

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bristol
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc in 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>	18 – 19 February 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 '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 15 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 May 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 4 June 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 part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation 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	Patricia Higham (Social worker) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor) Alan Murphy (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Nicole Casey
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Kate Whittington (University of Bristol)
Secretary	Lulli Knight (University of Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Linton (College of Social Work) Rosean Connelly (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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising material and website, to ensure that potential applicants have contemporary information about changes to bursary arrangements.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how 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 very detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them was up to date. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and website if and how information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks required for the admissions process.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is a DBS process in place for the programme. However, the visitors noted the programme advertising materials did not include explicit information about the required DBS checks, in particular that applicants will be asked to declare any convictions at the interview stage. The visitors considered information about the DBS checks to be important to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the DBS check and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the criminal conviction checks required for the admissions process.

### **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 submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the health declaration required for the admission procedures.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is a process for checking compliance with health requirements. However, the visitors noted the programme advertising materials did not include explicit information about the required health checks, in particular that applicants will be asked to declare any health related issues at the interview stage. As such the visitors could not determine where information about the health declaration was made available to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. In particular they could not identify where details about the health check process and clarity about the confidentiality commitments made to the applicants in the application process are provided. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the health declaration required for the admission process.

### **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 the longstanding relationship the education provider has with placement providers such as Bristol City, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire. In meeting with the senior team and placement educators, the visitors were informed that regular meetings took place between the education provider and placement providers to discuss the programme and matters regarding the provision of placements. In addition, the visitors were provided with a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the programme and the providers. However, during discussions with the placement providers, the visitors heard that the MOA is still in development and may be changed from its existing state. The visitors were therefore, 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 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.

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

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

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, on the programme's website the language used suggests students will become registered as a Social Worker on graduation and in Document 1 (MSc Social Work Booklet), the HCPC is referred to as the "Health & Care Professionals Council" page 4. All successful graduates from the

programme need to apply for Registration with the HCPC before they can work as a Social Worker, in England, and that all references to the HCPC should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council'. In addition, throughout the documentation the visitors noted the use of the phrase "...re-accredited by the HCPC" (such as in Document 32, Programme Specification page 1). The HCPC does not accredit programmes and as such the term re-approved should be used instead. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that the programme team were in the process of developing a consent form. The visitors also noted in the mapping document provided that, "All students are encouraged to think about a learning agreement in the form of Ground Rules which acknowledge the importance of confidentiality". Through discussions with the students and the programme team the visitors learnt that students were encouraged to develop their own ground rules which they must abide to whilst on the programme. The education provider submitted the ground rule as evidence to meet this standard. However, the visitors were unable to determine where within the development of these ground rules that consent was discussed and what protocols were in place for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as service users in practical and clinical teaching. As such the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate in this form of teaching and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been gained. The visitors also could not determine, from the evidence provided, how situations where students declined to participate were managed and what alternative learning arrangements would be provided to ensure that there was no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, and how this information will be communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.7. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors could not easily identify which parts of the information provided were pertinent to the requirements for student progression and achievement within this particular programme. From the discussions with the

programme team, the visitors were not certain what criteria are used for students' progression within the programme and how this information would be communicated to students. The visitors were unable to see how the assessment regulations regarding student progression and achievement would be made clear to students so they can understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulations regarding how students will progress through the programme and how this information would be communicated to students.

#### **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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that "the regulations are currently being amended within the programme-specific regulations to reflect" this standard. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulation. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme clearly state that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted the education provider's 'Policy for External Examining of Taught Programmes' (Doc 29). Upon reviewing the document the visitors were unable to locate the appropriate information that clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner being appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulation and determines how the programme may meet this standard.

Patricia Higham  
Manoj Mistry  
Alan Murphy

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bristol
<b>Programme name</b>	Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	18 – 19 February 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 '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 15 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 May 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 4 June 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 part of a joint event. The education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation 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	Patricia Higham (Social worker) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor) Alan Murphy (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Nicole Casey
Proposed student numbers	50 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Kate Whittington (University of Bristol)
Secretary	Lulli Knight (University of Bristol)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Linton (College of Social Work) Rosean Connelly (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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising material and website, to ensure that potential applicants have contemporary information about changes to bursary arrangements.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how 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 very detailed accounts of being supported by the admission tutor and the information given to them was up to date. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation and website if and how information about possible changes to the fee structure due to changes in bursaries will be communicated to potential applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are informed and kept up to date regarding possible changes to the fee structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks required for the admissions process.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is a DBS process in place for the programme. However, the visitors noted the programme advertising materials did not include explicit information about the required DBS checks, in particular that applicants will be asked to declare any convictions at the interview stage. The visitors considered information about the DBS checks to be important to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. This includes the requirement for the DBS check and why this is needed along with details about the process. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the criminal conviction checks required for the admissions process.

### **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 submit further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the health declaration required for the admission procedures.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is a process for checking compliance with health requirements. However, the visitors noted the programme advertising materials did not include explicit information about the required health checks, in particular that applicants will be asked to declare any health related issues at the interview stage. As such the visitors could not determine where information about the health declaration was made available to enable potential applicants to make informed decisions about this programme. In particular they could not identify where details about the health check process and clarity about the confidentiality commitments made to the applicants in the application process are provided. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence demonstrating how they will ensure potential applicants to the programme are fully informed about the health declaration required for the admission process.

### **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 the longstanding relationship the education provider has with placement providers such as Bristol City, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire. In meeting with the senior team and placement educators, the visitors were informed that regular meetings took place between the education provider and placement providers to discuss the programme and matters regarding the provision of placements. In addition, the visitors were provided with a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the programme and the providers. However, during discussions with the placement providers, the visitors heard that the MOA is still in development and may be changed from its existing state. The visitors were therefore, 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 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.

