

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme name</b>	BA (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 – 15 January 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 February 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary 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 23 February 2015. 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 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	36 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Steve Keen (Bournemouth University)
Secretary	Karen Silverthorne (Bournemouth University)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional 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 an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

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

**Condition:** The visitors recommend the programme documentation be revised to include more detailed information on how service users and carer's feedback is used to monitor and evaluate the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme is subject to regular monitoring and evaluations systems, the visitors are therefore satisfied this SET is met. During the visit, the visitors learnt of the number of ways which service users and carers involvement is monitored within the programme. The service user and carers involved in the programme spoke in great detail of the feedback mechanism in place for them to contribute to the development of the programme. The visitors were made aware of how this feedback is then used to evaluate the programme. From these discussions, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to revise their documentation to include the discussions had around how service user and carer feedback is used to monitor and evaluate the programme.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Condition:** The visitors suggest the programme team revise their documentation to reflect the most up to date information on how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors received clarification on the involvement of service users and carers. For example, the visitors learnt of how the different subcommittee groups of service users and carers are interlinked and how each committee is involved within the programme. The visitors also learnt that the School Strategy on service users and carer involvement which refers to the University of Teesside (Section 5 of the carer and service user partnership file) is outdated and that the education provider does not have a partnership with the University of Teesside. From these discussions the visitors suggest that the programme team revise their documentation to clearly reflect the most up to date information on how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Jane McLenachan  
Dorothy Smith  
Frances Ashworth

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Programme name</b>	MA Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 – 15 January 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 February 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary 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 23 February 2015. 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 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan (Social worker) Dorothy Smith (Social worker) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Steve Keen (Bournemouth University)
Secretary	Karen Silverthorne (Bournemouth University)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional 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 an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

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

**Condition:** The visitors recommend the programme documentation be revised to include more detailed information on how service users and carer's feedback is used to monitor and evaluate the programme.

**Reason:** Documentation and discussion at the visit indicated the programme is subject to regular monitoring and evaluations systems, the visitors are therefore satisfied this SET is met. During the visit, the visitors learnt of the number of ways which service users and carers involvement is monitored within the programme. The service user and carers involved in the programme spoke in great detail of the feedback mechanism in place for them to contribute to the development of the programme. The visitors were made aware of how this feedback is then used to evaluate the programme. From these discussions, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to revise their documentation to include the discussions had around how service user and carer feedback is used to monitor and evaluate the programme.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Condition:** The visitors suggest the programme team revise their documentation to reflect the most up to date information on how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors received clarification on the involvement of service users and carers. For example, the visitors learnt of how the different subcommittee groups of service users and carers are interlinked and how each committee is involved within the programme. The visitors also learnt that the School Strategy on service users and carer involvement which refers to the University of Teesside (Section 5 of the carer and service user partnership file) is outdated and that the education provider does not have a partnership with the University of Teesside. From these discussions the visitors suggest that the programme team revise their documentation to clearly reflect the most up to date information on how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Jane McLenachan  
Dorothy Smith  
Frances Ashworth

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Sheffield Hallam University
<b>Programme name</b>	PG Diploma Specialist Mental Health Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Type of programme</b>	Approved mental health professional
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 January 2015

## 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. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health practitioners (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 March 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary 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 April 2015. 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 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional) Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Peter Grover (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Lucy J Begley (Sheffield Hallam University)
Members of the joint panel	Lisa Reidy (Internal Panel Member) Colette Fegan (Internal Panel Member) Jim Rogers (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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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 45 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider has detailed the admission procedures and the requirements for admission to the programme. However, during meetings with the students and the programme team, the visitors learnt that some students may have face to face interviews whilst other may not. In addition, during the admission process, the students did not know how students are selected for an interview or otherwise. The visitors also noted that going forward, the education provider will make interviews compulsory as part of the admission process. Nevertheless, the visitors require further evidence to show how applicants are provided with the information, including information about interviews that they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

### **B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided, that there are proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulating the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there are new partner organisations in partnership agreements and that the education provider will update partnership agreements between the education provider and its partner organisations to reflect the changes. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were therefore unable to identify how the arrangements will ensure that this programme has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. The visitors will require further evidence to show these partnership agreements are finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

### **B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used**

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

**Reason:** In the documentation provided it states that; "all assessment tasks in each module have to be passed with no compensation between them in order to meet

HCPC and regulatory requirements.” Programme specification, page 23. The HCPC does not set roles for student progression during a programme, HCPC set standards for education providers. Also “Candidates attending this programme are required to demonstrate their adherence to the HCPC Code of Practice for Social Care Workers see appendix viii” programme handbook, page 13. This statement is incorrect as HCPC does not have code of practice for social care workers however, HCPC has standards that programmes must meet to gain approval. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

**B.14 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 submit evidence to demonstrate how their policies for absence ensure students who could not attend classes learn about the missed elements of the curriculum.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted the attendance requirements. On page 2 of the student handbook, it states “It is essential that all students take responsibility for their learning by engaging fully with their course and that as a minimum students should”. For the practice placement settings, the visitors noted on page 10 of the practice placement handbook “In order for a fair assessment to be made of the student’s capability, the student must have been present at the placement for all of the designated number of days allocated to the practice experience”. However, the visitors could not determine how the education provider would ensure students who miss classes would learn about the missed elements of the curriculum. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how their policies for absence ensure students who could not attend classes learn about the missed elements of the curriculum.

