Document 2), but in discussion with the programme team it was stated that this would be a pass/fail module. The visitors require that this is clarified within the programme documentation so students understand the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how students give their consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Course Learning Agreement form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form and accompanying guidance so that examples of tasks that students will be giving their consent for are detailed. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussions with the students at the visit, it appeared that their understanding of interprofessional learning was that it happened whilst on placement, rather than as part of a taught module. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that there is interprofessional learning within the 'Practice 1' module, through communication and partnership working with other health and care professionals. The visitors were therefore content that where there is interprofessional learning within the programme, the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are being adequately addressed, and therefore that this standard is met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered within the curriculum, this could impact on the way in which this standard is met, and in this case the HCPC should be informed of any changes to interprofessional learning through the major change process.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the recent increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student

numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

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

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

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

Valerie Maehle
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	MA Social Work (Chelmsford)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	2 – 3 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Valerie Maehle (Physiotherapist) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	30
First approved intake	July 2003
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Paul Jackson (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Laura Bright (Internal Panel Member) Vanessa Waller (Internal Panel Member) Ian Cummins (External Panel Member) Maxine Fletcher (External Panel Member) Nasreen Hammond (The College of Social Work) Jane Lindsay (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the information provided to potential applicants regarding the requirements for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English to ensure that they are consistent.

Reason: The visitors noted from a review of the admissions information, that whilst there were stated IELTS requirements for the programme, that these appeared contradictory. On one page of the website, it was stated that the requirement was 6.5, whilst on other pages of the website it stated that the requirement was 7.0 and 7.5. Additionally, in discussion with the programme team there was some confusion as to what the requirements of the programme were. The visitors therefore require that the education provider reviews the information provided to potential applicants to clarify the IELTS requirements for the programme to ensure that requirements for a good command of reading, writing and spoken English are applied, and that that they are consistent.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy in the 'Senate Code of Practice on Admissions', which is a university-wide document. However, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. From discussion with the programme team, they clarified that there are currently very limited opportunities to transfer to the programme from other universities through AP(E)L, and that this may be why there is little information about it in the programme documentation. The visitors require that the information provided to applicants is revised to detail the programme's policies about AP(E)L. This will allow applicants to make an informed decision when applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health and social care professions council' (programme specification, page 6) and the 'Health and professionals care council' (student handbook, page 6) rather than the 'Health and Care Professions Council' (HCPC). The visitors therefore require that the information provided to students is updated to reflect the current terminology in use relating to the HCPC. Additionally, following the merger of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) and the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) into the Disclosure and

Barring Service (DBS), CRB checks are now called DBS checks. Therefore the visitors require that all references to CRB checks within the admissions and programme documentation are updated to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, and to avoid any potential confusion for applicants and students. From a review of the programme documentation the visitors also noted that some documents were in draft form, for example Module Definition Forms (MDFs) were provided with a module amendment form. The visitors therefore require that, if any amendments are made to the documentation, the finalised versions are provided, to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information about how their relationship with Essex County Council ensures that there is a sufficient range of placement opportunities for students.

Reason: From discussions with the practice placement educators and the programme team during the visit, the visitors were made aware of the close working relationship between the programme team and Essex County Council, for the organisation of placements for students in local authority (LA) settings. This relationship is maintained through regular meetings to determine the number of LA placements available, the learning needs of the students, and the allocation of students to LA placement providers and educators. The visitors noted, in conversation with the practice placement providers and educators that the partnership takes a significant role in allocating students to available placements based on student preferences that have been expressed in application forms for placement. As such the visitors are unclear how the team ensures that the range of practice learning which each student undertakes effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Therefore the visitors require further information about the relationship the programme team has with Essex County Council and how this works in practice to ensure that all students get the experiences they require on placement. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures there is a sufficient number and range of placements to support students in the achievement of the required learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored within practice placements.

Reason: In the SETs mapping document, it was indicated that the education provider requests confirmation that an agency has an equality and diversity policy as part of the initial and ongoing audit of the placement. Whilst it can be seen that the education provider seeks placements with equality and diversity policies in place, the visitors could not see evidence of a process by which the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are implemented at the placement setting, and how they are monitored. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the

education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies in relation to students are implemented and monitored at the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to clarify the requirements for student progression within the programme, in particular for the 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the addition of a zero credit 'Assessed Readiness for Direct Practice' module led to discussions regarding progression following completion of this module. It was not clear if students would be able to progress onto taught modules (as they have achieved the required credits to do so), and how this would work in practice, as they would not be able to go on placement without having passed this module. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly demonstrates how students progress from level 4 – 5 in this module. Additionally, the new module approval form states that 'in order to pass this module, students are required to achieve an overall mark of 40%' (page 25, Document 2), but in discussion with the programme team it was stated that this would be a pass/fail module. The visitors require that this is clarified within the programme documentation so students understand the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing how students give their consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the Course Learning Agreement form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing the consent form and accompanying guidance so that examples of tasks that students will be giving their consent for are detailed. This will contribute to a greater understanding of the specific tasks that students are providing their consent for before they sign the declaration.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussions with the students at the visit, it appeared that their understanding of interprofessional learning was that it happened whilst on placement, rather than as part of a taught module. From discussions with the programme team it was clarified that there is interprofessional learning within the 'Practice 1' module, through communication and partnership working with other health and care professionals. The visitors were therefore content that where there is interprofessional learning within the programme, the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are being adequately addressed, and therefore that this standard is met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider was considering altering its policies around IPL. However, they would like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered within the curriculum, this could impact on the way in which this standard is met, and in this case the HCPC should be informed of any changes to interprofessional learning through the major change process.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the recent increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student

numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

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

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

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

Valerie Maehle
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Dietitian
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Diploma Professional Development in Paramedic Practice, Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Sara Smith (Dietitian) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	45
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Tim Davis (Coventry University)
Secretary	James Watts (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Nigel Poole (Internal Panel Member) Sarah Illingworth (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and incorrect terminology. The programme specification states “programme accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)” (page 4). The HCPC use the term ‘approval’ for programmes not ‘accreditation’. The programme specification also states the programme provides “the student with a programme of study which meets all the necessary requirements of the Health and Care Professions Council to apply for registration as a Dietitian and to use the protected title of Dietitian” (page 5). The visitors considered that successful graduates are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be automatically registered; there is a registration process to complete. ‘The Practice Placement Handbook- Clinical Educators’ refers to appendix 3 “HCPC PRE-PLACEMENT GUIDELINES”. The HCPC does not provide specific pre-placement guidelines. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify for students' information about compensation and student progression within the programme documentation.

Reason: Within the programme documentation submitted for the visit, the visitors noted the pass mark of 40% for all modules was clearly stated in the student course handbook (p20). The visitors also noted however that some modules in the module directory allowed compensation between modes of assessment at a level of 35% whereas others it was at a level of 40%. For example, Human Nutrition 110DT states "Assessment 1 must be at least 35% and Assessment 2 must be at least 35%" and Foundations of Dietetic Practice 111DT states "Coursework 1 must be at least 40% and Coursework 2 must be at least 40%". The visitors considered this to be potentially misleading for students. The visitors consider it to be important for students to understand that different modules may have different requirements for student progression and compensation and so this should be clearly articulated within the programme documentation such as the programme course handbook. The visitors therefore require the education provider to include further information about compensation and student progression within the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Sara Smith
Kathryn Heathcote
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time Part time (In service)
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Occupational Therapist
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 deadline date to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on panel 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Diploma Professional Development in Paramedic Practice, Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	195
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Chris Bland (University of Coventry)
Secretary	Julie Keane (University of Coventry) Tessa Piper (University of Coventry)
Members of the joint panel	Christopher McKenna (College of Occupational Therapists) Deb Hearle (College of Occupational Therapists) Clair Parkin (College of Occupational Therapist Executive officer) Catherine Wells (External panel member) Mike Rosser (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Occupational therapist.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, on page 97 of the Professional Practice Handbook states 'At level three, the pass mark (45) reflects the standard required by the Health Professions Council for a student to be eligible for registration'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of pass rates. The HCPC's requirements around modules and pass rates are for the education provider to demonstrate that students who complete their programme meet the standards of proficiency. Also the visitors noted on the programme specification page 4 states that the programme is 'accredited' by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Andrew Steel
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Diploma Professional Development in Paramedic Practice, Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Sara Smith (Dietitian) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	130
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Beverley Steventon (Coventry University)
Secretary	Sally Sykes (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Tabor (Internal Panel Member) Heather Hunter (External Panel Member) Fiona Roberts (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants and students are made aware of changes to the fee structure and information about changes to the bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider will recruit self-funded students to the programme. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for physiotherapy students in UK are changing. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation that information about changes to the fee structure, the bursaries and the self-funded route will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information. Therefore they require the education provider to provide further evidence, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the above information.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit contained some incorrect statements and terminology. The programme specification states the programme is “accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and by Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)” (page 4). The HCPC use the term ‘approval’ for programmes and not ‘accreditation’. The programme specification also states “All modules must be passed at level 3 and no fails may be carried towards the Physiotherapy Licence to Practice award” (Section 13.3). Approved programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC; the programme does not automatically give a license to practice. The visitors also noted the Student Course Handbook refers to a different programme “this is a facility for every student who is studying psychology” (page 27). The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Kathryn Heathcote
Sara Smith
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Leicester)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Physiotherapist
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Diploma Professional Development in Paramedic Practice, Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Sara Smith (Dietitian) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	130
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Beverley Steventon (Coventry University)
Secretary	Sally Sykes (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Tabor (Internal Panel Member) Heather Hunter (External Panel Member) Fiona Roberts (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy) Nina Thomson (Chartered Society of Physiotherapy)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants and students are made aware of changes to the fee structure and information about changes to the bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider will recruit self-funded students to the programme. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for physiotherapy students in UK are changing. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation that information about changes to the fee structure, the bursaries and the self-funded route will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information. Therefore they require the education provider to provide further evidence, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the above information.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is accurate and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

Reason: The visitors noted the documentation submitted by the education provider prior to the visit contained some incorrect statements and terminology. The programme specification states the programme is “accredited by Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) and by Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)” (page 4). The HCPC use the term ‘approval’ for programmes and not ‘accreditation’. The programme specification also states “All modules must be passed at level 3 and no fails may be carried towards the Physiotherapy Licence to Practice award” (Section 13.3). Approved programmes provide eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC; the programme does not automatically give a license to practice. The visitors also noted the Student Course Handbook refers to a different programme “this is a facility for every student who is studying psychology” (page 27). The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Kathryn Heathcote
Sara Smith
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 deadline date to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on panel 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Joanna Goodwin (Occupational therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	19
First approved intake	September 1997
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Chris Bland (University of Coventry)
Secretary	Julie Keane (University of Coventry) Tessa Piper (University of Coventry)
Members of the joint panel	Alan Mount (External panel member) Mike Rosser (Internal panel member) Tim Lewis (College of Operating Department Practitioners)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Operating Department Practitioner.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology and information. For example, on page 15 of the Programme Specification states 'In order to be eligible for registration as an Operating Department Practitioner with the HCPC all modules and all clinical placements and clinical hours must be passed and achieved'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of pass rates or the number of hours undertake as clinical hours. The HCPC's requirements around modules and clinical hours are for the education provider to demonstrate that students who complete their programme meet the standards of proficiency. Also the visitors noted on the student handbook page 46 states that programme is 'accredited' by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation and feel that incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team consider maintaining currency of records for practice placement educators and their training.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was clear that the education provider run regular initial and refresher training courses for practice placement educators. The visitors were content that this standard continues to be met. However, the visitors recommend the programme team consider keeping an updated list of the training practice placement educators have received. In this way the visitors felt that the programme team may be able to more easily evaluate the currency of placement educators training and evaluate where any additional training may or should be delivered.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider a more formal system for checking the HCPC registration (or any other registration) details of each practice placement educator.