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

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

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, on the programme's website the language used suggests students will become registered as a Social Worker on graduation and in Document 1 (MSc Social Work Booklet), the HCPC is referred to as the "Health & Care Professionals Council" page 4. All successful graduates from the

programme need to apply for Registration with the HCPC before they can work as a Social Worker, in England, and that all references to the HCPC should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council'. In addition, throughout the documentation the visitors noted the use of the phrase "...re-accredited by the HCPC" (such as in Document 32, Programme Specification page 1). The HCPC does not accredit programmes and as such the term re-approved should be used instead. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that the programme team were in the process of developing a consent form. The visitors also noted in the mapping document provided that, "All students are encouraged to think about a learning agreement in the form of Ground Rules which acknowledge the importance of confidentiality". Through discussions with the students and the programme team the visitors learnt that students were encouraged to develop their own ground rules which they must abide to whilst on the programme. The education provider submitted the ground rule as evidence to meet this standard. However, the visitors were unable to determine where within the development of these ground rules that consent was discussed and what protocols were in place for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as service users in practical and clinical teaching. As such the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate in this form of teaching and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been gained. The visitors also could not determine, from the evidence provided, how situations where students declined to participate were managed and what alternative learning arrangements would be provided to ensure that there was no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, and how this information will be communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.7. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors could not easily identify which parts of the information provided were pertinent to the requirements for student progression and achievement within this particular programme. From the discussions with the

programme team, the visitors were not certain what criteria are used for students' progression within the programme and how this information would be communicated to students. The visitors were unable to see how the assessment regulations regarding student progression and achievement would be made clear to students so they can understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulations regarding how students will progress through the programme and how this information would be communicated to students.

#### **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 submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that "the regulations are currently being amended within the programme-specific regulations to reflect" this standard. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulation. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme clearly state that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements that there will be at least one external examiner who will be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted the education provider's 'Policy for External Examining of Taught Programmes' (Doc 29). Upon reviewing the document the visitors were unable to locate the appropriate information that clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner being appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit. However, the visitors noticed that information provided was still awaiting approval from the 'Assessment Standing Group' and therefore, the information presented may still change. As such, the visitors require the finalised documentation which defines the programme's assessment regulation and determines how the programme may meet this standard.

Patricia Higham  
Manoj Mistry  
Alan Murphy

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Central Lancashire
<b>Programme name</b>	PG Cert Mental Health Practice including Approved Mental Health Professional training (AMHP)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Work based learning
<b>Type of programme</b>	Approved mental health professional
<b>Date of visit</b>	10 – 11 March 2015

## 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 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 21 April 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 14 May 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 8 May 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 4 June 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 reviewed 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	Robert Goemans (Approved mental health professional) Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Steve Benson (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort; 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Louisa Jones (University of Central Lancashire)
Secretary	Carolyn Johnson (University of Central Lancashire)
Members of the joint panel	Tony Graham (Internal Panel Member) Peter Hall (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 43 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 as to how they effectively collaborate with local authorities and employers of prospective students to ensure that applicants receive all of the relevant admissions information.

**Reason:** The mapping document for this criterion stated that the fact sheet provides prospective students with information on the programme, and that admission is carried out in partnership with the local authority. At the visit, the visitors heard from current students that they had received information about the programme mainly from their local authority, rather than directly from the education provider. The agencies distribute the education provider's programme information, such as fact sheets, and some authorities had held introduction sessions for the AMHP programmes available at this education provider and at a different education provider. The visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures that up-to-date, clear information specific to this programme, such as the education provider's staff, support and resources available or the programme's content were available to applicants for the programme, where they were not directly providing the information to applicants. The visitors also were unclear how the education provider ensures that a distinction is made between its application criteria, which is applicable to all potential students, and any local authority criteria which will have to be met only by some applicants. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider ensure that up-to-date, clear information is provided to all applicants where this is done principally through the local authority.

### **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 as to how they communicate clear information about the programme's entry requirements to those applicants not applying via a local authority.

**Reason:** The programme specification's entry requirements state that: "The applicant might not be employed by the local authority however applications are processed and nominated by the local authority". The visitors understood that this statement was in relation to applicants coming from a healthcare trust background, but could not find information for potential applicants coming directly to the education provider within this document. The programme specification also lists "Employment with an agency with the ability to provide a suitable practice placement...", as a requirement, though the admissions handbook gives further information on page 7 which indicates that applications can still be made where this employment is not in place. The visitors therefore found that the entry requirements presented in some of the documentation could be misleading to people not applying via, or employed by, a local authority and therefore require the programme team to revisit information provided to all potential applicants to ensure it is consistent and clear.

### **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 of how the admissions procedures enable the education provider to gather sufficient information about applicants to make an informed decisions about admissions.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the entry requirements for the programme as outlined in the programme specification, course pro-forma and admissions handbook. The documentation outlines how the local authority interview and nominate applicants for the programme. The visitors noted on page 6 of the admissions handbook that: "The nominating Local Authority will take into consideration the length of post qualifying experience and suitability for the programme using their own applications process." Discussions with the programme team at the visit confirmed that the education provider also screens application forms through a 'Programme Selection Panel' to ascertain whether applicants have demonstrated that they have the level of professional competence, capacity and ability to undertake and complete an AMHP training programme at this level, and has the final decision on admission. This panel also assesses an additional reflective account of professional development for non-graduate entry students. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not find the detailed criteria applied by the education provider as part of the selection panel's screening process, or evidence of how the suitability criteria is communicated to students applying to the programme. The visitors therefore need further information about the screening process and how the admissions procedures at the education provider ensure they have sufficient information to make the final decision as to whether to offer applicants a place on the programme.

### **A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further detail of the professional entry standards they use in the screening of applicants, and how these are applied

**Reason:** As for criteria A.1, the visitors noted on page 6 of the admissions handbook that: "The nominating Local Authority will take into consideration the length of post qualifying experience and suitability for the programme using their own applications process." Discussions with the programme team at the visit confirmed that the education provider also screens application forms through a 'Programme Selection Panel' to ascertain whether applicants have demonstrated that they have the level of professional competence, capacity and ability to undertake and complete an AMHP training programme at this level, and has the final decision on admission. This panel also assesses an additional reflective account of professional development for non-graduate entry students. However, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not find the detailed criteria applied by the education provider as part of the selection panel's screening process, or evidence of how this criteria was applied consistently through the review of application forms. The visitors therefore need further information on this screening process and how the admissions procedures at the education provider ensure appropriate academic and professional entry standards are applied.

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

**Condition:** Further evidence must be provided as to the approach taken to secure the viability of running the programme and any actions taken to broaden the pool of potential applicants for the programme.