**D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit states “We have extensive audit systems in place for the regular and annual review of placement opportunities, which meets established PSRB requirements” programme specification page 8. The visitors learnt through discussions at the visit that the education provider is introducing a new system to approve and monitor placements. Due to the placement audit systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors were content with other criteria in section D although this condition relates to some criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the new system will be used for this programme to ensure the education provider maintains overall responsibility for the approval and monitoring of placements.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team monitors the involvement of service users and carers within the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met at a threshold level. However, during discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that there are planned future developments with service user and carer involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as service users and carers' involvement in admissions and delivery of the programme curriculum. However, the programme team provided limited detail about how this would be done, or how this involvement will directly impact this programme. The visitors feel that the current involvement of service users and carers is at a threshold level, although the education provider have mentioned further plans there was no evidence of their involvement. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team monitor the involvement of service users and carers. The visitors suggest that a more robust service user and carer involvement will allow a greater depth to students' learning and other aspects of the programme.

Christine Stogdon  
Kathleen Taylor  
Sheila Skelton

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme name</b>	BA (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	9 – 10 December 2014

## 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. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 April 2015. 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 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	80 inclusive of the part time route
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Marjorie Spiller (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Jackie Campbell (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Bill Penson (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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided, that the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulate the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were therefore unable to identify how the arrangements will ensure that this programme has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there is a workforce planning meeting in the beginning of 2015 to discuss different aspects of this programme and update partnership agreements between the education provider and its partner organisations. The visitors will require further evidence to show the draft of these partnership agreements are finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of what commitment is being made to ensure the programme has a secure place in the education providers' business plan with the current student numbers.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that the programme has resources in place for the proposed intake of 83 students once a year. However, during the meetings and discussions with the senior team, programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the student numbers have increased on this programme recently. The education provider has another social work programme with placement requirements in their provision. The visitors also learnt that the placement providers have placement agreements with other education providers in the geographical area. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there is a workforce planning meeting in the beginning of 2015 to discuss different aspects of this programme including placements availability determining the students' intake number. The visitors could not determine how the current resources including practice educators and practice placements detailed in the documentation are appropriate for the above changes to student intake. This condition is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 3.1 regarding finalisation of placement agreements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show the commitment made and how the education provider is planning to put appropriate resources in place to ensure the programme is secure with the increased student numbers.

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

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

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. For example, the programme specification on page 14 states “You will need to attend 30 compulsory skills days (210 hours) which form part of the practice learning opportunity for the first year and these hours are the minimum requirement of the regulating body, The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)”. In another example on page 17, it states “The 200 days in practice are a minimum requirement of the regulatory body, the HCPC”. These statements are incorrect as HCPC do not prescribe the number of hours or days students need to be on placement as part of their programme, instead education providers must demonstrate and justify how they meet the HCPC standards of education and training (SETs). Therefore, visitors require the programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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

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

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users. However, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme or how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. They also could not find information on 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 protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

**Condition:** The 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.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each

module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles and learning outcomes.

The visitors also noted in the programme specification on page 14 “You will need to attend 30 compulsory skills days (210 hours) which form part of the practice learning opportunity for the first year”. However, in the same paragraph it states “Time lost through absence for any reason will need to be made up before you can progress to the second year of the programme. A minimum of 90% of the days will need to be completed during term time and the hours lost made up at the end of the academic year”. During the visit, visitors were given a breakdown of these 30 compulsory skill days and when these days will be delivered during term time. The visitors noted that there are only 30 of these skills days, with no indication of how time lost through absence will be covered as indicated above. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how learning outcomes delivered in 30 compulsory skills days will be achieved by students who have lost time through absence before the end of the academic year.

**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 clearly articulate that the approved programme provides eligibility to register for the HCPC protected title of social worker in England.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme and admissions documents did provide enough clarity for students about the exit awards in place for the programme. The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students around the final award which will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC as a social worker in England, which is a protected title. During the programme team meeting, it was discussed that the programme team will update the programme documents to make a more explicit statement that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC as a social worker in England. In order to be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require evidence that the programme documents are produced in line with these HCPC requirements.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider strengthening information available to potential applicants to ensure it is up to date and includes information about changes to bursary arrangements.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met and that the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. Students gave detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them was up to date. However, the visitors suggest that the education provider consider strengthening information including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are well informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. This will further ensure students are well aware about the financial arrangements.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider the frequency of training provided to interview panels around equality and diversity policies in place.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met and that the education provider ensures that the interview panels are made aware and appropriately trained on the equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students at the education provider. The interview panel includes service users and carers, practice educators and academic staff. During discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors learnt that they are appropriately briefed before the interviews. This was echoed by the practice placement educators who were involved in the interviews. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team should consider increasing the frequency of training provided to interview panels. This will strengthen equality and diversity policies in place in relation to applicants and students and support the implementation and monitoring of them.

Simon Mudie  
David Childs  
Paula Sobiechowska

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Staffordshire University
<b>Programme name</b>	BA (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	9 – 10 December 2014

## 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. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 4 February 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. 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 April 2015. 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 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	80 inclusive of the full time route
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Marjorie Spiller (Staffordshire University)
Secretary	Jackie Campbell (Staffordshire University)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Bill Penson (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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant 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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided, that the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulate the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were therefore unable to identify how the arrangements will ensure that this programme has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there is a workforce planning meeting in the beginning of 2015 to discuss different aspects of this programme and update partnership agreements between the education provider and its partner organisations. The visitors will require further evidence to show the draft of these partnership agreements are finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of what commitment is being made to ensure the programme has a secure place in the education providers' business plan with the current student numbers.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that the programme has resources in place for the proposed intake of 83 students once a year. However, during the meetings and discussions with the senior team, programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the student numbers have increased on this programme recently. The education provider has another social work programme with placement requirements in their provision. The visitors also learnt that the placement providers have placement agreements with other education providers in the geographical area. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there is a workforce planning meeting in the beginning of 2015 to discuss different aspects of this programme including placements availability determining the students' intake number. The visitors could not determine how the current resources including practice educators and practice placements detailed in the documentation are appropriate for the above changes to student intake. This condition is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 3.1 regarding finalisation of placement agreements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show the commitment made and how the education provider is planning to put appropriate resources in place to ensure the programme is secure with the increased student numbers.