Reason: The visitors noted the programme has a detailed auditing and monitoring process for practice placement providers and placement educators. Through discussions with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would check the registration status of the mentors at the same time when undertaking the placement provider audit. The visitors were satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that subsequently the programme team left it up to placement providers to check that placement educators HCPC registration was up-to date. The visitors' therefore suggest the programme team consider a more robust system of checking practice placement educators' registration status after a placement provider has been audited. In this way the programme team may be better able to ensure that all placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Andrew Steel
Joanna Goodwin

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Sara Smith (Dietitian)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	40 (twice a year)
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Beverley Steventon (Coventry University)
Secretary	Lise Elliot (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Tabor (Internal Panel Member) Sam Willis (External Panel Member) Graham Harris (College of Paramedics) Paul Eyre (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure information about the bridging module is clearly articulated.

Reason: The visitors noted that applicants to the programme are predominantly ambulance technicians. The visitors noted each student on this programme will complete the bridging module before starting the programme to help them acclimatize to the higher education learning environment. During meetings with the students and discussion with the programme team the visitors explored this bridging module. From the documentation and discussions with the programme team however, the visitors were unable to determine how information about this module was clearly articulated to potential applicants and students. Therefore they require the education provider to provide further evidence, including advertising materials, to demonstrate how this information about the bridging module is clearly articulated.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation

to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider how best to use the support systems in place to enhance students' academic writing skills.

Reason: The visitors noted that applicants to the programme are predominantly ambulance technicians who may not have been in an academic setting for some time. The visitors were made aware that each student was allocated a personal tutor on entry to the programme and that staff devoted a lot of time and effort to supporting students. The visitors also noted the pastoral support mechanisms in place that students could access and as such the visitors were content this standard was met. However, in discussion with the students the visitors noted that some students indicated they felt they were struggling with this aspect of the programme and would have liked to have been able to access further support, particularly around academic writing. As such the visitors recommend to the programme team that they consider how their current support mechanisms can best support students with their academic writing skills. In this way the team may be better placed to enhance student's academic writing skill where needed.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the programme team consider keeping the number of contact hours that student have with their practice placement educators under review.

Reason: The visitors noted that applicants to the programme are predominantly ambulance technicians. The visitors noted that each student is allocated a practice placement educator while they are on placement. Therefore the visitors are content this standard is met. However, during discussion with the students the visitors were made aware that some students indicated they felt they could often go without contact with their placement educator for periods while they were on placement. This is due to their position as ambulance technicians in the trust and as such can be left to operate in the role in which they are currently employed. As such the visitors recommend to the programme team that they consider how the support mechanisms can best support students while they are on placement and ensure that the numbers of contact hours students have with their placement educator are sufficient. In this way the programme team may enhance the level of support students receive while they are on placement.

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider considers how best to identify and engage with other placement providers to expand the number and range of placement settings available to students.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements as part of this programme. The visitors were therefore content this

standard was met. However, in the meetings with the placement provider and the programme team, it was highlighted all placements are provided by one placement provider. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continue to further develop partnerships with other practice placements providers in the area so students can experience a wide range of different placement settings. In this way the programme team may be better placed to utilise a wide range of placements to enhance students' learning.

Mark Nevins
Kathryn Heathcote
Sara Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Coventry
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	28 – 30 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

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

Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes - Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice, Diploma Professional Development in Paramedic Practice, BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Dietetics. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Sara Smith (Dietitian)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Benjamin Potter
Proposed student numbers	32
First approved intake	September 2005
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Beverley Steventon (Coventry University)
Secretary	Lise Elliot (Coventry University)
Members of the joint panel	Tim Tabor (Internal Panel Member) Sam Willis (External Panel Member) Graham Harris (College of Paramedics) Paul Eyre (College of Paramedics)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure information about the programme requirements for driving and a driving licence is clearly articulated.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding admission criteria for the programme included driving licence requirements. The visitors noted the programme requires an “Acceptable Driving Licence”. During discussion with the programme team the visitors explored what constitutes an acceptable driving licence. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and discussions if the driving licence requirements were clear for potential applicants and students. Therefore they require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure there is enough information about driving and the driving licence requirements for the programme. In particular to articulate to applicant and student what an ‘acceptable’ driving licence constitutes. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme team ensures that applicant to the programme have all the information they require before taking up a place on the programme.

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

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

Reason: Documentation provided for the visit included information about the collaborative curriculum for interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme. The visitors noted in discussion at the visit that the programme team will amend the collaborative curriculum, as presented, to the requirements of the education provider. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the revised collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of how they ensure all practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures the practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated they are currently reviewing their placement audit process and in the future would ensure practice placement provider equality and diversity policies are in place. In order to determine how the programme could continue to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

Condition: The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression through the programme including arrangements for any failed credits.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided the visitors learnt that students are not allowed to carry any more than 20 failed credits between year 1 and 2 of the programme. The visitors could not ascertain when students would be required to make up these failed credits. During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt the education providers' progression policy stipulated the remaining 20 credits would need to be accomplished within the second year of the programme. The visitors were unable to determine if these requirements for progression are made clear to students. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how this information is clearly articulated to students so that they are aware of the requirements for progression including arrangements for making up any failed credits.

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

Condition: The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider considers how best to identify and engage with other placement providers to expand the number and range of placement settings available to students.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements as part of this programme. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. However, in the meetings with the placement provider and the programme team, it was highlighted all placements are provided by one placement provider. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continue to further develop partnerships with other practice placements providers in the area so students can experience a wide range of different placement settings. In this way the programme team may be better placed to utilise a wide range of placements to enhance students' learning.

Mark Nevins
Kathryn Heathcote
Sara Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 26 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social Worker) David Ward (Social Worker) Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	48
Chair	Elizabeth Price (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Emma Wingate (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan White (External panel member) Sarah Ives (Internal Panel Member) Kathryn Heathcote (Internal Panel Member) Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example page 9 of the Course Development Plan the education provider states that 'all programmes are approved by the GSCC'. The GSCC no longer exists and therefore references to this body should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. There are also incorrect statements about the HCPC's requirements for practice learning. For example, page 36 of the Programme Specification states 'TCSW & HCPC require all students to undertake 200 days of practice learning'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of practice days. The HCPC's requirements around placements are for the education provider to demonstrate that the practice learning effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Also, the visitors noted that throughout the Programme Specification it is stated that upon completion of the programme students 'will be eligible to register with HCPC as a qualified social worker'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character test at the point of registration. Also, page 1 of the programme specification states that the programme is 'accredited' by the HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by the HCPC, which is the correct terminology. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the formal procedure for with dealing with concerns about students' profession related conduct and how this works in tandem with the education provider's fitness to practice procedure.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. For example, the suitability procedures for the suspension and exclusion of students from the programme on the grounds of professional unsuitability. However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct to ensure that issues of this kind are dealt with clearly and consistently. They were also unclear how this process links into the established fitness to practice procedure. As a result the

visitors could not determine what criteria are used to determine when an issue around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure and how this is communicated to students, staff and placement educators to ensure consistency. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with issues around students' profession-related conduct and how this procedure connects to the fitness to practice processes in determining if students can continue on the programme. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process so that visitors can determine how this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarification on the formal processes they will use to allocate placements and ensure that all students get the experience they require to meet the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme which linked the relevant learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of proficiency. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that there are issues with finding appropriate statutory placements in the local area and that some students had two distinct placements with similar groups of service users. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcome of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement providers at the first placement meeting. As a result of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team used the allocation of placements to provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet the stated learning outcomes and subsequently the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the scheme of placements will work in practice to be sure that the range of practice placements are appropriate to support students in achieving the required learning outcomes and meet the relevant standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to articulate what the team consider to be appropriate training and to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators have undertaken this training so they can supervise and assess students appropriately.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, as well as discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider offers free training and refresher training for practice placement educators. They similarly noted that practice placement educators needed to achieve stage 1 and stage 2 of the 'practice educator professional standards' before supervising students on various placements. However, the visitors were unclear about what programme specific training practice placement educators would be required to undertake before they could supervise and assess a student's performance based on the requirements of this programme. The visitors were also unclear how the programme team monitors the training that practice placement educators have undertaken prior to supervising a student. The visitors were therefore unclear about

how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators have undertaken the required training activities so that they can undertake the role that is being asked of them. In particular the visitors were unclear how practice placement educators were being trained to implement the new assessment of students in regards to the SOPs and the professional capabilities framework (PCF). The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of the training that practice placement educators are required to undertake before they supervise a student on this programme. They also require further information of the programme specific training that is offered to practice placement educators to ensure they can assess students in line with the new assessment requirements around the SOPs and PCF. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including team members' relevant professional experience on their curriculum vitae.

Reason: From discussions at the visit, the visitors saw sufficient evidence that the programme team has appropriate staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme, and therefore were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to include their professional or direct practice experience on their curriculum vitae. In this way the programme team may be better able to demonstrate how they keep the curriculum current and bring relevant, recent experience to bear on the teaching activities of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Didsbury campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus in the near future. The visitors were presented with brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation of the new resources that will be available at the campus. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change once they move to the new campus of education and health as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that resources continue to be effectively used to support students in all settings and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider must inform HCPC if interprofessional learning is introduced to the curriculum once the education provider has moved campus.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that this standard is being met as the programme team articulated that currently there was no explicit interprofessional learning with other professional groups. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus which would be shared with a number of programmes from different professions. From the brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation, the visitors were made aware that, while there will be an increase in the quality of resources, these would be shared with other professional programmes. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify the HCPC of any changes to interprofessional learning on the programme through the major change process once they move to the new campus.

This is to ensure that, if any interprofessional learning is introduced by the education provider as a result of this move, this learning adequately addresses the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group.

David Childs
David Ward
Laura Golding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 26 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social Worker) David Ward (Social Worker) Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	48
Chair	Elizabeth Price (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Emma Wingate (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan White (External panel member) Sarah Ives (Internal Panel Member) Kathryn Heathcote (Internal Panel Member) Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example page 9 of the Course Development Plan the education provider states that 'all programmes are approved by the GSCC'. The GSCC no longer exists and therefore references to this body should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. There are also incorrect statements about the HCPC's requirements for practice learning. For example, page 36 of the Programme Specification states 'TCSW & HCPC require all students to undertake 200 days of practice learning'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of practice days. The HCPC's requirements around placements are for the education provider to demonstrate that the practice learning effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Also, the visitors noted that throughout the Programme Specification it is stated that upon completion of the programme students 'will be eligible to register with HCPC as a qualified social worker'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character test at the point of registration. Also, page 1 of the programme specification states that the programme is 'accredited' by the HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by the HCPC, which is the correct terminology. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the formal procedure for with dealing with concerns about students' profession related conduct and how this works in tandem with the education provider's fitness to practice procedure.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. For example, the suitability procedures for the suspension and exclusion of students from the programme on the grounds of professional unsuitability. However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct to ensure that issues of this kind are dealt with clearly and consistently. They were also unclear how this process links into the established fitness to practice procedure. As a result the

visitors could not determine what criteria are used to determine when an issue around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure and how this is communicated to students, staff and placement educators to ensure consistency. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with issues around students' profession-related conduct and how this procedure connects to the fitness to practice processes in determining if students can continue on the programme. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process so that visitors can determine how this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarification on the formal processes they will use to allocate placements and ensure that all students get the experience they require to meet the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme which linked the relevant learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of proficiency. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that there are issues with finding appropriate statutory placements in the local area and that some students had two distinct placements with similar groups of service users. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcome of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement providers at the first placement meeting. As a result of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team used the allocation of placements to provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet the stated learning outcomes and subsequently the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the scheme of placements will work in practice to be sure that the range of practice placements are appropriate to support students in achieving the required learning outcomes and meet the relevant standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to articulate what the team consider to be appropriate training and to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators have undertaken this training so they can supervise and assess students appropriately.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, as well as discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider offers free training and refresher training for practice placement educators. They similarly noted that practice placement educators needed to achieve stage 1 and stage 2 of the 'practice educator professional standards' before supervising students on various placements. However, the visitors were unclear about what programme specific training practice placement educators would be required to undertake before they could supervise and assess a student's performance based on the requirements of this programme. The visitors were also unclear how the programme team monitors the training that practice placement educators have undertaken prior to supervising a student. The visitors were therefore unclear about

how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators have undertaken the required training activities so that they can undertake the role that is being asked of them. In particular the visitors were unclear how practice placement educators were being trained to implement the new assessment of students in regards to the SOPs and the professional capabilities framework (PCF). The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of the training that practice placement educators are required to undertake before they supervise a student on this programme. They also require further information of the programme specific training that is offered to practice placement educators to ensure they can assess students in line with the new assessment requirements around the SOPs and PCF. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including team members' relevant professional experience on their curriculum vitae.