**Reason:** Evidence provided for this criterion included information on the School of Social Work, and two sets of course committee minutes. The visitors were given sight of the School Business Plan at the visit, and met with key senior staff for the School of Social Work. The visitors heard from senior staff that there was a commitment to provide resources to deliver the programme and that they considered it viable to continue running the programme even with a very small cohort. The visitors noted from the course leader's internal annual monitoring reports that the programme cohort consisted of two students in 2013 – 14, though an initiative for a preparatory year had enabled higher intake numbers for the current academic year. In meeting with placement providers the visitors heard of a new scheme within one of the key providers to centralise AMHP provision, meaning that they would need to train fewer AMHPs in future and could not give guarantees of future applicants to the education provider. The criteria mapping states that, "Regular course committee minutes are held and attended by agency partners and we have regular discussions about future planning". From the minutes submitted, the visitors noted a high proportion of apologies received from agency partners and were therefore unable to determine the extent to which future planning discussions were taking place. Though the senior team stated the programme was immune to requiring certain numbers, the visitors could not find evidence in the documentation provided outlining the programme team's approach to managing risks to the programme's continued viability, such as a robust strategy for consolidating and developing the preparatory year scheme, or reaching out to broaden the pool of applicants. They therefore require further evidence to ensure the education provider undertake review and future planning of the programme's viability and that this criterion will be met.

### **D.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify where the responsibility falls in ensuring that the placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment, and how this is communicated and confirmed in agreements with all parties.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted and discussions at the visit highlighted that the practice placement representatives organised the placements, including ensuring settings are appropriate, in discussion with the education provider. The visitors reviewed the Practice Learning Contract (Practice learning handbook, appendix 6) and noted that the health and safety checklist introduced students to various policies at the placement setting. It was clear from the Practice Learning Contract that there were defined roles and responsibilities for various elements of practice placement organisation, however the visitors could not determine who holds the responsibility for ensuring the placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. The visitors also could not find evidence of the formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of practice placements before they are used (see criterion D.4). This criterion requires the education provider to hold overall responsibility for ensuring the placement settings will provide a safe and supportive environment for student learning. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the processes in place to

demonstrate that the education provider ensures practice placements provide safe and supportive environments.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must further evidence how they implement and maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements for students.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted for this criterion comprised several documents within the practice learning handbook, including the Supplementary Application Form, Practice Learning Contract and Placement Evaluation Forms. The documentation submitted and discussions at the visit highlighted that the practice placement representatives organised the placements, including ensuring settings are appropriate, in discussion with the education provider, and that the Practice Learning Contract forms the basis of the approval of placements. The visitors also heard from meetings at the visit that, though a tutor from the education provider will review and be part of the Practice Learning Contract, they will not always attend the practice learning agreement meeting. The visitors were unable to find evidence of a thorough and effective system used by the education provider for the initial assessment and ongoing, regular monitoring of all placements. Irrespective of who manages the processes for identifying, assessing and auditing placements, this criterion requires the education provider to demonstrate a thorough and effective system for ensuring the placement settings are appropriate. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must evidence how they implement clear requirements that placement educators taking students have undertaken appropriate placement educator training.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated the programme has no requirement for practice placement educators to have completed a practice educator training programme, though there are opportunities and learning resources available to practice educators at the education provider. This was reiterated during the visit in discussions with the placement providers, who confirmed that, though they believed that most placement educators did have formal training, they have no requirements for a certain level or award to have been completed. The visitors therefore could not determine how this criterion is met by the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating that the education provider ensures all practice educators have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training.

#### **E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the competencies set out in section 2 of the criteria**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly demonstrate how the programme ensures that the following criteria of Section 2: Approved mental health professionals will be assessed as met:

**7.3 Be able to plan, negotiate and manage compulsory admission to hospital or arrangements for supervised community treatment.**

**Reason:** Through their review of the criteria mapping and curriculum documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors felt that the programme's delivery would ensure that any successful graduate of the programme could meet this criteria. In discussion with students at the visit, there appeared to be a general understanding that this competency could be assessed as met in the placement setting without the student having coordinated compulsory admission, through a combination of experience from other assessments. At the visit, the visitors were also provided with an additional document: "Guidance in relation to AMHP approval criteria /Key competencies", which gives suggestions as to appropriate evidence for each competency. For this criteria, the terminology 'consider' and 'address' are used, and the visitors were not able to find explicit communication to students and placement educators that the students will have to co-ordinate the compulsory admission process in order to assess the competency as met. The programme team confirmed that students would need to take the lead in coordinating compulsory detentions in order to demonstrate this competency in practice. However, in order to ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence as to how the assessment of this criteria is explicitly communicated to all parties.

## Recommendations

### **D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider**

**Recommendation:** The education provider is recommended to continue to seek further formalisation of the agreements with practice placement providers to ensure the effective collaboration continues.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed course committee minutes prior to the visit, and were able to see the strong collaborative links that were in place with the education provider and the placement providers. In the meeting with the senior team, the visitors heard that there were discussions ongoing with local authorities and agencies in the region with the view to further strengthen and formalise these partnership arrangements. The visitors encourage the education provider to continue to pursue formalised agreements wherever possible, to ensure the collaborative partnership approach that has been developed continues.

Clare Bates  
Steve Benson  
Robert Goemans

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<b>Programme name</b>	BA Honours in Applied 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>	25 – 26 February 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 '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 7 April 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 14 May 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MA Social Work, full time. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker in England) Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Louise Whittle (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Almudena Lara (Department for Education)
Proposed student numbers	65 per cohort across full time and part time; 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Kevin Bampton (University of Derby)
Secretary	Shelley Nix (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Angie Snow (Internal panel member) Douglas Carr (Internal panel member) Sue Taplin (External Panel Member) Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit admissions documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy in the information made available to applicants.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the programme website to evidence this standard. The visitors were satisfied that the web page was a suitable platform to inform applicants of the details of the programme, however, they noted instances of inconsistent and missing information. For example, the web page states that the required UCAS points for entry to the programme are set at 240, however the presentation delivered to applicants on open days states that minimum entry is 260 UCAS points. In addition to this the visitors noted that the programme requires each applicant to hold a C grade GCSE Maths and English as stated in the handbook for recruitment and selection of new students, page 8. "Passes in 5 other subjects at GCSE grade C or above which must include English and Maths, or their equivalent in other academic qualifications". However, the information provided on the university web page states "Your points at level 3 will be in addition to 5 GCSEs at grade C or equivalent level 2 qualifications". There is no specific mention of the Maths and English GCSE requirements. The visitors note that the inconsistent and missing information could be misleading to potential applicants for the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that all information available to applicants is accurate and consistent to enable an applicant to make an informed choice on whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clarify the current AP(E)L policies for the programme.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to page 8 of the programme handbook which states "It may be possible to receive credit for relevant prior learning. APL applicants will be considered in line with University of Derby regulation...". However, in a discussion with the programme team the visitors heard mixed comments about the acceptance of AP(E)L on the programme, including statements that the programme did not accept prior learning. The visitors were therefore uncertain on the current status of accepting AP(E)L for the programme. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify, should AP(E)L be accepted, how it will be consistently applied to ensure that students' prior learning is mapped against the learning outcomes for the programme or individual modules. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clarify if the programme accepts AP(E)L and if so, how this will be consistently applied to ensure that students who are eligible for AP(E)L are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England on graduation.