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

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

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology. For example, the programme specification on page 14 states “You will need to attend 30 compulsory skills days (210 hours) which form part of the practice learning opportunity for the first year and these hours are the minimum requirement of the regulating body, The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)”. In another example on page 17, it states “The 200 days in practice are a minimum requirement of the regulatory body, the HCPC”. These statements are incorrect as HCPC do not prescribe the number of hours or days students need to be on placement as part of their programme, instead education providers must demonstrate and justify how they meet the HCPC standards of education and training (SETs). Therefore, visitors require the programme documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of how the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit that the programme is delivered through full and part time routes. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that most of the teaching on the part time route is delivered at a different campus (Lichfield campus) compared to the full time route (Stoke campus). The visitors were unable to find references in the documentation except one, in the document 3 BA (Hons) Social Work course, page 1 that “you can study the course full time at our Stoke campus or part time at our Lichfield campus (some teaching on the part time route takes place at the Stoke campus)”. During the visit, the visitors saw facilities in place for the full time route (Stoke campus) only. The visitors were unable to determine that the resources in place at Lichfield campus to support student learning are appropriate and effectively used. Therefore, the education provider will need to submit further evidence so visitors can determine whether the resources in place at Lichfield campus are appropriate and will be effectively used to support students learning.

### **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 further evidence of how the resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit that the programme is delivered through full and part time routes. During discussions with the

senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that most of the teaching on the part time route is delivered at a different campus (Lichfield campus) compared to the full time route (Stoke campus). The visitors were unable to find references in the documentation except one, in the document 3 BA (Hons) Social Work course, page 1 that “you can study the course full time at our Stoke campus or part time at our Lichfield campus (some teaching on the part time route takes place at the Stoke campus)”. During the visit, the visitors saw facilities in place for the full time route (Stoke campus) only. The visitors were unable to determine that the resources to support student learning at Lichfield campus effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. Therefore, the education provider will need to submit further evidence so that visitors can determine whether the resources in place at Lichfield campus are appropriate and will effectively support students learning. This condition is linked to the condition placed under SET 3.8.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how learning resources, including IT facilities, are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff on the part time route.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit that the programme is delivered through full and part time routes. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that most of the teaching on the part time route is delivered at a different campus (Lichfield campus) compared to the full time route (Stoke campus). The visitors were unable to find references in the documentation except one, in the document 3 BA (Hons) Social Work course, page 1 that “you can study the course full time at our Stoke campus or part time at our Lichfield campus (some teaching on the part time route takes place at the Stoke campus)”. During the visit, the visitors saw facilities in place for the full time route (Stoke campus) only. The visitors were unable to determine that learning resources, including IT facilities to support student learning at Lichfield campus are appropriate to the curriculum and, are readily available to students and staff. Therefore, the education provider will need to submit further evidence so that visitors can determine whether the resources including IT facilities at Lichfield campus are appropriate and will be readily available to students and staff. This condition is linked to conditions placed under SET 3.8 and 3.9.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit that the programme is delivered through full and part time routes. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that most of the teaching on the part time route is delivered at a different campus (Lichfield campus) compared to the full time route (Stoke campus). The visitors were unable to find references in the documentation except one, in the document 3 BA (Hons) Social Work course, page 1 that “you can study the course full time at our Stoke campus or part time at our Lichfield

campus (some teaching on the part time route takes place at the Stoke campus)”. During the visit, the visitors saw facilities in place for the full time route (Stoke campus) only. The visitors were unable to determine that adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students are in place at Lichfield campus. Therefore, the education provider will need to submit further evidence to show that the facilities in place at Lichfield are adequate and accessible to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. This will enable visitors to make a judgment whether this standard is met. This condition is linked to conditions placed under SET 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show there is a system in place for academic and pastoral support for students on the part time route.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation submitted prior to the visit that the programme is delivered through full and part time route. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that most of the teaching on the part time route is delivered at a different campus (Lichfield campus) compared to the full time route (Stoke campus). The visitors were unable to find references in the documentation except one, in the document 3 BA (Hons) Social Work course, page 1 that “you can study the course full time at our Stoke campus or part time at our Lichfield campus (some teaching on the part time route takes place at the Stoke campus)”. During the visit, the visitors saw facilities in place including academic and pastoral support for students on the full time route (Stoke campus) only. The visitors were unable to determine that adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students are in place at Lichfield campus. Therefore, the education provider will need to submit further evidence to show that the facilities in place at Lichfield include a system in place of academic and pastoral support for students. This will enable visitors to make a judgment whether this standard is met. This condition is linked to conditions placed under SET 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10.

### **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 protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users. However, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme or how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. They also could not find information on 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 protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

**Condition:** The 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.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles and learning outcomes.

The visitors also noted in the programme specification on page 14 “You will need to attend 30 compulsory skills days (210 hours) which form part of the practice learning opportunity for the first year”. However, in the same paragraph it states “Time lost through absence for any reason will need to be made up before you can progress to the second year of the programme. A minimum of 90% of the days will need to be completed during term time and the hours lost made up at the end of the academic year”. During the visit, visitors were given a breakdown of these 30 compulsory skill days and when these days will be delivered during term time. The visitors noted that there are only 30 of these skills days, with no indication of how time lost through absence will be covered as indicated above. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how learning outcomes delivered in 30 compulsory skills days will be achieved by students who have lost time through absence before the end of the academic year.