Reason: From discussions at the visit, the visitors saw sufficient evidence that the programme team has appropriate staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme, and therefore were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to include their professional or direct practice experience on their curriculum vitae. In this way the programme team may be better able to demonstrate how they keep the curriculum current and bring relevant, recent experience to bear on the teaching activities of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Didsbury campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus in the near future. The visitors were presented with brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation of the new resources that will be available at the campus. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change once they move to the new campus of education and health as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that resources continue to be effectively used to support students in all settings and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider must inform HCPC if interprofessional learning is introduced to the curriculum once the education provider has moved campus.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that this standard is being met as the programme team articulated that currently there was no explicit interprofessional learning with other professional groups. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus which would be shared with a number of programmes from different professions. From the brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation, the visitors were made aware that, while there will be an increase in the quality of resources, these would be shared with other professional programmes. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify the HCPC of any changes to interprofessional learning on the programme through the major change process once they move to the new campus.

This is to ensure that, if any interprofessional learning is introduced by the education provider as a result of this move, this learning adequately addresses the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group.

David Childs
David Ward
Laura Golding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Manchester Metropolitan University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 26 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social Worker) David Ward (Social Worker) Laura Golding (Clinical psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Ben Potter
Proposed student numbers	46 (including MA Social Work)
Chair	Elizabeth Price (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Emma Wingate (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Susan White (External panel member) Sarah Ives (Internal Panel Member) Kathryn Heathcote (Internal Panel Member) Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example page 9 of the Course Development Plan the education provider states that 'all programmes are approved by the GSCC'. The GSCC no longer exists and therefore references to this body should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. There are also incorrect statements about the HCPC's requirements for practice learning. For example, page 36 of the Programme Specification states 'TCSW & HCPC require all students to undertake 200 days of practice learning'. The HCPC does not have prescriptive requirements in terms of practice days. The HCPC's requirements around placements are for the education provider to demonstrate that the practice learning effectively supports the delivery of the learning outcomes. Also, the visitors noted that throughout the Programme Specification it is stated that upon completion of the programme students 'will be eligible to register with HCPC as a qualified social worker'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character test at the point of registration. Also, page 1 of the programme specification states that the programme is 'accredited' by the HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by the HCPC, which is the correct terminology. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the formal procedure for with dealing with concerns about students' profession related conduct and how this works in tandem with the education provider's fitness to practice procedure.

Reason: In discussions at the visit and from the documentation, the visitors were made aware that there are processes in place which deal with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. For example, the suitability procedures for the suspension and exclusion of students from the programme on the grounds of professional unsuitability. However, the visitors were unable to determine a clear, definitive, formal procedure for dealing with issues around student professional conduct to ensure that issues of this kind are dealt with clearly and consistently. They were also unclear how this process links into the established fitness to practice procedure. As a result the

visitors could not determine what criteria are used to determine when an issue around students' profession related conduct is referred to the fitness to practice procedure and how this is communicated to students, staff and placement educators to ensure consistency. Therefore the visitors require clear evidence of the formal procedure in place to deal with issues around students' profession-related conduct and how this procedure connects to the fitness to practice processes in determining if students can continue on the programme. This evidence should also highlight explicit information for students and placement educators around this process so that visitors can determine how this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarification on the formal processes they will use to allocate placements and ensure that all students get the experience they require to meet the relevant standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme which linked the relevant learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of proficiency. However, in discussion with the students it was highlighted that there are issues with finding appropriate statutory placements in the local area and that some students had two distinct placements with similar groups of service users. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcome of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement providers at the first placement meeting. As a result of the evidence provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team used the allocation of placements to provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet the stated learning outcomes and subsequently the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the scheme of placements will work in practice to be sure that the range of practice placements are appropriate to support students in achieving the required learning outcomes and meet the relevant standards of proficiency for social workers.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to articulate what the team consider to be appropriate training and to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators have undertaken this training so they can supervise and assess students appropriately.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, as well as discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider offers free training and refresher training for practice placement educators. They similarly noted that practice placement educators needed to achieve stage 1 and stage 2 of the 'practice educator professional standards' before supervising students on various placements. However, the visitors were unclear about what programme specific training practice placement educators would be required to undertake before they could supervise and assess a student's performance based on the requirements of this programme. The visitors were also unclear how the programme team monitors the training that practice placement educators have undertaken prior to supervising a student. The visitors were therefore unclear about

how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators have undertaken the required training activities so that they can undertake the role that is being asked of them. In particular the visitors were unclear how practice placement educators were being trained to implement the new assessment of students in regards to the SOPs and the professional capabilities framework (PCF). The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of the training that practice placement educators are required to undertake before they supervise a student on this programme. They also require further information of the programme specific training that is offered to practice placement educators to ensure they can assess students in line with the new assessment requirements around the SOPs and PCF. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including team members' relevant professional experience on their curriculum vitae.

Reason: From discussions at the visit, the visitors saw sufficient evidence that the programme team has appropriate staff with the relevant expertise and knowledge to deliver an effective programme, and therefore were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to include their professional or direct practice experience on their curriculum vitae. In this way the programme team may be better able to demonstrate how they keep the curriculum current and bring relevant, recent experience to bear on the teaching activities of the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Didsbury campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus in the near future. The visitors were presented with brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation of the new resources that will be available at the campus. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change once they move to the new campus of education and health as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that resources continue to be effectively used to support students in all settings and that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider must inform HCPC if interprofessional learning is introduced to the curriculum once the education provider has moved campus.

Reason: The visitors are satisfied that this standard is being met as the programme team articulated that currently there was no explicit interprofessional learning with other professional groups. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the social work department to a new campus which would be shared with a number of programmes from different professions. From the brochures of the new campus as well as a presentation, the visitors were made aware that, while there will be an increase in the quality of resources, these would be shared with other professional programmes. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify the HCPC of any changes to interprofessional learning on the programme through the major change process once they move to the new campus.

This is to ensure that, if any interprofessional learning is introduced by the education provider as a result of this move, this learning adequately addresses the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group.

David Childs
David Ward
Laura Golding

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	Teesside University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 15 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	34
First approved intake	September 2006
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Liz Holey (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Jacquie Horner (Internal Panel Member) Tim James (Internal Panel Member) Paul Stone (Internal Panel Member) Diana Lesnic (Internal Panel Member) Scott Bullock (Internal Panel Member) Paul Fletcher (External Panel Member) Richard Robley (External Panel Member) Wilfred Foxe (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alan Wood (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Barlow (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarity as to the selection and entry criteria that will be used in relation to applicants' command of English, and how this will be assessed in applications.

Reason: The programme documentation states that the admissions procedure will ensure that all entrants have achieved at least key skill level two in English. The programme specification also states that the programme team must satisfy themselves through the admissions process that entrants are able to communicate clearly and accurately in spoken and written English, however the visitors were unclear what criteria or assessment would be used to measure this. It was also not clear if, or what, International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was required for entry to the programme for applicants whose first language is not English. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit programme documentation to clearly state what measures will be used to ensure that the English language requirements needed for entry to the programme are met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the documentation as to how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions.

Reason: The education provider described in the SETs mapping document how the education provider embeds equality and diversity issues into the programme's delivery through staff updates and induction sessions for the students. However, the visitors were unable to determine what the equality and diversity policy being applied in the admissions process was. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what processes are in place for collecting information on the implementation and monitoring of the policy. In discussion at the visit, the programme team stated that they have guidance around equality and diversity issues available to staff at interviews and that the policy is monitored throughout admissions. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the guidance or any associated monitoring processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the education provider's equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions to ensure this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information for students about the requirements for progression and achievement through the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation prior to the visit. From the evidence provided, they were unable to determine a consistent and clear assessment strategy for individual modules, or at each level of the programme. There appeared to be

inconsistency as to which assessments were eligible for compensation, though discussion at the visit clarified the validating body's definitions of 'elements' and 'components' in relation to this. The student handbook also refers to 'contained awards' on page 10 and states that these will be relevant to those students who have used the APL or APEL process. At the visit, the programme team confirmed the definition of contained awards as step-off or fall-back awards. However, the terminology found in student-facing documentation concerning compensation, progression and achievement throughout the programme may be unclear or misleading to students. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that all resources available to support students as they progress through the programme are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information about policies and regulations that students will be subject to throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme, and copies of regulations relating to student discipline, complaints and fitness to practice. However, the visitors could not find these processes referenced in the student handbook or student-facing documents, and therefore were unclear as to how students are notified as to what procedures and regulations are in place. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the regulations and policies students will be subject to, particularly fitness to practise and expectations of professional conduct, are clearly articulated or referenced in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information and is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for podiatrists / chiropodists.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and noted inaccuracies in the terminology used and references made to the HCPC. There were a number of references in the placement portfolio documents and handbooks to the 'HPC' and 'Health Professions Council'. All such references must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. In addition, there was reference to the level of attendance expected of students in the student handbook (page 49), which implies that the HCPC requires students to attend all practical modules. The HCPC SETs outline that the education provider must determine appropriate attendance requirements for their programmes. The visitors considered such references to be inaccurate and potentially misleading to students. It was also noted by the visitors that overall there were limited references to the HCPC or the HCPC's publications in the student handbook or other student-facing documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to remove any instances

of inaccurate or out of date terminology throughout and ensure that students are well-informed of the regulatory setting for podiatrists / chiropodists.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide any documentation that is revised as a result of the validation process.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the programme specification, module descriptors, learning outcomes and assessments as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made the visitors will need to review them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme documentation where changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted documentation is not subject to change. In this way the visitors can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clarification of the assessment strategy, including any compensation, progression and reassessment details throughout the programme.

Reason: In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations of the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the progression criteria, reassessment or resubmission procedures, or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The visitors were therefore unable to determine the progression and achievement requirements at each level of the programme. As referred to under SET 3.8, the visitors were also unable to determine which assessments would be eligible for compensation throughout the programme. They were therefore unable to determine whether students successfully completing the programme will have been assessed effectively to ensure that the standards of proficiency are met. The visitors therefore require further clarification and confirmation as to the assessment strategy that will be used throughout the programme. In this way they can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clarification and final confirmation of the assessment strategy, to demonstrate how this will comply with the assessment regulations of the new validating body.

Reason: In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the progression criteria, reassessment procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. At the visit, the programme team discussed these issues with colleagues from the validating body, and the validating body set a number of conditions

for the assessment strategy. These included a review of compensation, components and elements and the use of resubmission throughout the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine at the visit that the programme is compliant with the validating body's assessment regulations and that this SET is met. They therefore require the education provider to explicitly document the assessment regulations that are in place at each stage of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit any revised module descriptors for the programme or confirm that the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change.

Reason: As detailed in the reasons for SET 3.8 and 6.2, discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptors, including assessment of learning outcomes, as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made to the module descriptors, the visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptors are not subject to change.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: As stated in the condition under SET 6.2, the programme team provided links in the documentation to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the progression criteria, any module prerequisites, reassessment procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The visitors were therefore unable to determine the progression and achievement requirements at each level of the programme, what the policy was for trailing failed modules across years, or how reassessment attempts would be managed where students had not achieved all of the learning outcomes, in practice or theory. At the visit, the programme team clarified with colleagues from the validating body that students would need to pass all modules (120 credits), in order to progress to the next level, and would not be permitted to trail modules unless there were mitigating circumstances. This requirement, as well as the resit or resubmission arrangements for failed assessments, must be clearly outlined in the programme documentation. As stated, discussions at the visit also indicated that the programme team may implement some changes to the assessment strategy. The visitors therefore require further clarity and confirmation in the documentation of the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that there will be a clear appeals process available to students on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find reference to an appeals procedure. The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme. The mapping document states that the New College Durham 'Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy' will be updated to comply with the validating body regulations and processes. The visitors were provided with the validating body's complaints procedure, but were not provided with the procedure that will be used for students' right to appeal. The visitors were therefore not clear how a student can ask for a review of a decision made on their assessment, progression and achievement. The visitors require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly specify the criteria and procedures for the appointment of external examiners for the programme.