Kim Bown  
Gary Dicken  
Louise Whittle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Derby
<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>	25 – 26 February 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
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 '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 7 April 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 14 May 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 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 part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BA Honours in Social Work, full time programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker in England) Gary Dicken (Social worker in England) Louise Whittle (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Almudena Lara (Department for Education)
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort; 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Kevin Bampton (University of Derby)
Secretary	Shelley Nix (University of Derby)
Members of the joint panel	Angie Snow (Internal panel member) Douglas Carr (Internal panel member) Sue Taplin (External panel member) Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) Nigel Simons (The College of Social Work)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

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

## Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a condition is set on the programme, 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 SET.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clarify the current AP(E)L policies for the programme.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to page 8 of the programme handbook which states “It may be possible to receive credit for relevant prior learning. APL applicants will be considered in line with University of Derby regulation...”. However, in a discussion with the programme team the visitors heard mixed comments about the acceptance of AP(E)L on the programme, including statements that the programme did not accept prior learning. The visitors were therefore uncertain on the current status of accepting AP(E)L for the programme. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify, should AP(E)L be accepted, how it will be consistently applied to ensure that students’ prior learning is mapped against the learning outcomes for the programme or individual modules. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clarify if the programme accepts AP(E)L and if so, how this will be consistently applied to ensure that students who are eligible for AP(E)L are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England on graduation.

Kim Bown  
Gary Dicken  
Louise Whittle

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	De Montfort University
<b>Programme name</b>	BA Honours in 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>	3 - 4 March 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	13

## 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 27 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 May 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 30 June 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 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	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Sophia Welton
Secretary	Amanda Thompson

## 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 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit admissions materials to ensure consistency and accuracy.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to a number of resources available to applicants and staff including the open day presentation and the admissions handbook. When reviewing the documentation the visitors noticed an inconsistency in the information made available to staff regarding the required UCAS points for entry onto the programme. Specifically, the Admissions Handbook, page 5 states "...a minimum UCAS points threshold of 260 is required...". Further into the same document, page 7 states "...minimum 240 points from 2 A levels or equivalent...". The visitors noted that inconsistent information provided to staff who are assessing potential applicants for the programme could cause confusion and lead to inconsistencies in the decisions being made. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit all programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy to enable admissions staff to make an informed choice about whether to make an offer of a place on the programme.

In addition to this the visitors noted inconsistencies in the information made available to staff compared to the information available to students. Specifically in contrast to the above mentioned UCAS points described in the admissions handbook, the Open day presentation, slide 9 states "...300 UCAS Points AND Maths and English GCSEs at grade C or above...". The visitors consider this information could be misleading to potential applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit all admissions documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy to enable students to make an informed choice about whether to take up the offer of a place on a programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must update the programme web page to inform potential applicants of the alternative and accessible formats available for admissions information.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the programme web page to evidence this standard. The visitors noted that the programme relied heavily on the university web site to deliver the required information to potential applicants as a first point of contact. The visitors agreed that the web page provided sufficient information for applicants to make an informed choice about whether to apply to the programme, however, the visitors were unable to locate where this information might be available in other formats. In particular it was noted that the web page may not be accessible to all applicants and there was no clear information to guide potential applicants on the availability of accessible formats for admissions information and how to request this. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme web page

to include information on how potential applicants can request the information on the web page in alternative and accessible formats to enable them to make an informed choice on 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 evidence of the formal process in place to follow up any declarations made on an applicants Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied with the process in place to ensure that each applicant to the programme will undergo a criminal convictions check via a DBS, as stated in the admissions handbook. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information on the process to be followed should an applicant make a declaration on their DBS application, or should the DBS be returned with convictions. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that any declarations would be considered on a case by case basis, taking into consideration the view of practice educators and if they would offer a placement to each individual and consideration of employment on the same basis. The visitors were satisfied with this process for vetting declarations made, however, were unable to see a formal process which states this. The visitors note that without seeing a formal document for applying this process to all DBS checks, they are unable to have confidence that the process will continue to be applied consistently throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation to state the formal process to be followed should an applicant declare a conviction upon completing a DBS check.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show where health requirements are clearly set out to applicants and the formal process in place to consider these.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied with the process in place to ensure that each applicant to the programme will complete a mental health declaration, as stated in the admissions handbook. However, the visitors were unable to locate where this requirement was clearly communicated to potential applicants before deciding to visit the university. The visitors note that slide 12 of the open day presentation states “You must complete a health declaration form...” However, the visitors were unable to locate where applicants could find this information prior to attending an open day, or if they were unable to attend an open day. In addition to this, the visitors were unable to find any information on the process to be followed should an applicant disclose information when completing the mental health declaration. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that any disclosures would be considered on a case by case basis, taking into consideration the support the programme can offer and reasonable adjustments that can be made for each applicant. The visitors were satisfied with this process for approaching declarations, however, were unable to see a formal process which states this. The visitors note that without seeing a formal document for applying this process to all mental health declarations, they are unable to have confidence that the process will continue to be applied consistently throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation to state the formal

process to be followed should an applicant make a disclosure on the mental health declaration.

## **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarity and a clear process on the requirement for applicants to make a declaration regarding statutory involvement.

**Reason:** In the documentation made available prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there was a requirement for applicants to make a declaration regarding statutory involvement. Specifically the entry criteria in the Admissions Handbook, page 7 states "...Declaration : statutory involvement as a service user...". The visitors were unclear on the requirements for completing the aforementioned declaration. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the requirement was for applicants to declare any previous involvement with statutory services in any context. However, the visitors were still unclear on the specific requirement for an applicant when completing this declaration. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to see a formal process which states the process to be followed when assessing this declaration. The visitors note that without seeing a formal document for applying this process to all declarations, they are unable to have confidence that the process will continue to be applied consistently throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation to state the criteria for assessing statutory involvement declarations and the process to be followed should an applicant make a disclosure on the declaration.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the implementation and monitoring mechanisms in place for equality and diversity in the admissions process.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to a university wide equality and diversity policy to evidence this standard. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the content of the policy was appropriate to ensure equality and diversity in the admissions process, there was no clear evidence to show how the policy is implemented and monitored. The visitors note that without seeing a formal process for the implementation and monitoring of this policy, they are unable to have confidence that the process will continue to be applied consistently throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation to state the formal implementation and monitoring processes in place to support the equality and diversity policy and ensure that it is consistently applied in the admissions process.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place for service user and carer involvement on the programme.