#### **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 clearly articulate that the approved programme provides eligibility to register for the HCPC protected title of social worker in England.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme and admissions documents did provide enough clarity for students about the exit awards in place for the programme. The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for students around the final award which will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC as a social worker in England, which is a protected title. During the programme team meeting, it was discussed that the programme team will update the programme documents to make a more explicit statement that the final award will lead to eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC as a social worker in England. In order to be satisfied this standard is met the visitors require evidence that the programme documents are produced in line with these HCPC requirements.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider strengthening information available to potential applicants to ensure it is up to date and includes information about changes to bursary arrangements.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met and that the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. In discussion with the students, it was highlighted that students on the programme are aware of the changes in bursary arrangements for social work students in England. Students gave detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them was up to date. However, the visitors suggest that the education provider consider strengthening information including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are well informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. This will further ensure students are well aware about the financial arrangements.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team should consider the frequency of training provided to interview panels around equality and diversity policies in place.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met and that the education provider ensures that the interview panels are made aware and appropriately trained on the equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students at the education provider. The interview panel includes service users and carers, practice educators and academic staff. During discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors learnt that they are appropriately briefed before the interviews. This was echoed by the practice placement educators who were involved in the interviews. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team should consider increasing the frequency of training provided to interview panels. This will strengthen equality and diversity policies in place in relation to applicants and students and support the implementation and monitoring of them.

Simon Mudie  
David Childs  
Paula Sobiechowska

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme name</b>	Dip HE Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 January 2015

## 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. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 20 March 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject, or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 April 2015. 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 14 May 2015.

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vince Clarke (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Kathryn Fox (University of Cumbria)
Secretary	Joanna Littlewood (University of Cumbria)

## 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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 FdSc Paramedic Practice 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 satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

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

The visitors agreed that 42 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 16 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 programme documentation, in particular advertising material, to clearly state that this programme is only open to students from the HM Armed Forces.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors who the potential students for this programme would be. Discussions with the senior team revealed that the HM Armed Forces would be the sole provider of potential students for this programme. It was confirmed by the senior team that this programme would not be open to anyone beside HM Armed Forces. However, the documentation provided prior to the visit did not reflect this information. As such, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, in particular, admissions material to clearly articulate that students will only be recruited from the HM Armed Forces.

### **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 information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular any requirements around driving.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted in the programme specification, page 25, "Applicant must...hold a full UK driving licence by the time the student attends the interview stage". During discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that applicants are, in fact, not expected to hold a full UK driving licence by the time they attend the interview stage as stated in the documentation. The programme team confirmed that applicants are not required to hold a full UK licence to get on to the programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants to the programme. As such, the visitors require the programme team to revise the admission information given to applicants to reflect that a full UK licence is not a requirement to get onto the programme. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme will ensure that the applicants can make informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding criminal convictions checks.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as part of the admissions process to the programme. During discussions it was revealed that the HM Armed Forces would be responsible for administering DBS check and not the university. This is reflected in the documentation,

programme specification, page 24, states DBS checks would be “undertaken by HM Armed Forces for their students” and then “the outcome shared with the university”. However the visitors had not been provided with evidence of the HM Armed Forces’ process, how it is applied and how it is structured to deal with any issues that would arise as a result of the DBS checks. As such, the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the DBS checks, how the HM Armed Forces procedures work with those of the university and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto the programme if any issue does arise. Therefore the visitors require further information about the DBS checks that are applied at the point of admission to this programme. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how the HM Armed Forces’ process works with the university process and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if an issue arises.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider’s health requirements.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. During discussions it was revealed that the HM Armed Forces would be responsible for administering the occupational health clearance and not the university. However the visitors had not been provided with evidence of the HM Armed Force’s process, how it is applied and how it is used to identify what adjustments could or could not reasonably be made if health conditions were disclosed. As such the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the health declarations, how the HM Armed Forces’ procedures work with those of the university and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student if adjustments would be required. Therefore the visitors require further information about the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how the HM Armed Forces’ process works with the university process and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if adjustments are required.

#### **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 submit further information about the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme and evidence to demonstrate students will achieve all the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the information given to applicants around AP(E)L on page 24 in the Programme Specification. “Application for direct entry to Level 5 of the DipHE Paramedic Practice by submission of a Practice Portfolio can be considered when an applicant is an IHCD qualified Ambulance

Technician and has verifiable experiential practice experience”. During discussion with the programme team the visitors noted that the programme team has created a mapping document using IHCD as a benchmark to see whether student can progress to Level 5 by meeting SOPs set at Level 4. However, the visitors were not presented with this evidence. The visitors also heard that AP(E)L would be considered on an individual basis. The visitors were unclear what the AP(E)L process for this programme is and how students will achieve the SOPs for paramedics if they enter directly at Level 5 if they only have an IHCD Ambulance Technician qualification. The visitors therefore require further information about the AP(E)L policy for this programme and evidence to demonstrate how students who enter at Level 5 with IHCD qualification achieve all the SOPs for paramedics.

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included instances of incorrect terminology and occasional errors. For example, page 25, in the Placement handbook states “If a number of absences detract from the number of hours required by the HCPC”. This is incorrect as the HCPC does not stipulate a number of attendance hours required, it is the education provider’s responsibility to manage attendance. Also, the programme briefing document, page 4, states that the programme is ‘validated’ by HCPC, rather than being ‘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 that 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 landscape of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the Level 4 Practice Assessment Document (PAD).