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should submit any changes to the summative assessment of students' clinical and practical skills through the HCPC major change process, to ensure that the assessment continues to be robust.

Reason: In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard how the practice placements are working well and that there is good collaboration between the practice placement educators and the education provider. It was confirmed that the placement educators provide formative feedback to students on placement and are able to input into the teaching that takes place at the education provider. The placement educators will be attending the clinics at New College Durham in the near future, and their involvement with several aspects of the programme is increasing. The visitors were content that this SET is met under the current arrangements, however discussions indicated that there may be a move towards placement educators being responsible for the summative assessment of students in placement. This change would need to be reviewed by the HCPC to ensure that the placement educators have the relevant experience to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students in placement.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should submit any changes to the summative assessment of students' clinical and practical skills through the HCPC major change process, to ensure that the assessment continues to be robust.

Reason: In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard how the practice placements are working well and that there is good collaboration between the practice placement educators and the education provider. It was confirmed that the placement educators provide formative feedback to students on placement and are able to input into the teaching that takes place at the education provider. The placement educators will be attending the clinics at New College Durham in the near future, and their involvement with several aspects of the programme is increasing. The visitors were content that this SET is met under the current arrangements, however discussions indicated that there may be a move towards placement educators being responsible for the summative assessment of students in placement. This change would need to be reviewed by the HCPC to ensure that the placement educators are given sufficient training in the assessment methods to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students in placement.

Catherine Smith
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	Teesside University
Programme name	Certificate in Local Analgesia
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement	Local anaesthetic
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 15 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	8
First approved intake	July 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Liz Holey (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Jacquie Horner (Internal Panel Member) Tim James (Internal Panel Member) Paul Stone (Internal Panel Member) Diana Lesnic (Internal Panel Member) Scott Bullock (Internal Panel Member) Paul Fletcher (External Panel Member) Richard Robley (External Panel Member) Wilfred Foxe (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alan Wood (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Barlow (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review a mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

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

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

The HCPC did not meet with the students as they were unable to attend the visit.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of criminal checks associated with the programme on entry.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the 'Course guide' document which will be used to inform applicants about the programme. The entry requirements state that applicants to the course must be registered with the HCPC as a podiatrist / chiropodist. The document also details further considerations, including that applicants must comply with HCPC standards related to fitness to practise. In discussions with the programme team at the visit, it was confirmed that applicants would need to provide evidence that they have an up to date criminal records check as part of the admissions procedure. However, the visitors could not see any information in the documentation to confirm this process, or to demonstrate how potential applicants would be informed of this requirement. The visitors were also unsure as to whether applicants would need to pay for their own criminal records check if they did not already have the evidence. The visitors therefore need further evidence of the full entry requirements relating to criminal checks, demonstrating how applicants will be notified in order for them to make an informed decision as to whether to apply to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the documentation as to how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions.

Reason: The education provider described in the SETs mapping document how the education provider embeds equality and diversity issues into the programme's delivery through staff updates and induction sessions for the students. However, the visitors were unable to determine what the equality and diversity policy being applied in the admissions process was. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what processes are in place for collecting information on the implementation and monitoring of the policy. In discussion at the visit, the programme team stated that they have guidance around equality and diversity issues available to staff at interviews and that the policy is monitored throughout admissions. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the guidance or any associated monitoring processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the education provider's equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions to ensure this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information about policies and regulations that students will be subject to throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme, and copies of regulations relating to student discipline, complaints and fitness to practice. However, the visitors could not find these processes referenced in the student handbook, and therefore were unclear as to how students are notified as to what procedures and regulations are in place. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the regulations and policies students will be subject to, particularly fitness to practise, are clearly articulated or referenced in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information and is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for podiatrists / chiropractors.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and noted inaccuracies in the terminology used and references made to the HCPC. There were a number of references in the placement documents and handbooks to the 'HPC' and 'Health Professions Council'. All such references must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. In addition, there was reference to the level of attendance expected of students in the student handbook (page 38), which implies that the HCPC requires students to attend all practical modules. The HCPC SETs outline that the education provider must determine appropriate attendance requirements for their programmes. The visitors also noted that the attendance requirements as outlined in this document are not entirely applicable to the Local Anaesthesia programme as they refer to the Clinical Practice modules of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme and detail a student's attendance requirements in relation to eligibility to progress to the next level of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors considered such references to be potentially misleading to students. It was also noted by the visitors that overall there were limited references to the HCPC or the HCPC's publications in the student handbook or other student-facing documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to remove any instances of inaccurate or out of date terminology throughout and ensure that students are well-informed of the regulatory setting for podiatrists / chiropractors.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide any documentation that is revised as a result of the validation process.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the programme documentation, including the module descriptor, learning outcomes and assessment as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made the visitors will need to review them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme documentation where changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted documentation is not subject to change. In this way the visitors can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clarification of the assessment strategy, including any compensation and reassessment details throughout the programme.

Reason: In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations of the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the reassessment or resubmission procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The module descriptor for Local Analgesia states that the module is not compensatable, and that, 'The pass mark for all elements of the programme is 50%'. However, the student handbook's assessment grid (page 10) does not outline the weighting percentages or pass marks for any of the assessments, and on page 23 states; 'To pass this programme you must achieve a minimum overall programme mark of 50%'. The visitors were therefore unable to determine a clear statement on compensation, elements and components within the programme and were unable to determine whether students successfully completing the programme will have been assessed effectively to ensure that the standard of proficiency is met. The visitors therefore require further clarification and confirmation as to the assessment strategy that will be used for the programme. In this way they can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clarification and final confirmation of the assessment strategy, to demonstrate how this will comply with the assessment regulations of the new validating body.

Reason: In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the reassessment or resubmission procedures, or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. At the visit, the programme team discussed these issues with colleagues from the validating body, and the validating body set a number of conditions for the assessment strategy. These included a review of compensation, components and elements and the use of resubmission throughout the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine at the visit that the programme is compliant with the validating body's assessment regulations and that this SET is met. They therefore require the education provider to explicitly document the assessment regulations that are in place for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit any revisions to the module descriptor for the programme or confirm that the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

Reason: As detailed in the reason for SET 6.2, discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptor, including assessment of learning

outcomes, as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made to the module descriptor, the visitors will need to review this to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptor if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student assessment and achievement within the programme.

Reason: As stated in the condition under SET 6.2, the programme team provided links in the documentation to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to any module prerequisites, reassessment procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The module descriptor for Local Analgesia states that the module is not compensatable, and that, 'The pass mark for all elements of the programme is 50%'. However, the student handbook's assessment grid (page 10) does not outline the weighting percentages or pass marks for any of the assessments, and on page 23 states; 'To pass this programme you must achieve a minimum overall programme mark of 50%'. The visitors were therefore unable to determine a clear statement on compensation, elements and components within the programme or how reassessment attempts would be managed where students had not achieved all of the learning outcomes, in practice or theory. The requirements, as well as the resit or resubmission arrangements for failed assessments, must be clearly outlined in the programme documentation. As stated, discussions at the visit also indicated that the programme team may implement some changes to the assessment strategy. The visitors therefore require further clarity and confirmation in the documentation of the requirements for student achievement throughout the programme.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that there will be a clear appeals process available to students on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find reference to an appeals procedure. The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme. The mapping document states that the New College Durham 'Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy' will be updated to comply with the validating body regulations and processes. The visitors were provided with the validating body's complaints procedure, but were not provided with the procedure that will be used for students' right to appeal. The visitors were therefore not clear how a student can ask for a review of a decision made on their assessment, progression and achievement. The visitors require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly specify the criteria and procedures for the appointment of external examiners for the programme.

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

Catherine Smith
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	New College Durham
Validating body / Awarding body	Teesside University
Programme name	Prescription Only Medicine Certificate
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant entitlement(s)	Prescription only medicine
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 15 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 June 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Catherine Smith (Chiropodist / Podiatrist) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	8
First approved intake	July 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2013
Chair	Liz Holey (Teesside University)
Secretary	John Holmes (Teesside University)
Members of the joint panel	Jacque Horner (Internal Panel Member) Tim James (Internal Panel Member) Paul Stone (Internal Panel Member) Diana Lesnic (Internal Panel Member) Scott Bullock (Internal Panel Member) Paul Fletcher (External Panel Member) Richard Robley (External Panel Member) Wilfred Foxe (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alan Wood (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists) Alison Barlow (The Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists)

Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review a mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs prior to the visit as a mapping document was not required by the visitors as the programme is a post-registration qualification.

The HCPC did not review a practice placement handbook as the documentation does not exist.

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

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

The HCPC did not meet with the students as they were unable to attend the visit.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of criminal checks associated with the programme on entry.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the 'Course guide' document which will be used to inform applicants about the programme. The entry requirements state that applicants to the course must be registered with the HCPC as a podiatrist / chiropodist. The document also details further considerations, including that applicants must comply with HCPC standards related to fitness to practise. In discussions with the programme team at the visit, it was confirmed that applicants would need to provide evidence that they have an up to date criminal records check as part of the admissions procedure. However, the visitors could not see any information in the documentation to confirm this process, or to demonstrate how potential applicants would be informed of this requirement. The visitors were also unsure as to whether applicants would need to pay for their own criminal records check if they did not already have the evidence. The visitors also noted that the 'Course guide' for the programme states that the module is worth 20 credits, rather than 10 credits. The visitors therefore need to see revised advertising materials for the programme to demonstrate how applicants will be enabled to make an informed decision as to whether to apply to the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence in the documentation as to how the equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions.

Reason: The education provider described in the SETs mapping document how the education provider embeds equality and diversity issues into the programme's delivery through staff updates and induction sessions for the students. However, the visitors were unable to determine what the equality and diversity policy being applied in the admissions process was. The visitors could also not determine, from the evidence provided, what processes are in place for collecting information on the implementation and monitoring of the policy. In discussion at the visit, the programme team stated that they have guidance around equality and diversity issues available to staff at interviews and that the policy is monitored throughout admissions. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the guidance or any associated monitoring processes. The visitors therefore require further evidence to determine how the education provider's equality and diversity policy is implemented and monitored in admissions to ensure this standard is being met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information about policies and regulations that students will be subject to throughout the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme, and copies of regulations relating to student discipline, complaints and fitness to practice. However, the visitors could not find these processes referenced in the student handbook, and therefore were unclear as to how students are notified as to what procedures and regulations are in place. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the regulations and policies students will be subject to, particularly fitness to practise, are clearly articulated or referenced in the programme documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it contains accurate information and is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for podiatrists / chiropodists.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit and noted inaccurate references made to the HCPC. There was reference to the level of attendance expected of students in the student handbook (page 37), which implies that the HCPC requires students to attend all practical modules. The HCPC SETs outline that the education provider must determine appropriate attendance requirements for their programmes. The visitors also noted that the attendance requirements as outlined in this document are not entirely applicable to this programme as they refer to the Clinical Practice modules of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme and detail a student's attendance requirements in relation to eligibility to progress to the next level of the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors considered such references to be potentially misleading to students. It was also noted by the visitors that overall there were limited references to the HCPC or the HCPC's publications in the student handbook or other student-facing documentation. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to remove any instances of inaccurate or out of date terminology throughout and ensure that students are well-informed of the regulatory setting for podiatrists / chiropodists.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide any documentation that is revised as a result of the validation process.

Reason: Discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the programme documentation, including the module descriptor, learning outcomes and assessment as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made the visitors will need to review them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme documentation where changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted documentation is not subject to change. In this way the visitors can ensure that this SET is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide clarification and final confirmation of the assessment strategy, to demonstrate how this will comply with the assessment regulations of the new validating body.