**Reason:** In meetings with the programme team and service users and carers, the visitors heard that service users and carers are able to feed back into the programme and that feedback given in the past had been acted upon. The visitors also heard that students had provided feedback on service user and carer involvement on the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the programme, at times, monitored and evaluated the involvement of service users and carers on the programme. However, the instances seemed infrequent and had no clear structure. The visitors note that without seeing a clear structure for the monitoring and evaluation of service user and carer involvement in the programme they are unable to have confidence that monitoring and evaluation mechanisms will be continuously and consistently applied throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require documentation to state the formal process for monitoring and evaluation of service user and carer involvement in the programme and how this will be consistently applied to ensure that the programme's effectiveness is appropriately evaluated.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure that all information is accurate and consistent.

**Reason:** Throughout the documentation the visitors noticed a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the information made available to students. For example, the Student Handbook, page 1 states "By the end of the programme you will have achieved both an academic and a professional award which will enable you to register as qualified social workers". The visitors note that this statement suggests that on successful completion of the programme, students will automatically gain registration with the HCPC to practice as a social worker. This is incorrect as successful completion of the programme will make students eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, subject to application.

The visitors also noted several references to the previous Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), now known as the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). For example, "pages 4, 5, 6 and 8 of the Admissions Handbook and page 4 of the Student handbook all make reference to CRB checks. Slide 12 of the open day presentation also states "You must complete a health declaration form and enhanced DBS...". The visitors note that incorrect and inconsistent information could be misleading to students and therefore require the programme team to revisit the documentation to ensure that all information is accurate and effectively used to support student learning in all settings.

### **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 provide further information on the appropriate numbers of core texts in the library in line with the frequency of requirement for use.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the External Examiners Report 2013-14, page 8 states "The students felt that the library did not contain a sufficient number of the key social work texts...". In a meeting with students it was also stated that students felt there were an inadequate number of core texts available for the programme. When discussing this with the programme team it was stated that core texts for the programme were stocked

on a ratio of 1 for every six to eight students on the programme. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the number of core texts in the library, the visitors note that there seem to be continuous and consistent concerns raised by students and external examiners regarding the number of core texts available. The visitors therefore require further evidence on the requirements of core texts throughout the programme and the frequency with which students are required to use them in relation to the current curriculum. The visitors also require evidence to show that the numbers of core texts in the library are appropriate to support the student numbers on the programme and the frequency at which the core texts will need to be accessed, and, that further texts are made available should this be required.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must show how students are informed of the right to abstain from role play and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to a consent form which students were required to sign at the beginning of the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that there was a process in place for taking students consent before participating in role play activities. However, the visitors could not determine how students were aware of the right to abstain from role play, and, how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that alternative arrangements would be made on a case by case basis for students who decline from acting as service users and carers in role play activities, however there is no formal process in place to support this. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to support students who decline from participating in role play and the arrangements in place to ensure their learning needs are met in alternative ways.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of the formal processes in place to support service users and carers who are involved in the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were directed to documentation evidencing the involvement of service users and carers on the programme and also met with a service user who told us of their involvement with the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that service users and carers were contributing to the programme. However, throughout the documentation, the visitors were unable to locate clear information on how service users and carers are prepared for their roles and how they are supported when they are involved with the programme. In particular the visitors heard that there is “no clear coordination” for the service user and carer group. The visitors therefore require the education provider to implement and document a clear strategy to support service users and carers when they are involved on the programme and appropriately prepare them for their roles.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence on the opportunities made available to staff to enable them to stay current in their teaching.

**Reason:** In a meeting with the programme team, the visitors heard that staff opportunities for currency were made available through various platforms including; keeping up to date with the news, reading journals and involvement with the British Association of Social Workers (BASW). Whilst the visitors recognise that the platforms mentioned will cover some areas relating to currency in social work practice, they consider the opportunities to be limited. The visitors were also unable to see any information on how staff training and interaction with current social work practice is monitored. Without a clear process in place to evidence the range of opportunities made available to staff to attend training which informs the currency of their teaching the visitors are unable to state, with confidence, the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. The visitors therefore require information on the opportunities made available to staff to enable them to engage in events and activities, relevant to current social work practice that will inform their teaching. In addition to evidence how this will be monitored to ensure staff continue to stay up to date with current practice.

#### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide clarity on the responsibility for ensuring a safe and supportive placement environment and the monitoring mechanisms in place to support this.

**Reason:** In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the education provider, specifically the placement coordinator, takes responsibility for ensuring the placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. However, in a meeting with practice placement educators, the visitors heard that this was the responsibility of placement providers. The visitors were therefore unable to clarify who has responsibility for ensuring the practice placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. Further to this, the visitors were unable to locate any information on the formal processes in place to monitor this. The visitors note that without confirmation of the ownership of this process they are unable to state, with confidence, that the practice placement settings will provide a safe and supportive environment. Therefore the visitors require clarification on who has responsibility for ensuring that the practice placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment and the monitoring mechanisms associated with this.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence on how equality and diversity policies at the placement setting are clearly communicated to students and the monitoring mechanisms associated to this.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that students are required to fill in a check list on their first day of placement which ensures that particular policies and procedures have been introduced such as fire procedures and risk assessment policies. However, the list

stated in the Practice Placement Report, Induction list, page 20-21 does not contain any reference to the practice placement providers equality and diversity policies. The visitors were therefore unable to state, with confidence, that students would be introduced to each placements equality and diversity policy upon starting their placement. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider would monitor this. Therefore the visitors require updated information on how the education provider will ensure that students are introduced to equality and diversity policies at the practice placement setting and how this will be monitored.