**Reason:** The visitors noted, from the documentation provided, that student will be equipped with two Practice Assessment Documents (PADs) one set at Level 4 and another set at Level 5. From reviewing the Level 4 PAD the visitors noted that competencies students are expected to demonstrate such as “1.8 Practise within limits of competence and authority as a student paramedic” (Practice Assessment Document (PAD) Level 4). The visitors noted the competencies set in the PAD Level 4 document requires paramedic students to demonstrate the competencies ‘independently’, as opposed to ‘indirect supervision’. This is confirmed in the key code in the documentation which list level 4 as ‘independent’. At the visit, the visitors queried how students can demonstrate the competencies independently so early on in the programme. The programme team clarified that this was a documentation error, and

students are actually required to demonstrate the skill at Level 3 (Indirect supervision) as opposed to a Level 4 (independent). As such, the visitors require the education provider to revise the documentation to clearly articulate to the student and practice educators the level at which they should be demonstrating competencies. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the attendance requirements are clearly identified and to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

**Reason:** From the documentation the visitors noted inconsistent and incorrect information given to students regarding the attendance policy. The student placement handbook, page 20, states "There are very strict rules about the minimum number of hours of training undertaken... which are laid down by the HCPC". This is incorrect as the HCPC does not stipulate a number of hours of attendance, it is the education provider responsibility to manage attendance. The Programme handbook, page 25, states "You are expected to meet a 100% attendance requirement which includes your online learning". In discussion with the students, it was clear that they understood the requirement of 100 per cent attendance, not because this information was communicated clearly and consistently but because this was expected of them through their Army training. The visitors recognise that the students from this programme are unique because of their position and training with HM Armed Forces. Discussions with the programme team revealed that there is a clear process in place, they also confirmed that the attendance requirement for both the university and the placement setting was 100 per cent, and that tutors would contact the student if more than three lectures were missed. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to ensure that the attendance requirements are clearly identified and to include information as to what would trigger procedures for poor attendance.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the plans for continued service user and carer involvement within the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how service user and carers are currently involved in the programme. From the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users in the programme. The visitors were provided with limited information regarding how service users and carers will be involved in the programme. During discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that one of the core team members has recently been appointed to manage the involvement of service users and carers across all the health faculties. The programme team spoke of their intention to grow the pool of service users and carers involved in the programme and make it a faculty wide approach to the involvement of service users and carers. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team have considered and addressed the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base included in relevant curriculum guidance, particularly from the professional body.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that the education provider has considered the QAA benchmark statements for Paramedics. However, from the documentation the visitors could not see where the education provider has considered and addressed the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base included in relevant curriculum guidance, set by the professional body. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the team have considered the relevant curriculum guidance set by the professional body. The programme team gave a detailed discussion of all the ways the programme curriculum considers the professional body's guidance. However, this was not clear in the documentation. The visitors also heard that the programme team have undergone a College of Paramedics' mapping exercise, but the visitors were not presented with this information. As such, the visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence of how the programme's curriculum considers the standards set by the professional body. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme reflects the philosophy, core values and knowledge base of the relevant curriculum guidance from the professional body for the Paramedic profession.

#### **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 clarification of how the scheme of placements, including the number, duration and range of placements, will work in practice and identify which learning outcomes will be achieved in each placement.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the programme's scheme of placement is designed to provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet relevant learning outcomes. However the visitors could not determine how the practice placements arrangements will work. A detailed breakdown of each placement that students are required to complete is not clearly articulated in the programme documentation and it is also unclear as to which of the learning outcomes will be achieved in each placement. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the scheme of placements will work in practice to be sure that the duration and range of practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of identified learning outcomes.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation and outline the processes in place, to demonstrate evidence of the audit tool and supporting mechanisms used to approve and monitor all placements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the HM Armed Forces secure the practice placements with a number of Trusts such as the North West Ambulance NHS Trust and will have an agreement in place with the education provider to deliver the programme. The SETs mapping document presented to the visitors states “Memorandums of Understanding in place between the armed forces and the NHS Ambulance NHS Trust provisions of placements”. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence that shows the agreements between the education provider and the practice placement providers. From the documentation submitted, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not find evidence of formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of practice placements before they are used. From discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that a number of informal mechanisms are used to check and monitor the quality of practice placements. The visitors highlighted that formal arrangements should be in place so that the education provider is able to ensure the quality of all practice placements. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that demonstrates the programme has a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the HM Armed Forces secure the practice placements with a number of Trusts such as the North West Ambulance NHS Trust and will have an agreement in place with the education provider to deliver the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence that shows the agreements between the education provider and the practice placement providers. From the documentation submitted, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not find evidence of formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of practice placements before they are used. The visitors highlighted that formal arrangements should be in place so that the education provider is able to ensure that all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of the auditing processes to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that all practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the HM Armed Forces secure the practice placements with a number of Trusts such as the North West Ambulance NHS Trust and will have an agreement in place with the education provider to deliver the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence that shows the agreements between the

education provider and the practice placement providers. From the documentation submitted, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educator training options that are offered to practice educators, including a multi-professional module on mentorship delivered by the education provider and online refresher courses. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, how the education provider takes responsibility for this, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of their processes to ensure placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation and discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that the HM Armed Forces secure the practice placements with a number of Trusts such as the North West Ambulance NHS Trust and will have an agreement in place with the education provider to deliver the programme. However, the visitors were not presented with evidence that shows the agreements between the education provider and the practice placement providers. From the documentation submitted, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangement are agreed. The visitors could not find evidence of formal mechanisms in place to ensure the practice educators are appropriately registered. The visitors highlighted that formal arrangements should be in place so that the education provider is able to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered or agree other arrangements with the students and practice placement provider. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure placement educators are appropriately registered or how other arrangements are agreed.

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

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there will be placements in non-ambulance service settings, as highlighted in Student Placement Handbook, page 9 “a variety of relevant learning experiences, across patient journeys within pre-hospital, hospital emergency care and primary care”. During discussions with students about their experience on non- ambulance placements, the visitors learnt that the students felt that the preparation for non - ambulance placements was not sufficient. Students provided detailed cases of where their practice placement educators were not aware that they were coming to do a placement with them, nor did the practice placement educators have any information or an understanding of the expected learning outcomes to be achieved by the students whilst at that placement. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

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

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the placement educator handbook online. The visitors could not determine from the practice placement handbook how the education provider ensured practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for each individual placement particularly regarding the students’ scope of practice and expectations of both the students and practice placement educators at each individual placement. The content of the website refers to preparation for the FdSc Paramedic Practice programme and did not provide any information on the Dip HE Paramedic Practice programme. From this information the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures placement educators are fully prepared for placements. During discussion with the programme team the visitors were told about an online resource referred to as webfolio that is used to prepare practice educators for placement. The visitors did not have access to the webfolio but were informed that it is mandatory for all placement educator to access the webfolio as a way of preparation for

placement. Once practice educators access all the information on the webfolio, they have to email the programme team who keep a record of it. The documentation however, did not reflect this information. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that practice educators are fully prepared for placement, as also how practice educators are made aware of students' scope of practice for each placement and the expectations of the practice placement educators at placement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

#### **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 clearly articulate an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

**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 any aegrotat awards conferred would not provide them eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards to ensure that students are aware of the consequences of having an award of this type conferred.