Reason: In the documentation, the programme team provided links to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to the reassessment or resubmission procedures that would be in place for this programme specifically. At the visit, the programme team discussed these issues with colleagues from the validating body, and the validating body set a number of conditions for the assessment strategy. These included a review of compensation, components and elements and the use of resubmission throughout the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme. The visitors were therefore unable to determine at the visit that the programme is compliant with the validating body's assessment regulations and that this SET is met. They therefore require the education provider to explicitly document the assessment regulations that are in place for the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit any revisions to the module descriptor for the programme or confirm that the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

Reason: As detailed in the reason for SET 6.2, discussion at the visit indicated the programme team may amend the module descriptor, including assessment of learning outcomes, as part of the post visit process for the new validating body. If any changes are to be made to the module descriptor, the visitors will need to review this to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptor if any changes are made, or confirm the previously submitted module descriptor is not subject to change.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student assessment and achievement within the programme.

Reason: As stated in the condition under SET 6.2, the programme team provided links in the documentation to the assessment regulations at the new validating body. However, the visitors were unable to find explicit confirmation in the documentation as to any module prerequisites, reassessment procedures or other associated measures of achievement that would be in place for this programme specifically. The visitors were therefore unable to determine a clear statement on how reassessment attempts would be managed where students had not achieved all of the learning outcomes, in practice or theory. The assessment requirements, as well as the resit or resubmission arrangements for failed assessments, must be clearly outlined in the programme documentation. As stated, discussions at the visit also indicated that the programme

team may implement some changes to the assessment strategy. The visitors therefore require further clarity and confirmation in the documentation of the requirements for student achievement throughout the programme.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that there will be a clear appeals process available to students on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find reference to an appeals procedure. The visitors were provided with additional documentation at the visit relating to various policies and procedures, including a mapping document which stated whether the education provider or validating body's quality processes would be used for this programme. The mapping document states that the New College Durham 'Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy' will be updated to comply with the validating body regulations and processes. The visitors were provided with the validating body's complaints procedure, but were not provided with the procedure that will be used for students' right to appeal. The visitors were therefore not clear how a student can ask for a review of a decision made on their assessment, progression and achievement. The visitors require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must clearly specify the criteria and procedures for the appointment of external examiners for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, this standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are

agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiner to the programme have been included in the assessment regulations to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Catherine Smith
Paul Blakeman

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Nottingham Trent University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Lel Meleyal (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker) George Delafield (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	35
First approved intake	August 2003
Chair	Judith Ward (Nottingham Trent University)
Secretary	Elizabeth Twells (Nottingham Trent University) Rosemary Taylor (Nottingham Trent University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Hek (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider will need to ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that most references to the Health and care professions council (HCPC) were correct. However, there were a few instances where the HCPC was referred to as the Health and care professionals council, for example in the MA contextual document (p3) and handbook (p49) and there were also references to HCPC validation of the programme. The HCPC approve programmes within the UK for the professions we regulate, rather than validate programmes of study, therefore the visitors require that the programme documentation is updated to reflect this. Additionally, the education provider needs to ensure that references to the 'Criminal Records Bureau' (CRB) (p9, BA handbook) are updated to the 'Disclosure and Barring Service' (DBS) regarding requirements for criminal convictions checks. This will ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and that the terminology used in relation to criminal convictions checks is accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide finalised versions of any documentation that has changed following revisions from the initial documentation reviewed by the visitors, prior to the visit.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors learned that the programme documentation had recently undergone significant revisions. Unfortunately due to limited time available at the visit, the visitors were unable to review the revised documentation fully to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings continue to be effectively used. The visitors were also made aware that the programme had recently gone through an internal validation event, and understand that changes to the programme documentation may be required following this event. The visitors therefore require that any documentation that has changed from the original documentation that they reviewed prior to the visit, and as a result of the internal validation event is provided to ensure that resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a finalised version of the 'Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play' policy, and demonstrate how this will be made readily available to students.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of a recently drafted policy regarding student participation in role plays where they would be acting as service users. This policy includes students ability to opt out of acting as service users in role

plays, and states that every participant must give their informed consent before participating. At the visit, the programme team explained that currently students would be asked to volunteer when acting as service users rather than nominated to do so, however they felt that incorporating this policy into the curriculum would formalise students ability to provide their consent when acting as service users. The visitors were informed that the policy was currently in draft form, and further amendments may be made to it. Therefore the visitors require that they see the finalised version of the 'Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play' policy, and information regarding where within the programme documentation it would be made readily available to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students whilst on placement.

Reason: In the 'HEI placement audit report' (October 2012) provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification. In the meeting with the programme team, it was clarified that there are procedures in place for training practice placement educators, however the visitors could not see from the documentation the processes that are in place to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding the current practice placement educators that are in place, including their registration status and, where they are not registered, details of their qualifications and experience.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, in particular the 'HEI placement audit report' provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification, as of October 2012 when the report was produced. From discussions with the programme team it was not clear what the criteria for becoming a placement educator was, and the steps taken to check their appropriateness for the role of a practice placement educator. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further documentary information about the processes in place for checking the the registration status of current placement educators and, where they are not registered, the processes in place to check the qualifications and experience of practice placement educators, which make them suitable to undertake this role.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of where it is clearly stated within the assessment regulations of the programme that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors felt that whilst there was some information regarding exit awards within the programme documentation, it needed to be clarified that any programmes or exit awards that are not approved by the HCPC do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a revised BA contextual document in which the wording concerning exit awards had changed to state that “students who leave the social work degree must complete their studies on related courses in order to be eligible to register with the HCPC” (p22). This is incorrect, and therefore the visitors require evidence that the documentation has been updated to clearly state that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of where it clearly specifies that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see evidence of where it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of where within the programme documentation this is stated, to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear within the assessment regulations that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided, and in the meeting with the programme team that there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme for the proposed student numbers for the next cohort of the BA (35 students) and for the new MA programme (5 students). Therefore the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However at the visit, the senior management team expressed a view to potentially increase the student numbers for the MA programme in future years. Additionally, in the meeting with the programme team they discussed the challenges of running out the current BA part time programme, whilst introducing a new BA work based learning programme, and MA programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team keeps the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the number of students or teaching staff, that the HCPC is informed through the major change process to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussion with the senior team, the visitors were informed that there is not currently interprofessional learning in place on the programme, and as this is not a requirement of the HCPC, this standard continues to be met. However, the senior team discussed plans for incorporating interprofessional learning into the curriculum for future cohorts. In the meeting with the students, they also discussed the possibility of working with trainee barristers in mock court appearances in the future that had been communicated to them by the programme team. The visitors therefore recommend that any incorporation of interprofessional learning into the curriculum is submitted to the HCPC via the major change process, to ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is being adequately addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the teaching of safe practice under review to ensure that students are fully aware of safety precautions they can take whilst on placement to further encourage safe and effective practice.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided and in the meeting with the practice placement providers that learning, teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct and therefore that this standard continues to be met. However, in discussion with the service user group, the visitors noted concern amongst some members of the group, that some students seemed unaware of what they felt were basic safety precautions to take when they go on placement. One service user mentioned recent discussion with a member of the programme team around how the service user experience could be utilised to enhance student's awareness of safe practice whilst on placement. The visitors therefore recommend that how students are taught about safe practice in preparation for placement is kept under review to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Lel Meleyal
Graeme Currie
George Delafield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Nottingham Trent University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Lel Meleyal (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker) George Delafield (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	5
Chair	Judith Ward (Nottingham Trent University)
Secretary	Elizabeth Twells (Nottingham Trent University) Rosemary Taylor (Nottingham Trent University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Hek (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 7 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider will need to ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that most references to the Health and care professions council (HCPC) were correct. However, there were a few instances where the HCPC was referred to as the Health and care professionals council, for example in the MA contextual document (p3) and handbook (p49) and there were also references to HCPC validation of the programme. The HCPC approve programmes within the UK for the professions we regulate, rather than validate programmes of study, therefore the visitors require that the programme documentation is updated to reflect this. Additionally, the education provider needs to ensure that references to the 'Criminal Records Bureau' (CRB) (p9, BA handbook) are updated to the 'Disclosure and Barring Service' (DBS) regarding requirements for criminal convictions checks. This will ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and that the terminology used in relation to criminal convictions checks is accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide finalised versions of any documentation that has changed following revisions from the initial documentation reviewed by the visitors, prior to the visit.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors learned that the programme documentation had recently undergone significant revisions. Unfortunately due to limited time available at the visit, the visitors were unable to review the revised documentation fully to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings continue to be effectively used. The visitors were also made aware that the programme had recently gone through an internal validation event, and understand that changes to the programme documentation may be required following this event. The visitors therefore require that any documentation that has changed from the original documentation that they reviewed prior to the visit, and as a result of the internal validation event is provided to ensure that resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a finalised version of the 'Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play' policy, and demonstrate how this will be made readily available to students.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of a recently drafted policy regarding student participation in role plays where they would be acting as service users. This policy includes students ability to opt out of acting as service users in role

plays, and states that every participant must give their informed consent before participating. At the visit, the programme team explained that currently students would be asked to volunteer when acting as service users rather than nominated to do so, however they felt that incorporating this policy into the curriculum would formalise students ability to provide their consent when acting as service users. The visitors were informed that the policy was currently in draft form, and further amendments may be made to it. Therefore the visitors require that they see the finalised version of the 'Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play' policy, and information regarding where within the programme documentation it would be made readily available to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students whilst on placement.

Reason: In the 'HEI placement audit report' (October 2012) provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification. In the meeting with the programme team, it was clarified that there are procedures in place for training practice placement educators, however the visitors could not see from the documentation the processes that are in place to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding the current practice placement educators that are in place, including their registration status and, where they are not registered, details of their qualifications and experience.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, in particular the 'HEI placement audit report' provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification, as of October 2012 when the report was produced. From discussions with the programme team it was not clear what the criteria for becoming a placement educator was, and the steps taken to check their appropriateness for the role of a practice placement educator. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further documentary information about the processes in place for checking the the registration status of current placement educators and, where they are not registered, the processes in place to check the qualifications and experience of practice placement educators, which make them suitable to undertake this role.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of where it is clearly stated within the assessment regulations of the programme that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors felt that whilst there was some information regarding exit awards within the programme documentation, it needed to be clarified that any programmes or exit awards that are not approved by the HCPC do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a revised BA contextual document in which the wording concerning exit awards had changed to state that “students who leave the social work degree must complete their studies on related courses in order to be eligible to register with the HCPC” (p22). This is incorrect, and therefore the visitors require evidence that the documentation has been updated to clearly state that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of where it clearly specifies that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see evidence of where it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of where within the programme documentation this is stated, to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear within the assessment regulations that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided, and in the meeting with the programme team that there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme for the proposed student numbers for the next cohort of the BA (35 students) and for the new MA programme (5 students). Therefore the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However at the visit, the senior management team expressed a view to potentially increase the student numbers for the MA programme in future years. Additionally, in the meeting with the programme team they discussed the challenges of running out the current BA part time programme, whilst introducing a new BA work based learning programme, and MA programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team keeps the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the number of students or teaching staff, that the HCPC is informed through the major change process to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussion with the senior team, the visitors were informed that there is not currently interprofessional learning in place on the programme, and as this is not a requirement of the HCPC, this standard continues to be met. However, the senior team discussed plans for incorporating interprofessional learning into the curriculum for future cohorts. In the meeting with the students, they also discussed the possibility of working with trainee barristers in mock court appearances in the future that had been communicated to them by the programme team. The visitors therefore recommend that any incorporation of interprofessional learning into the curriculum is submitted to the HCPC via the major change process, to ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is being adequately addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the teaching of safe practice under review to ensure that students are fully aware of safety precautions they can take whilst on placement to further encourage safe and effective practice.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided and in the meeting with the practice placement providers that learning, teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct and therefore that this standard continues to be met. However, in discussion with the service user group, the visitors noted concern amongst some members of the group, that some students seemed unaware of what they felt were basic safety precautions to take when they go on placement. One service user mentioned recent discussion with a member of the programme team around how the service user experience could be utilised to enhance student's awareness of safe practice whilst on placement. The visitors therefore recommend that how students are taught about safe practice in preparation for placement is kept under review to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Lel Meleyal
Graeme Currie
George Delafield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Nottingham Trent University
Programme name	PGDip in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	22 – 23 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 21 June 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 July 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 22 August 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Lel Meleyal (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker) George Delafield (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	5 (MA and PG Diploma Social Work (Masters exit route only))
Chair	Judith Ward (Nottingham Trent University)
Secretary	Elizabeth Twells (Nottingham Trent University) Rosemary Taylor (Nottingham Trent University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Hek (The College of Social Work) Reshma Patel (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the advertising materials for the programme to clarify that the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Work is an exit route for the MA Social Work programme.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team provided a presentation indicating that students would be able to exit from the MA Social Work programme with the Postgraduate (PG) Diploma in Social Work. As this is a recent development within the planning of the programme, information regarding the PG Diploma exit route was not detailed in the documentation that the visitors reviewed prior to the visit. The visitors therefore require evidence that information regarding the PG Diploma as an exit award is communicated to potential applicants of the programme, and that the differences between the MA and the PG Diploma programmes are communicated. This will ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

Condition: The education provider will need to ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and of the terminology that is used throughout the wider sector.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that most references to the Health and care professions council (HCPC) were correct. However, there were a few instances where the HCPC was referred to as the Health and Care Professionals Council, for example in the MA contextual document (p3) and MA handbook (p49) and there were also references to HCPC validation of the programme. The HCPC approve programmes within the UK for the professions we regulate, rather than validate programmes of study, therefore the visitors require that the programme documentation is updated to reflect this. Additionally, the education provider needs to ensure that references to the 'Criminal Records Bureau' (CRB) (p9, BA handbook) are updated to the 'Disclosure and Barring Service' (DBS) regarding requirements for criminal convictions checks. This will ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England, and that the terminology used in relation to criminal convictions checks is accurate.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide finalised versions of any documentation that has changed following revisions from the initial documentation reviewed by the visitors, prior to the visit.