**6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure that information made available to students clearly states that the BA Honours in Social Work is the only programme that confers eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the Course Template, page 2 which states "...eligibility to join the HCPC register...". The visitors note that the statement highlighted does not state that upon graduation, successful students will be eligible to apply for registration. Further to this, the visitors could not confirm that students and potential applicants would have access to this particular document throughout the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to state, with confidence, that students would be made aware of the requirements for this programme to be the only programme that confers eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC on successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit programme documentation to make it explicitly clear that this programme is the only programme that will confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register, and, where this information will be readily available and accessible to students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit programme documentation to clearly state if aegrotat awards are offered, and, that they do not confer eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

**Reason:** In the mapping provided prior to the visit, the education provider evidenced this standard by stating that aegrotat awards are not available on this programme. However, in a meeting with the senior team it was stated that the education provider does offer aegrotat awards for this programme. The visitors were therefore unable to confirm if the programme did or did not offer aegrotat awards. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit programme documentation to ensure that information regarding aegrotat awards is current and accurate. Further to this, if aegrotat awards are available on the programme, the visitors require the education provider to clearly state that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider considers expanding the service user and carer group.

**Reason:** The visitors could see that service users and carers are involved with the programme across a number of areas. However the visitors noted that there seemed to be a heavy reliance on one or two representatives of the service user and carer group. The visitors were concerned that should the key service users and carers be unable to continue their work with the education provider, there would be a risk to the involvement of service users and carers on the programme. The visitors also noted that the service user and carer group had a limited representation of carers. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team considers expanding the service user and carer group to include a wider range of expertise and in greater numbers.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider considers a more formalised method for the recruitment of service users and carers.

**Reason:** The visitors could see that service users and carers are involved with the programme and that there was an informal method for recruiting them. The visitors heard that there was no clear recruitment strategy for service user and carer involvement and felt that a recruitment strategy would strengthen the involvement of service users and carers on the programme. Furthermore the visitors felt that a clear recruitment strategy would reduce this risk of this standard falling below a threshold level. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the education provider considers implementing a clear recruitment strategy for the involvement of service users and carers on the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team considers a more formal partnership agreement with practice placement agencies.

**Reason:** Throughout documentation and whilst at the visit, the visitors saw and heard details of the number, duration and range of placements appropriate to the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that there was no formal agreement in place between the education provider and practice placement agencies. The visitors noted that, without a formal agreement, practice placement agencies have the ability to withdraw collaboration with the university at any given point, presenting a risk to the number of placements available to the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers developing a more formal partnership agreement with partner placement agencies to strengthen how they meet this standard.

Robert Goemans  
Sid Jeewa  
Deborah Kouzarides

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Manchester Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc (Pre-Registration) Speech and Language Therapy
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Speech and language therapist
<b>Date of visit</b>	27 – 28 January 2015

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
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 'speech and language therapist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 15 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 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 HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Catherine Mackenzie (Speech and language therapist) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Lorna Povey (Speech and language therapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	14 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	David Lambrick (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Emma Wingate (Manchester Metropolitan University)
Members of the joint panel	Nigel Cox (Internal Panel Member) Sarah Ives (Internal Panel Member) Sandra Whiteside (External Panel Member) Aileen Wright (External Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and external examiners' reports have not been produced.

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 BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology, 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of what commitment is being made to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that the programme has appropriate resources in place for the proposed intake of 14 students once a year. During the meetings and discussions with the senior and programme team, the visitors learnt that this programme will replace the BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology in academic year 2016 – 17. However, during the transitional period of academic year 2015 – 16, the student numbers will increase to approximately 28 students for these two programmes alone. Because this programme and the BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology programme will run in parallel in academic year 2015 – 16. The visitors could not determine how the current resources including academic staff, practice educators and practice placements detailed in the documentation are appropriate for the above changes to student numbers during this transitional period. 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 effectively managed during the transitional period.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised to meet the conditions set as a result of this validation event.

**Reason:** Through discussions at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by internal validation panel. The visitors consider programme documentation that students routinely refer to as important resources to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set referred to amendments to module descriptors (unit specifications), the programme specification document and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review the revised documents to ensure that the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure it provides accurate and consistent information to students, particularly in relation to practice placements.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided prior to the visit that the final placement in year one will be eight weeks long and will be in adult settings. On page 18 of programme specification it states “Adult placement, 8 weeks x 4 days/week 32 days/224 hours”. However, the visitors learnt in the student handbook that the same placement will be nine weeks long as stated on page five of the student handbook

“MSC Year 1, 9 week block year 1, 4 days per week (20/05/16-28/7/16)”. The visitors were unsure about the length of the final placement in year one of the programme. The visitors also noted in the programme documentation the total number of placement hours that students are required, on page 17 of the programme specification “In line with RCSLT guidance, students are required to attend a mandatory 525 placement hours”. However, during the programme team meeting, the team confirmed that the total placements hours are 536 to allow flexibility for students to make up any missed hours. Therefore, the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to ensure it provides accurate and consistent information to students, particularly in relation to practice placements.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must further outline the attendance policy’s triggers, associated follow-up procedures, and how this is communicated to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that students are expected to attend every session that is part of their programme, and that procedures are in place to monitor attendance. However, it was not clear from the documentation, the amount of missed teaching that would trigger a follow up action. Especially, the visitors were not sure of the minimum attendance required to assess students, both in academic and placements settings. As such, the visitors could not see how students were made aware of the follow up process, and any consequences of missing practice or taught elements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process in place if student attendance falls below the requirement of 100 per cent, and how students are informed of this process.

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

**Condition:** The education providers must submit further evidence to show the involvement of service users and carers within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation, the visitors noted that there is some involvement of service users and carers in the programme. 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 although the education provider has mentioned further plans for service users and carers’ involvement, there was no evidence of their involvement. The visitors therefore required further evidence to show the involvement of service users and carers within the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students will meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **13.1** understand the structure and function of the human body, together with knowledge of health, disease, impairment and dysfunction relevant to their profession
- **13.9** understand biomedical and medical sciences as relevant to the development and maintenance of communication and swallowing
- **13.10** understand psychology as relevant to lifespan development and change, normal and impaired communication, and psychological and social wellbeing
- **13.11** understand sociology in relation to the practice of speech and language therapy, including its application to educational, health and workplace settings and within multi-cultural societies

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine the above SOPs would be addressed in the programme curriculum. Within the SOPs mapping document, the programme team indicated that the above SOPs would be delivered within modules, Clinical Theory 1 and Clinical Theory 1 Professional Competence. In discussions, the programme team highlighted that the above modules would cover these SOPs during the course of the programme. However, the visitors could not determine where in particular, these modules' learning outcomes ensured these SOPs are delivered. Also, the programme team discussed these SOPs will be made explicit in the curriculum to better reflect them. Therefore, the visitors need further details of how the programme will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students will meet the above SOPs.