#### **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, or agree other arrangements.

**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 the assessment regulations of the programme to state that any external examiner 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 examiner to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard is met.

Vince Clarke  
Glyn Harding  
Simon Mudie

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Cumbria
<b>Programme name</b>	UAWd Approved Mental Health Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Work based learning
<b>Type of programme</b>	Approved mental health professional
<b>Date of visit</b>	28 – 29 January 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendation .....	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. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health practitioners (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 20 March 2015 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 26 March 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 10 April 2015. 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 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Steve Benson (Approved mental health professional) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor) Dorothy Smith (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
First approved intake	22 December 2008
Chair	Fiona Powley (University of Cumbria)
Secretary	Suzanne Parkes (University of Cumbria)

## 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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<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"/>
Module guides for HSWG 7009 and HSWG 9003	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme Annual Evaluatory Reports from 2012–13 and 2013–14	<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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

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 41 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **A.4 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored in relation to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the education provider referenced the institution wide admission policy and admissions procedure as sources of evidence for this criterion in their mapping document. These documents were University of Cumbria wide, and did not specify how the policy and procedure was implemented or monitored for this programme. The education provider also referenced the Programme Specification documents, which contained a statement that the education provider “encourages and welcomes students of all ages, cultures, disabilities and social backgrounds and gives fair consideration to all applicants, treating them solely on the basis of their merits, abilities and potential in line with equality legislation” (pages 19 and 21). After reviewing these documents, the visitors were clear that there is an equality and diversity policy in relation to admissions, but were unable to determine how the policy was implemented and monitored in relation to this programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the policy is implemented for this programme and how equality and diversity in admissions is monitored to ensure that this criterion is met.

### **B.2 The programme must be effectively managed**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility between the programme team, senior team and placement providers.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Work Programme Structure diagram, along with a list of names and job titles for the programme team from the Programme Handbook (pages 6 and 7). From discussions at the visit, the visitors were clear that there is cooperation between the programme team, senior team and placement providers. However, the visitors were unclear how the lines of reporting and hierarchy worked, and whether the informal cooperation was embedded into clear management policies and procedures for the programme. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates clear University of Cumbria ownership of the processes that underpin the running of the programme, including structures of decision making and lines of reporting, at both Department and University level, to ensure that this criterion is met.

### **B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that they have a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place before the commencement of the next cohort.

**Reason:** In the education provider's mapping submission, the education provider referenced the list of the programme team from the Programme Specification (pages 6 and 7), and the staff CVs when evidencing how this criterion is met. Considering this evidence, the visitors were satisfied that there was an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme in its current form, and that the staff team were appropriately qualified and experienced. However, at the visit, the education provider confirmed that the maximum number of students per year would increase from twelve to twenty from September 2015. The visitors acknowledge the pressure that current staffing levels put on the programme team with the current cohort size. This is further impacted by the long term absence of the programme leader, although the visitors consider that the interim programme leader is appropriately qualified and experienced for the role, and that the programme therefore meets criterion B.4. Considering the pressure on the programme team with current numbers, and the increased workload resulting from an increase in cohort size, the visitors were not satisfied that current staffing levels are adequate should the planned increase in cohort size go ahead. Therefore, the visitors require evidence demonstrating that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the cohort that starts the programme in September 2015.

#### **B.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure an effective programme is in place for the development of teaching staff not employed directly by the University of Cumbria.

**Reason:** From the documentary submission, and from discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted a significant proportion of the programme's teaching is delivered by external or visiting lecturers, who were not directly employed by the University of Cumbria. In the Programme Specification documents, there are "Staff development priorities for staff teaching this programme", but it is unclear from these documents whether these priorities apply to external staff who teach on the programme. The further evidence provided in this area (Statement on Staff Development on the education provider's website, and generic Role Profiles for Level 2 and 3) related only to development for staff employed by the University. The visitors were unclear how the education provider supports the development of visiting lecturers in order to ensure they are kept up to date in terms of practice and research. To ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures that visiting lecturers are supported by an effective programme for their professional and research development.

#### **D.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 update the programme documentation to accurately reflect the competency based nature of the practice learning.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the statement in the Practice Handbook which "require[s] students to undertake a minimum of 100 hours practice" (page 5). The visitors were not satisfied that this short period of practice would effectively support the achievement of the learning outcomes. In discussions at the visit, various groups

(including the students and the programme team) acknowledged that the 100 hours functioned as a minimum, and in reality, all students undertook a far greater number of practice hours. The programme team also stated that completing the practice placements is competency based rather than time limited. However, with the current stated minimum number of hours, the visitors consider there is a risk that students could undertake a period of practice learning that is too short to support the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors also considered that the stated minimum could mislead potential applicants to the programme, who may be expecting to complete exactly or just over 100 hours of practice, when in reality this would not be sufficient. The visitors require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to state a more representative expected minimum period for practice learning, and to accurately reflect the competency based nature of practice learning if it is judged to be adequate.