Reason: From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors learned that the programme documentation had recently undergone significant revisions.

Unfortunately due to limited time available at the visit, the visitors were unable to review the revised documentation fully to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings continue to be effectively used. The visitors were also made aware that the programme had recently gone through an internal validation event, and understand that changes to the programme documentation may be required following this event. The visitors therefore require that any documentation that has changed from the original documentation that they reviewed prior to the visit, and as a result of the internal validation event is provided to ensure that resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide a finalised version of the ‘Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play’ policy, and demonstrate how this will be made readily available to students.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of a recently drafted policy regarding student participation in role plays where they would be acting as service users. This policy includes students ability to opt out of acting as service users in role plays, and states that every participant must give their informed consent before participating. At the visit, the programme team explained that currently students would be asked to volunteer when acting as service users rather than nominated to do so, however they felt that incorporating this policy into the curriculum would formalise students ability to provide their consent when acting as service users. The visitors were informed that the policy was currently in draft form, and further amendments may be made to it. Therefore the visitors require that they see the finalised version of the ‘Social Work Students as Service User in Role Play’ policy, and information regarding where within the programme documentation it would be made readily available to students.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team following the visit, it was clarified that the difference between the MA Social Work and the PG Diploma in Social Work as the exit award for the MA is the addition of the 60 credit dissertation on the MA programme, which is focused on research skills, knowledge and methods. From discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors learned that the programme documentation had recently undergone significant revisions, including the production of a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document for the PG Diploma programme. Unfortunately due to limited time available at the visit, the visitors were unable to review the revised documentation. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that a student who exits the MA programme with the PG Diploma award meets the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the processes in place to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students whilst on placement.

Reason: In the 'HEI placement audit report' (October 2012) provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification. In the meeting with the programme team, it was clarified that there are procedures in place for training practice placement educators, however the visitors could not see from the documentation the processes that are in place to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence regarding the current practice placement educators that are in place, including their registration status and, where they are not registered, details of their qualifications and experience.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, in particular the 'HEI placement audit report' provided prior to the visit, the visitors learned that 51.4% of the practice educators or supervisors in place did not have a social work qualification, as of October 2012 when the report was produced. From discussions with the programme team it was not clear what the criteria for becoming a placement educator was, and the steps taken to check their appropriateness for the role of a practice placement educator. To be assured that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to provide further documentary information about the processes in place for checking the the registration status of current placement educators and, where they are not registered, the processes in place to check the qualifications and experience of practice placement educators, which make them suitable to undertake this role.

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

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

Reason: As identified in the condition around SET 4.1, as the visitors were unable to review any documentation in regards to the PG Diploma exit award, they could not be sure that the assessment strategy and design ensure that students exiting before the completion of the dissertation element of the MA programme would be able to meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all of the SOPs for social workers in England to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team provided a presentation indicating that students would be able to exit from the MA Social Work programme with the postgraduate (PG) Diploma in Social Work. As this is a recent development within the planning of the programme, information regarding the PG Diploma exit route was not detailed in the documentation that the visitors reviewed prior to the visit. The visitors therefore require that the programme documentation is revised to ensure that students understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme, and the impact for students if they decide to exit the MA programme with the PG Diploma exit award.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of where it is clearly stated within the assessment regulations of the programme that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors felt that whilst there was some information regarding exit awards within the programme documentation, it needed to be clarified that any programmes or exit awards that are not approved by the HCPC do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a revised BA contextual document in which the wording concerning exit awards had changed to state that “students who leave the social work degree must complete their studies on related courses in order to be eligible to register with the HCPC” (p22). This is incorrect, and therefore the visitors require evidence that the documentation has been updated to clearly that only programmes that are approved by the HCPC lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of where it clearly specifies that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see evidence of where it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of where within the programme documentation this is stated, to ensure that this standard can be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of where it is clearly stated within the assessment regulations of the programme that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided, and in the meeting with the programme team that there was an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme for the proposed student numbers for the next cohort of the BA (35 students) and for the new MA programme (5 students). Therefore the visitors were content that this standard has been met. However, at the visit the senior management team expressed a view to potentially increase the student numbers for the MA programme in future years. Additionally, in the meeting with the programme team they discussed the challenges of running out the current BA part time programme, whilst introducing a new BA work based learning programme, and MA programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team keeps the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors would also like to remind the education provider that if there are any changes to the number of students or teaching staff, that the HCPC is informed through the major change process to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform the Health and care professions council (HCPC) of any future changes to the ways in which interprofessional learning is delivered.

Reason: From discussion with the senior team, the visitors were informed that there is not currently interprofessional learning in place on the programme, and as this is not a requirement of the HCPC, this standard continues to be met. However, the senior team discussed plans for incorporating interprofessional learning into the curriculum for future cohorts. In the meeting with the students, they also discussed the possibility of working with trainee barristers in mock course appearances in the future that had been communicated to them by the programme team. The visitors therefore recommend that any incorporation of interprofessional learning into the curriculum is submitted to the HCPC via the major change process, to ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is being adequately addressed.

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

Recommendation: The programme team should keep the teaching of safe practice under review to ensure that students are fully aware of safety precautions they can take whilst on placement to further encourage safe and effective practice.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided and in the meeting with the practice placement providers that learning, teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct and therefore that this standard continues to be met. However, in discussion with the service user group, the visitors noted concern amongst some members of the group, that some students seemed unaware of what they felt were basic safety precautions to take when they go on placement. One service user mentioned recent discussion with a member of the programme team around how the service user experience could be utilised to enhance student's awareness of safe practice whilst on placement. The visitors therefore recommend that how students are taught about safe practice in preparation for placement is kept under review to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Lel Meleyal
Graeme Currie
George Delafield

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 August 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Dicken (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	60
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
First approved intake	August 2003
Chair	David Rowley (University of East London)
Secretary	Debbie Brearley (University of East London) Laura Scott (University of East London) Jinder Thind (University of East London)
Members of the joint panel	Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how applicants are informed that any exit awards of the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the Health and care professions council (HCPC).

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook contained clear information regarding exit awards of the programme, and that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. However, the visitors felt that the handbook would be provided to students of, rather than applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how applicants to the programme are informed that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register, which will allow them to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions documentation to clarify the English language requirement required for successful admission to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the English language requirement for admission to the programme was stated as IELTS 'level 7' (Admissions guidebook, prospective students, p29). At the visit, the programme team clarified that the requirements for this programme were of an overall minimum IELTS level of 7, with no element below 6.5. This is correctly stated on page 2 of the programme specification. The visitors therefore require that the admissions documentation is revised to clarify the minimum reading, writing and spoken English requirements of the programme, and ensure that the requirements are consistently stated across all programme documentation, to allow potential applicants to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply for a place on the programme.

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

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

Reason: From discussion with students at the visit, the visitors were informed that on occasion, students play the role of service users when participating in elements of the programme. Some students said that there were discussions in these sessions around who wanted to participate, and the programme team confirmed this arrangement, that students were asked if they wanted to act within this role, rather than nominated to do so. However, from a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of the information students are provided with regarding these sessions. As such it was unclear on what information they were basing their decisions to give

consent to participate, and how the programme team ensures students grant their consent to be part of these sessions. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the expectations of them when acting as service users, and how the team ensures that students provide their consent to act as service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the programmes approved by the HCPC are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC part of the Register, or protected title, in their named award.

Reason: From a review of the postgraduate programme information on the education provider website, the visitors noted two programmes; 'Social Work and Emotional Wellbeing (D60M) (MA)' and 'Social Work & Emotional Wellbeing (Professional Doctorate)'. As these programme titles contain reference to the Social work part of the HCPC Register, the visitors felt that this could be misleading, as it is not clear from these titles that students would not be able to apply for registration as a Social worker, in England upon successful completion of these programmes. The visitors therefore require that these programme titles are revised to ensure that applicants, students, staff and the public understand that these programmes do not provide successful graduates with eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way the visitors can determine how the education provider is ensuring that only approved programmes are those which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award, and how this programme can meet this standard.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion with the programme team indicated that there is a university wide policy regarding aegrotat awards in the 'Manual of General Regulations' (part 10) but upon review of these, the visitors could not determine where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant

part of the HCPC register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. This standard requires assessment regulations of the programme to state that at least one external examiner needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. The visitors therefore require evidence of the documentation where it clearly specifies the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Gary Dicken
Christine Stogdon
Robert Stratford

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 August 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 5 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Dicken (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	60
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
First approved intake	August 2003
Chair	David Rowley (University of East London)
Secretary	Debbie Brearley (University of East London) Laura Scott (University of East London) Jinder Thind (University of East London)
Members of the joint panel	Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how applicants are informed that any exit awards of the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the Health and care professions council (HCPC).

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook contained clear information regarding exit awards of the programme, and that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. However, the visitors felt that the handbook would be provided to students of, rather than applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how applicants to the programme are informed that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register, which will allow them to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions documentation to clarify the English language requirement required for successful admission to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the admissions guidebook for prospective students, the visitors noted that a good command of reading, writing and spoken English is assessed through completion of a written test for all shortlisted candidates (p34). In the programme specification, it also states that an IELTS 'level 7 in communication and comprehension skills' (p3) is required. From discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that the requirements for this programme were for an overall minimum IELTS level of 7, with no less than a score of 6.5 in all elements. The visitors therefore require that the admissions documentation is revised to clarify the language requirements of the programme and ensure that the requirements are consistent across all documentation. In this way the visitors can determine how the programmes admissions information allows potential applicants to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply for a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that all references to the HCPC are accurate and reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for Social Workers in England.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted references to the 'Health care professions council' (MA programme specification, p2) and the 'Health and care profession council' (MA programme specification, p4). The visitors require that these references are updated to the 'Health and care professions council'. The visitors also noted in the programme specification that the 'MA in Social Work offers a postgraduate route that enables registration as a Social Worker with the Health

and care professions council' (p4). The visitors require that this is revised to state that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a Social worker with the HCPC, as registration is not guaranteed upon successful completion of the programme.

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

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

Reason: From discussion with students at the visit, the visitors were informed that on occasion, students play the role of service users when participating in elements of the programme. Some students said that there were discussions in these sessions around who wanted to participate, and the programme team confirmed this arrangement, that students were asked if they wanted to act within this role, rather than nominated to do so. However, from a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of the information students are provided with regarding these sessions. As such it was unclear on what information they were basing their decisions to give consent to participate, and how the programme team ensures students grant their consent to be part of these sessions. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the expectations of them when acting as service users, and how the team ensures that students provide their consent to act as service users.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that the programmes approved by the HCPC are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC part of the Register, or protected title, in their named award.