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

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

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider has systems in place for the regular and annual review of placement. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider has service level agreements with placement providers that ensure placements are appropriate. However, the visitors did not see those agreements. In addition, the visitors learnt through discussions 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 standard is met. 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.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students will meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **13.1** understand the structure and function of the human body, together with knowledge of health, disease, impairment and dysfunction relevant to their profession
- **13.9** understand biomedical and medical sciences as relevant to the development and maintenance of communication and swallowing
- **13.10** understand psychology as relevant to lifespan development and change, normal and impaired communication, and psychological and social wellbeing
- **13.11** understand sociology in relation to the practice of speech and language therapy, including its application to educational, health and workplace settings and within multi-cultural societies

**Reason:** From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine where in the assessment strategy, the above SOPs would be assessed. Within the SOPs mapping document, the programme team indicated the above SOPs would be delivered and assessed within modules Clinical Theory 1 and Clinical Theory 1 Professional Competence. In addition, during discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the above modules would cover and assess students on these SOPs during the course of the programme. However, the visitors could not determine how the assessment strategy for these modules will ensure that these SOPs in particular are assessed. Also, the programme team discussed these SOPs will be made explicit in the assessments strategy to better reflect them. Therefore, the visitors need further details of how the assessment strategy will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students will meet the above SOPs.

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

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

**Reason:** From review of the programme documentation and meetings with students, the visitors noted information about students' progression and the re-sit policies. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider's progression policy stipulated students who fail clinical placements will be offered opportunity to register on other modules to accrue sufficient academic credits for the fall back awards. However, the visitors were unclear whether students' progression to the final placement is dependent on passing the second placement for the programme. The visitors could not see if such requirements for progression are made clear to students in the documentation. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to revisit their programme documentation to ensure this information is clearly articulated to students so that they are aware of the requirements for progression including arrangements for placements.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team consider monitoring attendance of practice placement educators when delivering training.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, it was clear that the education provider runs regular training sessions for practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, the visitors felt that the attendance of practice placement educators can be strengthened. Therefore, the visitors recommend the programme team to consider monitoring attendance when delivering training to practice placement educators. In this way the visitors felt that the programme team will enhance the process of placement educators' training and evaluate where any additional training may be delivered to those who could not attend.

Catherine Mackenzie  
Simon Mudie  
Lorna Povey

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Northumbria University at Newcastle
<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>	4 – 5 March 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 '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 28 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 May 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 4 June 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. The visit also considered a different programme MA Social Work. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graeme Currie (Social worker in England) Garry Hickman (Social worker in England) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	85 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Alison Machin (Northumbria University, at Newcastle)
Secretary	Julie Blackwell (Northumbria University, at Newcastle)

## 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 condition is set on the programme, 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 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

**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. However, 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.

Graeme Currie  
Christine Morgan  
Garry Hickman

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Northumbria University at Newcastle
<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>	4 – 5 March 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 28 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 May 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 4 June 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. The visit also considered a different programme BSc (Hons) Social Work. A separate visitor report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graeme Currie (Social worker in England) Garry Hickman (Social worker in England) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Alison Machin (Northumbria University, at Newcastle)
Secretary	Julie Blackwell (Northumbria University, at Newcastle)

## 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 condition is set on the programme, 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 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

**6.8 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. However, 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

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the education provider to update their programme documentation to incorporate details of interprofessional on this programme.

**Reason:** From discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that there is currently interprofessional learning in place on the programme. The visitors were content that this standard is met. However, the visitors felt that the details of how interprofessional learnings take place on the programme could be incorporated in the programme documentation more explicitly. This will ensure students understand fully the nature and details of interprofessional on this programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme documentation should reflect the full details of how interprofessional learnings take place.

Graeme Currie  
Garry Hickman  
Christine Morgan

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Northumbria University at Newcastle
<b>Programme name</b>	Post Graduate Certificate Approved Mental Health Professional
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Type of programme</b>	Approved mental health professional
<b>Date of visit</b>	4 – 5 March 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 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 28 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 4 May 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 4 June 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 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	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional) Lynn Heath (Approved mental health professional) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Chris Tait (Northumbria University at Newcastle)
Secretary	Joan Charlton (Northumbria University at Newcastle)

## 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 49 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 1 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

### **E.8 Assessment regulations must clearly specify that any requirements for an aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP**

**Condition:** The education provider is required to state that any requirements for an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.

**Reason:** The documentation reviewed prior to the visit outlined the regulations for an aegrotat award. Page 12 of the programme handbook referred the visitors to the 'Assessment regulations for Northumbria Awards' which can be found online. Page 17 of this document stated that "An Aegrotat award may be recommended when a PAB does not have enough evidence of the student's performance to be able to recommend the intended award, but is satisfied that the student would otherwise have reached the required standard for the intended award." Therefore the visitors established that an aegrotat award may be awarded to a student who is unable to complete the programme due to illness. During the programme team meeting this was discussed in further detail, it was established that an aegrotat award may be awarded to a student under the regulations of the education provider. However the visitors noted that the documentation does not make it clear that an aegrotat award does not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP. Therefore the education provider is required to state in the documentation made available to current and perspective students that a student who is awarded an aegrotat award under the university regulations is not eligible to be approved as an AMHP.

## Recommendations

### **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**

**Recommendation:** The education provider considers the inclusion of a clear statement in the documentation as to how attendance is monitored in taught sessions.

**Reason:** The visitors noted on page 11, paragraph 16 of the programme handbook that “Students are required to attend all taught sessions and the required amount of days in practice.” However in the documentation made available to students did not state how attendance was recorded in taught sessions. The students stated that attendance was recorded by filling in an attendance sheet at each teaching session. This was discussed further during the meeting with the programme team where it was stated that the education provider employs an electronic attendance monitoring system, however the programme did not use this system and instead adopted a sign in sheet due to the nature of the teaching patterns of the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the programme met the relevant criteria as the students must attend all teaching sessions and that attendance was recorded using a sign in sheet. However the visitors recommend that the methods of recording attendance were made clear in the programme handbook, so that all new students are aware as to the required attendance and how attendance was recorded.

David Abrahart  
Lynn heath  
Simon Mudie

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Pearson College
<b>Programme name</b>	HND in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	27 – 28 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 30 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 14 May 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 16 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. 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) Graham Harris (Paramedic) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	150 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	10 September 2015
Chair	Jane Baker (Pearson Education Ltd)
Secretary	Costanza Tobino (Pearson Education Ltd)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as these are based within Employer Partners.