#### **D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information about the revised arrangements for practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from discussions at the visit that not all practice placement educators undertake practice placement educator training. Currently, the individual designated as the Lead Practice Educator undertakes specific practice placement educator training with the education provider. The visitors considered this appropriate under current arrangements, as all students are formally supervised by this individual, which helps to ensure parity in student placement experience and assessment. However, the visitors noted from discussions with the programme team that the education provider plans to change the way it manages practice placements, with other practice educators becoming more involved in students learning and assessment. As part of this change, the education provider is developing and widening their programme of practice placement educator training with the intention of ensuring consistency and equivalence in the teaching and assessment of students on placement. To ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require further information about this training, including a timeline for when it will be implemented.

#### **E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective practice as an AMHP**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information to detail how their monitoring processes ensure objective assessment of students' AMHP competence.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors noted several policies intended to demonstrate objectivity in the assessment of students, including the Academic Regulations and the Procedures Governing Marking and Moderation of Assessment. The visitors also noted from the documentation, and from discussions with the programme team, senior team, and practice placement providers and educators, that there are further policies in place intended to ensure objectivity in the assessment. For example, the programme's external examiner is changed regularly and reports annually, and there is regular internal monitoring and validation. However, the visitors were unclear how relevant policies and procedures were applied to this programme. The visitors also noted the reliance on external individuals to ensure consistency and objectivity in the assessment, rather than clear ownership of the

application of relevant policies by the University of Cumbria. Therefore, to ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures objectivity in the assessment processes. This could be in the form of a cohesive account of the processes in place to achieve objectivity in the assessment, and how they are applied to this programme.

#### **E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme**

**Condition:** The education provider must name the programme(s) of study that ensures individuals meet section 2 of the approval criteria for AMHP programmes, and ensure that the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates the programme award(s) clearly and consistently.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and discussions at the visit regarding the programme title, the visitors noted that there was not a final award given to individuals who meet section 2 of the HCPC approval criteria for AMHP programmes. The Programme Handbook states that a “transcript [is provided] to enable [the student] to apply to the LA to become an AMHP” (page 11). This transcript is given after completing the modules linked to AMHP competence, along with a Qualificatory Practice Unit. These modules are contained within a suite of post qualifying study, which includes modules that are not directly linked to AMHP training. The education provider gives awards when students complete certain programmes of study within this suite equalling 60 or 120 credits. However, this criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate student progression and achievement within the programme, and therefore the awards that do and do not lead to individuals meeting section 2 of the approval criteria for AMHP programmes. In order to determine this criterion is met, the visitors require the education provider to confirm the programme title(s) that lead to individuals meeting section 2 of the approval criteria for AMHP programmes, and ensure that the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates the programme award(s) and what activity they entitle an individual to perform clearly and consistently.

#### **E.10 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 an appropriate professional register**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information to demonstrate how their criteria for appointing external examiners for the programme ensures that at least one will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register.

**Reason:** In the mapping provided, the education provider referenced the University of Cumbria wide external examiner policy, which states “the Programme Leader is responsible for ensuring that the criteria for appointment of the Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) are met” (page 3). They also referenced a generic statement about why the programme appoints external examiners in the Programme Handbook (page 16). Neither of these statements were clear in articulating the programme specific criteria that are used when appointing external examiners to this programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, to ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require evidence that

articulates the criteria that the programme team use to appoint external examiners to the programme.

## Recommendation

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team embed service user and carer involvement more formally into the programme's structure.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, it was clear that service users and carers were involved in the programme. The service users and carers were generally satisfied with their involvement, and mentioned their involvement in other programmes in the faculty. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that this criterion is met. However, although the service users and carers were clear about the areas in which they were involved currently, they were unsure of formal protocols and procedures should they wish to contribute to the programme in different ways. For example, there was no regular meeting of the service users and carers to discuss their involvement in the programme. The visitors also noted that involvement was very reliant on informal working relationships between the service users and carers and members of the programme team. Although the service users and carers were confident that they were well supported in their roles, they were also not clear about the formal training they had received, and one individual was not aware that they had been nominated as a specific "Expert by Experience Champion". The visitors considered that there were risks to involvement in its current form, especially if individuals from the service user and carer group or the programme team change. Therefore, the visitors recommend that service user and carer involvement is embedded more formally into the programme's structure and includes provision for input on curriculum development and planning.

Steve Benson  
Ian Hughes  
Dorothy Smith

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Wiltshire College
<b>Validating body</b>	University of Bath
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	21 – 22 January 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	4
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 17 March 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 14 May 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The professional body, the College of Social Work (TCSW), 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 and role of HCPC visitors	Michael Branicki (Social worker) Graeme Currie (Social worker) Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
First approved intake	8 August 2003
Chair	Adrian Vatcher (University of the West of England)
Secretary	Wendy Lloyd (Wiltshire College)
Members of the joint panel	Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (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"/>
Service users and carers	<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 satisfied 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 the relevant part of the Register.

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 six SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally 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 admissions guidance about the health check so that applicants have the information available to make an informed choice about whether or not to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Reason:** The programme specification detailed that one of the admissions requirements was the completion of a satisfactory health check. The visitors considered this could be misleading as the admissions documentation did not specify what the criteria for passing the health check were. The visitors would like to see this criteria in more detail, to understand the purpose of, and the criteria for passing the health check. The visitors concluded that there was not sufficient information regarding the health check to allow a potential applicant to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. During the visit it was established that the health check has a dual role. The first purpose of the health check is to ensure that the applicant is healthy enough to successfully take up a place on the programme. The second purpose is to identify where special requirements or adjustments may need to be made so that an individual is appropriately supported on the programme. The current wording of the admission criteria does not mention the second purpose of the health check, the visitors considered that a potential applicant may view this criteria as a barrier to admission. This information should be available for potential applicants and that the current statement about the health check could be misleading. To ensure that the standard is met the visitors would like to see the documentation state more clearly what the purpose of the health check is and what is involved.