Reason: From a review of the postgraduate programme information on the education provider website, the visitors noted two programmes; 'Social Work and Emotional Wellbeing (D60M) (MA)' and 'Social Work & Emotional Wellbeing (Professional Doctorate)'. As these programme titles contain reference to the Social work part of the HCPC Register, the visitors felt that this could be misleading, as it is not clear from these titles that students would not be able to apply for registration as a Social worker, in England upon successful completion of these programmes. The visitors therefore require that these programme titles are revised to ensure that applicants, students, staff and the public understand that these programmes do not provide successful graduates with eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way the visitors can determine how the education provider is ensuring that only approved programmes are those which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award, and how this programme can meet this standard.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion with the programme team indicated that there is a university wide policy regarding aegrotat awards in the 'Manual of General Regulations' (part 10) but upon review of these, the visitors could not determine where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. This standard requires assessment regulations of the programme to state that at least one external examiner needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. The visitors therefore require evidence of the documentation where it clearly specifies the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Gary Dicken
Christine Stogdon
Robert Stratford

Visitors' report

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

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	82
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about what impact achieving the 300 credit level 6 'Ordinary Degree in Social Work Studies' would have on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency within the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to service users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

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

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	82
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used

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

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

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

from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team should provide further evidence of how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice over the full period of study.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time BA (Hons) Social Work can be completed in 9 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to the process that would be used to ensure that a student studying over this period would be subject to the most up-to-date and current teaching and learning. The visitors were also unclear about how, if any changes were made to the curriculum, a student would be kept updated to reflect these changes. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which articulates the process by which a student who will be studying for 9 years will be kept up to date with the changes in current practice and how the programme team will manage this.

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

Condition: The programme team should provide evidence of how students will progress and achieve within this programme if a student was to take 9 years to complete it.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time BA (Hons) Social Work can be completed in 9 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However the visitors could not identify, in the documentation provided, which modules students would be expected to have completed and by when in order to successfully complete the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure how students progress and achieve on this programme if they were to complete it in 9 years. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of a clear progression route through the programme which articulates what elements of the programme a student would need to have completed and by when in order to successfully graduate after 9 years of study.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award

would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about what impact achieving the 300 credit level 6 'Ordinary Degree in Social Work Studies' would have on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency within the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to service users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme name	Masters Award in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	45
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used

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

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

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

from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the impact of achieving an alternative exit award on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

.

.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency with in the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to services users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme name	Masters Award in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	45
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used

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

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

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

from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team should provide further evidence of how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice over the full period of study.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time MA Social Work can be completed in 6 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to the process that would be used to ensure that a student studying over this period would be subject to the most up-to-date and current teaching and learning. The visitors were also unclear about how, if any changes were made to the curriculum, a student would be updated to reflect these changes. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which articulates the process by which a student who will be studying for 6 years will be kept up to date with the changes in current practice and how the programme team will manage this.

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

Condition: The programme team should provide evidence of how students will progress and achieve within this programme if a student was to take 6 years to complete it.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time MA Social Work can be completed in 6 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However the visitors could not identify, in the documentation provided, which modules students would be expected to have completed and by when in order to successfully complete the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure how students progress and achieve on this programme if they were to complete it in 6 years. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of a clear progression route through the programme which articulates what elements of the programme a student would need to have completed and by when in order to successfully graduate after 6 years of study.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award

would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the impact of achieving an alternative exit award on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency within the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to service users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	82 (MA and Post Graduate Diploma Social Work)
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used

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

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

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

from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the impact of achieving an alternative exit award on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency with in the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to services users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hull
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 June 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 September 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 August. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker) Aidan Worsley (Social worker) Angela Duxbury (Therapeutic radiographer)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	82 (MA and Post Graduate Diploma Social Work)
Chair	Jason Eames (University of Hull)
Secretary	Denise South (University of Hull)
Members of the joint panel	Vicky Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Rosemary Littlechild (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. There are references to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC) throughout the documentation. For example Volume 2 (31) page 88 the education provider states that 'It should be noted that a student may be subjected to either one or all of the above University and/or GSCC proceedings'. From August 2012, the Health and Care Professions Council hold regulatory responsibility for social workers in England and therefore several references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) as the regulator for social workers in England is incorrect as the GSCC no longer exists. Also, the visitors noted that throughout Volume 2 it is stated that upon completion of the programme '...allows you to register with the HCPC' and '...enables your admission to the HCPC register'. Students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character tests at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used

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

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

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

from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team should provide further evidence of how the curriculum remains relevant to current practice over the full period of study.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time MA Social Work can be completed in 6 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to the process that would be used to ensure that a student studying over this period would be subject to the most up-to-date and current teaching and learning. The visitors were also unclear about how, if any changes were made to the curriculum, a student would be updated to reflect these changes. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which articulates the process by which a student who will be studying for 6 years will be kept up to date with the changes in current practice and how the programme team will manage this.

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

Condition: The programme team should provide evidence of how students will progress and achieve within this programme if a student was to take 6 years to complete it.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme specification that the part time MA Social Work can be completed in 6 years. The programme team acknowledged this in discussion with the visitors and highlighted that this had not occurred previously and that it is an education provider requirement that students are able to study for this period of time. However the visitors could not identify, in the documentation provided, which modules students would be expected to have completed and by when in order to successfully complete the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure how students progress and achieve on this programme if they were to complete it in 6 years. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of a clear progression route through the programme which articulates what elements of the programme a student would need to have completed and by when in order to successfully graduate after 6 years of study.

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award

would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about what impact achieving the 300 credit level 6 'Ordinary Degree in Social Work Studies' would have on their ability to apply to the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider how best to enhance the preparation given to service users when they are involved with the teaching aspects of the programme.

Reason: From the discussion with the service users, it was clear that service users were heavily involved in the development and delivery of the programme. They spoke of a number of support mechanisms that were available to them by the university such as shadowing days and buddying system. The visitors are therefore content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider enhancing further the structural support in place especially when service users are involved in delivering the teaching of the programme. The visitors feel that in this way the programme team may be able to enhance the support they provide to service users and also enhance the teaching experience for students

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

Recommendation: The programme team should consider revisiting the documentation provided to students to ensure that the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers are explicitly addressed.

Reason: The visitors were provided with SOPs mapping document for the programme, outlining where each standard is addressed in the curriculum. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted how they ensured the achievement of the standards of proficiency within the programme for the relevant part of the register and were content that each SOP will be met by students on completion of the programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors noted that the documentation had a narrow focus, particularly on the achievement of the skills outlined by the professional body's framework. In turn this meant that the skills being achieved were not always explicitly linked to the HCPC's SOPs. Therefore the visitors recommend that the programme team considers how best to ensure that the documentation provided to students reflects the importance of achievement of the SOPs throughout the programme. In this way the programme team may better embed the understanding of the SOPs role in the regulation of a professional undertaking social work into students learning.

5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.

Recommendation: The visitors suggest the education provider consider how they can best ensure that students on placements consistently and clearly identify themselves to service users as student social workers.

Reason: Through the visit it was clear that service users would be aware they were working with students and so the visitors considered this standard to have been met. However, from the documents and discussions, there was some confusion with how

students introduced themselves to service users. The students indicated they would use 'student social worker' to introduce themselves while the practice placement documentation used the terminology of 'social worker in training' (SWIT). The visitors felt that this could be confusing for students considering how to introduce themselves. It was also highlighted that the placement providers had mixed views on whether SWIT clearly identified the students as students to service users and that the title SWIT could be linked with registered social workers when undertaking their ASYE (Assessed and Supported Year in Employment). The visitors therefore suggest that the programme team considers how best to address the differences in title used by the students when introducing themselves to service users. In this way the programme team may clarify the issue and enhance a student's ability to identify themselves clearly and accurately to service users when on placement.

David Childs
Aidan Wosley
Angela Duxbury

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the Programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	40
Proposed start date of Programme approval	September 2013
Chair	David Smith (University of Lancaster)
Secretary	Andrew Okey (University of Lancaster)
Members of the joint panel	Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the students the visitors learnt that students had to pay extra while on the programme without any prior warning. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider had to increase fees for the programme due to changes in bursaries by the government. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students in England are changing even further. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes to the bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression and the processes in place to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unclear about the progression requirements in place for students. The document Assessment Regulations 6.4.1 (page 10) states “To proceed to the final year of a Bachelors with honours degree (or part-time equivalent) all students must achieve, following all opportunities for reassessment, an overall aggregation score of 9 with no more than 30 credits condoned”. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team will ensure students receiving condonement meet HCPC’s SOPs. However, the visitors require further evidence of the regulations and processes in place throughout the programme to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The document 3.4 Things You Need to Know 2013-14 (page 15) states “Students may not be awarded an aegrotat degree in social work”. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Patricia Higham
Gordon Borrow
Beverley Blythe

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the Programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	40 inclusive of Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Proposed start date of Programme approval	September 2013
Chair	David Smith (University of Lancaster)
Secretary	Andrew Okey (University of Lancaster)
Members of the joint panel	Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the students the visitors learnt that students had to pay extra while on the programme without any prior warning. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider had to increase fees for the programme due to changes in bursaries by the government. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students in England are changing even further. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes to the bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression and the processes in place to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unclear about the progression requirements in place for students. The document Assessment Regulations 6.4.1 on page 12 states “When all the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of an integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant Examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4”. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team will ensure students receiving condonement meet HCPC’s SOPs. However, the visitors require further evidence of the regulations and processes in place throughout the programme to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The document 3.4 Things You Need to Know 2013-14 (page 15) states “Students may not be awarded an aegrotat degree in social work”. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors

therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Patricia Higham
Gordon Burrow
Beverley Blythe

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme name	MA Social Work with Religious Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the Programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	12
Proposed start date of Programme approval	September 2013
Chair	David Smith (University of Lancaster)
Secretary	Andrew Okey (University of Lancaster)
Members of the joint panel	Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

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

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the students the visitors learnt that students had to pay extra while on the programme without any prior warning. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider had to increase fees for the other programmes due to changes in bursaries by the government. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students in England are changing even further. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes to the bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression and the processes in place to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unclear about the progression requirements in place for students. The document Assessment Regulations 6.4.1 (page 10) states “To proceed to the final year of a Bachelors with honours degree (or part-time equivalent) all students must achieve, following all opportunities for reassessment, an overall aggregation score of 9 with no more than 30 credits condoned”. On page 12 it states “When all the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of an integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant Examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4”. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team will ensure students receiving condonement meet the SOPs. However, the visitors require further evidence of the regulations and processes in place throughout the programme to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards.

The document 3.4 Things You Need to Know 2013-14 (page 15) states “Students may not be awarded an aegrotat degree in social work”. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Patricia Higham
Gordon Burrow
Beverley Blythe

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Lancaster
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 May 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the Programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the Programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Patricia Higham (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	40 inclusive of MA Social Work
Proposed start date of Programme approval	September 2013
Chair	David Smith (University of Lancaster)
Secretary	Andrew Okey (University of Lancaster)
Members of the joint panel	Vicki Lawson-Brown (The College of Social Work) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted information regarding fees and bursaries. During discussion with the students the visitors learnt that students had to pay extra while on the programme without any prior warning. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted the education provider had to increase fees for the programme due to changes in bursaries by the government. The visitors highlighted that from September 2013 bursary arrangements for social work students in England are changing even further. The visitors were unable to determine from the documentation if information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes to the bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants and students. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of possible changes to the fee structure and information about the changes to bursary arrangements.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to articulate clearly the requirements for student progression and the processes in place to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were unclear about the progression requirements in place for students. The document Assessment Regulations 6.4.1 on page 12 states “When all the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of an integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant Examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4”. During discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team will ensure students receiving condonement meet HCPC’s SOPs. However, the visitors require further evidence of the regulations and processes in place throughout the programme to ensure students who receive condonement and progress further within the programme meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).

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

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

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the various awards and their impact on the eligibility of a student to apply for the Register. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The document 3.4 Things You Need to Know 2013-14 (page 15) states “Students may not be awarded an aegrotat degree in social work”. The visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors

therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation.