### **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 guidance to clearly identify how many hours of voluntary or paid work in a social services or welfare setting is required as a condition of application for the programme.

**Reason:** Page 10 of the programme specification document states “It is a condition of application that an applicant has 200 hours experience either voluntary or paid work in a social services or welfare setting (to be completed at time of application or by time of course commencement) with a reference to support this work.” Further discussion with the programme team discovered that this was no longer the case and the number of hours was being reduced for future cohorts. The visitors agreed that this inaccuracy could be misleading to potential applicants when considering applying for the programme. To ensure the standard is met, the visitors would like to see the correct statement in the programme specification so that potential applicants are clear about the admissions criteria and can make an informed choice about whether to apply for admission to the programme.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will effectively manage the programme considering their intention to increase cohort size to 25 per year.

**Reason:** The Wiltshire College business plan states that as of the 2015–16 academic year the planned cohort size as agreed with the University of Bath is 25. This is a significant increase to the current number of students which totals 37 across all three years. The visitors were satisfied that the programme is effectively managed for the current student number, allowing students that complete the programme to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. However, the visitors were concerned that if student numbers rise to 25 per cohort as planned, then the current management of the programme would not be able to deliver an effective programme. The visitors noted that the teaching and administrative staff, learning resources and practice placement provision would need to be readdressed in order to accommodate the proposed increase in cohort and deliver an effective programme, allowing successful students to meet the SOPs. In order to be satisfied that this standard is met, the visitors require evidence for the effective management of the programme for the planned expansion of the programme.

### **3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme for staff development, and demonstrate how this programme is monitored so it ensures continuing professional and research development.

**Reason:** the education provider currently has a programme for staff development in place, however the visitors considered that the education provider should be doing more to support staff teaching on a higher education programme. The visitors considered that the current programme for staff development was more relevant to further education teaching. Further discussion discovered that as a further education institution the requirement for programme staff to be actively involved in research was not expected due to the nature of the resources available to the education provider. The visitors considered staff development as important to the programme to ensure that the curriculum is taught by staff with relevant expertise and experience to deliver an effective programme. The visitors considered that the current staff development programme should be focused more to a higher education setting. To ensure that the standard is met the visitors would like to see a programme for staff development which is more relevant to the teaching of this higher education programme.

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted that throughout the programme handbook and module guides there were inaccuracies regarding the role of the HCPC, for example on page 15 in the programme handbooks it states “It is an HCPC requirement that students must complete 170 days placement over the course of the programme and 30 skills days”,

the HCPC does not specify a specific number of days on placement or skills days, this is a requirement of the professional body. Similarly, the programme specification on page 2 states “The professional capabilities framework developed by the HCPC and TCSW has replaced the previous competence based model developed by the General Social care Council (GSCC)”. This statement is incorrect as the HCPC has no involvement with the development of the professional capabilities framework. There were other instances of inaccurate information in the documentation as well. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revise all documentation and remove any inaccurate information so that students are correctly informed about the role and remit of the HCPC in relation to the programme of study and the profession.

### **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 further evidence to demonstrate that physical learning resources are effectively used to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were given a tour of the physical learning resources as part of the visit agenda. The visitors observed that some of the higher education (HE) learning rooms, which were intended as dedicated spaces for HE students, were available for use by other students at the college. During the visit the students noted that there were occasions where role play teaching and confidential learning sessions were held in the learning rooms which were also publically used. The visitors concluded that this use of rooms was not appropriate for required teaching and learning activities. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence that the education provider is able to promote a learning environment that is more conducive for the teaching of social work.

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

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

**Reason:** The current attendance policy, on page 15 of the social work programme handbook, states that “Attendance is compulsory for all elements of the programme and we expect your attendance to be 100%.” This clearly explains what the attendance is for all aspects of teaching on the programme. However, the visitors noted in the documentation and throughout the visit that there was no policy in place to monitor attendance, or trigger procedures for poor attendance. The visitors would like to see an attendance policy which clearly specifies what the required attendance for all aspects of the programme and how this is monitored, including the protocol for handling poor attendance.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to make it clear to the students that resources are available from the University of Bath.

**Reason:** As part of the licencing arrangement with the University of Bath, students at Wiltshire College have walk-in access to the learning resources at the University of Bath. This was made clear to the visitors during the tour of facilities. Under this arrangement Wiltshire College students can visit the library during weekends and University vacation days. This access included access to 'e-learning' resources, including library books and journals, both hard copies and online. It is not possible to borrow books or to print or save material. It was noted that access was limited due to a recent change to the arrangements with the University of Bath. It used to be that Wiltshire College students could visit the University of Bath and borrow books at any time, due to geographical and financial limitations it was noted by the education provider that this was rarely used by students on the programme. The policy changed to accommodate this meaning that students are now required to book a time to visit the University of Bath Library. It also became apparent that there was a share scheme allowing students at Wiltshire College to order books from the University of Bath and the University of the West of England, as well as other libraries throughout Wiltshire by using the South West Regional Library service (SWRL) agreement which gives Wiltshire College students access to 51 libraries. Under current licensing arrangements Wiltshire College students can request University of Bath External Library Membership, which allows them to borrow 5 books at a time and to visit the Library 24/7 throughout the year. There is a modest fee for this membership which Wiltshire College pays for on request by the students. Although it was apparent to the visitors that there was a pool of resources from Bath, and that students studying on the programme had access to these resources, they noted during the meeting with students that there was generally a poor understanding of the accessibility and availability of learning resources from the University of Bath. The visitors decided that, as the programme was a HE programme set in a further education setting, it was imperative that students had access to HE learning materials, specifically when it came to writing their final dissertations. The visitors further considered that the confusion among students could have a negative impact on their access to resources. For this reason the visitors recommend that the programme team make it clear to all students what access they have to learning resources for external education providers and how they can gain this access.

Michael Branicki  
Graeme Currie  
Susanne Roff