Patricia Higham
Gordon Burrow
Beverley Blythe

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Southampton
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Hearing aid dispenser
Date of visit	7 – 8 May 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Recommendations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 July 2013 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 2013. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 August 2013. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 September 2013.

Introduction

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

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MSc Audiology programme. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Hugh Crawford (Hearing aid dispenser) Tim Pringle (Hearing aid dispenser)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	30
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 17 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the admissions materials in use are reflective of the programme, and gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Reason: From a review of the admissions documentation, the visitors found that there were a series of omissions and errors. From the evidence provided the visitors could find little reference to the role of the HCPC as the statutory regulator for hearing aid dispensers. The education provider must revisit the admissions material to clearly state that successful completion of the programme leads to eligibility to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the HCPC. The visitors also noted that the admissions material provided related to the 'Healthcare Science (Neurosensory)' programme and did not reference this programme. The programme team explained that the information provided is generic, and will be the same information that will be provided for applicants to both programmes. The visitors require that the admissions material is updated to state that it relates to the 'BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology)' programme, and within this documentation, that all references to 'CRB' checks are updated to 'Disclosure and Barring' (DBS) checks to ensure that the terminology used is accurate. In this way the visitors will be able to ensure that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors were unable to locate any clear, detailed information regarding an AP(E)L process or policy within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Whilst the visitors are aware that there may be a university-wide policy on AP(E)L, they could not see where a potential applicant for the programme could easily access this information. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the AP(E)L policy for the programme is communicated clearly to potential applicants, to allow them to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the expertise and knowledge of the programme team, to enable them to deliver the hearing aid dispenser specific areas of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not clearly see which members of the programme team are registered hearing aid

dispensers. As such the visitors could not determine what relevant specialist expertise and knowledge the programme team have of the hearing aid profession, or of statutory regulation, to enable them to deliver the hearing aid dispensing specific aspects of the programme, or the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). They could also not determine what input into the programme there would be from HCPC registered professionals in order to do this, if these aspects of the programme are not to be delivered by the core programme team. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge that will be utilised by the programme team to enable them to deliver the modules specific to hearing aid dispensers and the HCPC SCPE's.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how staff keep the skills specific to hearing aid dispensing up to date, to allow them to deliver the programme effectively.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, there was no reference to how staff would keep up to date with skills specific to hearing aid dispensing, or how they would ensure they are aware of developments within the profession to inform their teaching of the programme. From discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that there are plans for new members of staff who will ensure that students are kept up to date with developments within the profession. However, it was not clear how the education provider will ensure that continuing professional development will be utilised by the team in order for them to keep up to date with developments in hearing aid dispensing. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team will ensure that their skills and knowledge, in relation to the hearing aid profession, will be kept up to date to allow them to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that all documentation relating to the programme is updated so that it is reflective of the cohort of the approved programme, programme title and the current landscape of statutory regulation for Hearing aid dispensers.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that all documentation related to the academic year 2012/13. As such module documentation referred to the previous BSc Audiology programme, rather than this programme. The visitors therefore require that all programme documentation is updated so that it is reflective of this programme. The visitors also noted references to the "Health and care professional council" and "HPC" such as in the programme specification (p1). Additionally in the SETs mapping document, the visitors noted reference to "the recognised list of accredited professional courses". The HCPC approves education and training programmes and does not accredit professional courses. The visitors therefore require that this is updated so that it is reflective of the language associated with the statutory regulation of hearing aid dispensers. Finally, the visitors noted that an aim of the programme as outlined in the programme specification was "to meet your academic needs for registration as a Healthcare science practitioner under the HPC or RCCP"

(p1). The HCPC is not the regulatory body for healthcare science practitioners, and therefore the visitors require that this is updated to clarify that following successful completion of the programme, students will be eligible to apply for registration as a hearing aid dispenser with the Health and care professions council (HCPC). The visitors feel that these errors in the use of terminology may be misleading for students and therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to be sure that the learning resources of the programme are being used effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the documentary resources available to students that are specific to the hearing aid dispensing profession.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not identify what hearing aid specific documentary resources are available to students on the course. In particular the visitors could not determine what reading material was available to students in order for them to learn about hearing aid dispensing, and keep up to date with developments in the profession. The visitors could also not identify what hearing aid dispensing specific material is included on any required reading lists. The visitors therefore require evidence of what documentary resources are available to support the learning and teaching activities of the programme specific to hearing aid dispensing. The visitors also require further information about what material students are required to read to ensure that they are kept up to date with developments within the profession.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that there is a system in place for gaining students informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching.

Reason: The visitors noted through discussion with the programme team that there was a faculty wide policy on informed consent, but that this hadn't been incorporated into the programme fully. Discussion with the students indicated an awareness that they could opt out of participating as service users if they wished to, but that there was no formal information regarding consent protocols in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of how the formal protocols for obtaining consent from students will be implemented full on the programme in order for them to determine how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that students' attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored, and at what point the programme team would intervene if attendance became an issue.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency;

- **1b.3 – be able to explain the financial implications of suitable hearing aid systems.**
- **2b.3 - be able to formulate and provide appropriate advice regarding hearing aids and associated technologies and their use to facilitate informed choices by service users.**
- **2b.4 – be able to select and evaluate the most appropriate hearing aid system and performance settings and/or associated technologies for service users.**
- **2c.2 – be aware of emerging technologies and new developments in hearing assistance.**

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet standard of proficiency 1b.3, 2b.3, 2b.4 and 2.c2. Although the education provider completed a standard of proficiency mapping document, the visitors could not see that the above mentioned standards of proficiency, specific to hearing aid dispensers were being taught within the curriculum. The visitors require the education provider to provide evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all standards of proficiency, and specifically where standards 1b.3, 2b.3, 2b.4 and 2.c2 are addressed within the curriculum, and therefore that those who successfully complete the programme meet these profession specific standards of proficiency.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the curriculum remains relevant to current hearing aid dispensing practice.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and discussion with the students, the visitors were aware of the input from audiologists and the audiologist profession.

However, the visitors could not see where in the curriculum students were made aware of advances in hearing aid dispensing, for example of the developments and advances in hearing aid technology. The visitors could also not identify where the programme team ensures that there is relevant and experienced hearing aid dispensing input into the programme curriculum. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensures that the curriculum remains relevant to current hearing aid dispensing practice.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to refer to the HCPC Standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE's) and provide evidence of how these are taught throughout the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not identify where students are made aware of the implications of the HCPC SCPE's. The visitors therefore require further evidence that demonstrates how the programme team ensure that students understand the implications of these standards. In particular the visitors require further evidence about where in the programme students are made aware of the SCPE's, if they are included in any teaching, and if there is opportunity for students to access the HCPC 'Student guide to conduct and ethics'. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the range of placements on the programme reflect the nature of modern practice within hearing aid dispensing and support the achievement of the required learning outcomes.

Reason: In discussion with the students, the visitors asked questions regarding the opportunities they have for seeing various types of hearing aid devices that would be used in private hearing aid dispensing practice whilst on placement. The students discussed experience of only working with devices that they would see within the public sector, and the programme team explained that within taught modules the main focus would be on devices students would see with the public sector, as this is what they will be experiencing on placement. As such the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to identify how the number, duration and range of placements on offer would support the delivery of the programme and facilitate students in getting the experience they need to meet the relevant standards of proficiency. In particular the visitors could not identify how the range of placements are appropriate to support the achievement of the learning outcomes that would teach the profession specific standards of proficiency, 1b.3, 2b.3, 2b.4 and 2.c2, as identified in conditions around SETs 4.1 and 6.1. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the range of practice placements available allow students to gain experience of working with a wider range of hearing aid devices, and therefore further support the achievement of the learning outcomes of the programme.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide a finalised version of the audit tool that is currently in development to ensure that there is a thorough and effective system in place for monitoring and approving all placements.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that an audit tool is currently being developed to approve and monitor all practice placements. The programme team explained that they are currently negotiating resources to support the delivery of the audit tool and explained that there is a lot of preparation work that needs to be completed before the tool is finalised, for example collaborating with the placement providers to arrange to visit each of the 26 placement centres. As the main mechanism for approving and monitoring placements for the programme is still being developed, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how this standard is can be met. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the programme team will implement the system currently being developed to approve monitor all placements thoroughly and effectively.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The education provider needs to provide further information regarding the system that is in place to ensure that practice placement educators in all settings receive appropriate training, and that this training is kept up to date.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team at the visit, the visitors were informed that all new practice placement educators are required to complete appropriate training, but the visitors could not see evidence of a process in place to monitor which placement educators had received training, and when. The programme team also discussed the opportunities for placement educators to attend training courses that the education provider is running, but that this was not mandatory and there was not any official refresher training sessions for practice educators provided. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an effective system in place to monitor which practice educators have undergone training and when, and how the education provider ensures that the skills and knowledge of practice placement educators are kept up to date.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency.

- **1b.3 – be able to explain the financial implications of suitable hearing aid systems.**
- **2b.3 - be able to formulate and provide appropriate advice regarding hearing aids and associated technologies and their use to facilitate informed choices by service users.**
- **2b.4 – be able to select and evaluate the most appropriate hearing aid system and performance settings and/or associated technologies for service users.**

- **2c.2 – be aware of emerging technologies and new developments in hearing assistance.**

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see how the assessment strategy and design ensured that the above mentioned standards of proficiency, specific to hearing aid dispensers were being taught and therefore how the education provider ensured that the relevant profession specific learning outcomes were assessed. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet all standards of proficiency, and specifically how standards 1b.3, 2b.3, 2b.4 and 2.c2 are assessed within the curriculum, and therefore that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the profession specific standards of proficiency for Hearing aid dispensers.

6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of where within the programme documentation it states which modules are mandatory for students to undertake and pass in order to progress and which modules are optional.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, there was discussion regarding the addition of modules to the curriculum that would focus specifically on hearing aid dispensing within the private sector, and that these could be mandatory modules. However in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors could not clearly see which modules students had to undertake and pass, and which modules were optional. As such the visitors were unclear about how students could progress through the programme, and what subject areas they had to study in order to progress and achieve on this programme. The visitors were also unclear about the marks students would have to achieve for each in order to progress through the programme. The visitors therefore need to see evidence of finalised module descriptors which indicate which modules are core and which are optional, and also the pass mark for each module. This will ensure that students clearly understand the requirements for progression and achievement within each module of the programme, and therefore that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of where within the assessment regulations it clearly specifies that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not see evidence of where in the programme documentation that it clearly states that the award of an aegrotat degree would not provide eligibility for a student to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of where within the programme documentation this is stated, to ensure that students on this programme are aware of this and that this standard can be met.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to make it clear within the assessment regulations that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme must be HCPC registered unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme states that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider including the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) as part of the reading list provided to students of the programme.

Reason: The visitors note that the education provider does not currently refer to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) within the reading list for the programme. The visitors wish to encourage the programme team to consider this addition to the reading list to allow students to gain a greater understanding of these standards, in preparation for the requirement for the SCPEs to be adhered to by all registrants of the HCPC.

4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.

Condition: If the education provider incorporates 'multiprofessional learning' into the programme the HCPC should be informed through the major change process to ensure that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs).

Reason: From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that there is currently no interprofessional learning incorporated into this programme. Therefore the visits are satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors were informed of plans to incorporate interprofessional learning into the curriculum through 'mutiprofessional learning' in October 2013. If this development occurs the visitors recommend that the programme team inform the HCPC of this change at the earliest opportunity through the major change process. In this way the HCPC can ensure that the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group is being adequately addressed through this interprofessional learning and that this standard continues to be met.

6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider should consider revisiting the programme documentation to clearly state that any exit awards for the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

Reason: The visitors identified from the documentation before the visit that none of the exit awards from the programme include any reference to a protected title or part of the HCPC register in their named award. Therefore the visitors were happy that this standard was met. However, the visitors could not see from the documentation provided that it is made clear to students that the exit awards from this programme do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors recommend that the education provider makes this explicit in the programme documentation to avoid any possible confusion for the students. In this way they may be able to enhance students' ability to make an informed decision if deciding to take an exit award from the programme.

Hugh Crawford
Tim Pringle