The HCPC did not meet with the students as the programme was new so there were no current or past students to meet.

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

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be 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 applicants employed by NHS Trusts.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors who the potential applicants for this programme would be. Discussions with the senior team revealed that NHS Trusts 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 NHS Trust employees. However, the documentation provided prior to the visit did not consistently 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 NHS Trusts.

### **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 the mode of study available for this programme is only through Part time.

**Condition:** From a review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors the modes of study available for this programme. Discussions with the senior team confirmed that the mode of study available for this programme is only through Part time. However, this is not reflected in the documentation. Volume 1, Document 3 Business Case, page 39 “Key elements of the design are to create a flexible programme that students can study while working full-time, and that it is delivered with ambulance services”. Furthermore, the visitors could not determine from the documentation whether applicants whilst remaining an employee of the Employer Partners, would also be required to undertake a minimum numbers of hours of study. As such, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation, in particular adverting material to clearly state that the mode of study available for this programme is only through Part time.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to payment of tuition fees.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, it was not clear to the visitors the arrangement in place for payment of tuition fees for this programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the payment of tuition fees would vary, and depend on the partnership arrangement with the Employer Partner. Currently the arrangement in place with East Midlands Ambulance Service (EMAS), is that the tuition fees

associated with the programme would be covered by EMAS. The visitors noted that this may not always be the case depending on the arrangements with the Employer Partner. As such, the visitors consider the cost implication to be an important factor in the decision making process for potential applicants. For this reason the visitors require further evidence of how potential applicants will be provided with information around cost of fees associated with this programme to enable them to make an informed choice on whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

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

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme. The visitors noted that there is a thorough matching process between an applicant's prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, whilst the partner provider handbook mentions AP(E)L, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what amount of credit could be considered through AP(E)L, and whether practice learning could be transferred or not. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review the information available to potential applicants with particular reference to Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks and any associated costs.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation and from discussions 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. Volume 1, Programme specification, page 19, "In all cases a successful applicant's offer of a place on the programme will be subject to... an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service ("DBS") check". The visitors also noted in the same documentation, that this process will then be repeated annually, "Continuation on the programme will be subject to a satisfactory annual enhanced DBS check". However, the visitors were unable to determine who will be responsible for any cost associated with DBS checks both at the point of entry and for the annual checks. The visitors recognise arrangements regarding DBS may differ across Employer Partners. Therefore, the visitors require further information regarding how any costs associated with DBS checks would be communicated to potential students. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

### **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 to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation, 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. The programme specification states "In all cases a successful applicant's offer of a place on the programme will be subject to...an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service ("DBS") check" (page 19). Furthermore, the visitors noted in the same documentation, that DBS checks would be repeated annually. During discussions it was revealed that Employer Partners would be responsible for administering DBS checks, and would share the outcome with the education provider. The visitors recognise that this programme will be offered to different Employer Partners and that each Employer Partner may have a different process in place relation to DBS checks. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of the education provider's process for overseeing criminal convictions checks. As such, the visitors could not determine how the education provider owns the admissions procedure to apply DBS checks, how the procedures of different Employer Partners work with those of the education provider, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with consistently. 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 and repeated annually for this programme. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how different Employer Partners' processes would work with the education provider's 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 to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's health requirements.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation, the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. The programme specification states "In all cases a successful applicant's offer of a place on the programme will be subject to... a satisfactory occupational health check" (page 19). During discussions with the programme team it was revealed that Employer Partners would be responsible for administering the health declaration, and would share the outcome with the education provider. The visitors recognise that this programme will be offered to different Employer Partners and that each Employer Partner may have a different process in place relation to health declaration checks. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence of the education provider's process for overseeing health checks. As such, the visitors could not determine how the education provider's own procedures to apply health checks, will work with Employer Partner. Nor could the visitors determine how the health check is used to identify what adjustments could or could not reasonably be made if health conditions were disclosed, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with

consistently. 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 different Employer Partners' processes work with the education provider's process and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if adjustments are required.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate areas of responsibility across all areas of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers, the visitors were unable to determine the lines of responsibility between the education provider and the Employer Partners. It was articulated by the programme team that the education provider would have overall responsibility for the programme, however, throughout the programme team meeting, several areas such as administering DBS checks and approving non-ambulance placements were referred to as being the responsibility of the Employer Partners. The visitors were also unable to locate any formal agreement between education provider and Employer Partners and how formal arrangements would be agreed with other Employer Partners. Without a clear outline of accountability for each aspect of the programme, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme is effectively managed. The visitors could not see how the evidence provided defines the education provider's responsibilities as part of overall programme management and therefore require further evidence to clearly articulate the areas of responsibility across the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarification on how the programme is being effectively managed, particularly, in relation to the role of the deputy programme leader.

**Reason:** From the documentation, the visitors noted the different roles that will contribute to the management of the programme, including the programme leader. During discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that a deputy programme leader will be recruited to join the programme team at a later date. The visitors were also informed that some of the responsibilities of the programme leader will be delegated to the deputy programme leader. From the discussions, the visitors were unsure what the deputy programme leader's role and responsibilities would be within the programme team, as no information was provided regarding this role in the documentation. Furthermore, the visitors were unsure how this role would contribute to the management of the programme to ensure that the programme is being effectively managed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to clarify the role of the deputy programme leader, what stage someone would be appointed to this role, and how they would contribute to the management of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the number of staff that will be in place to deliver the programme to ensure the programme is delivered effectively.

**Reason:** In the education provider's SETs mapping submission, they referenced the list of the programme team from the Person Specification (Volume 6), and the staff curriculum vitae when evidencing how this standard is met. Considering the evidence, the visitors were not satisfied that there was an adequate number of staff in place to deliver an effective programme at present. Further to this, there was discussion with the senior team around the working contract for staff based at Employer Partners. From the documentation, the visitors noted that clinical tutors will be contracted by the education provider to deliver certain aspects of the programme but would be contracted by the Employer Partner during other times of the year. Although the visitors were satisfied with this arrangement, they were unable to identify the number of clinical tutors that would be contracted by the education provider to ensure an adequate number of staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

Furthermore, the visitors are aware that the education provider intends to work with a number of Employer Partners, however, the visitors were not provided with information around the recruitment of staff and associated timelines and, in particular, the planned cohort sizes. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the plans in place to ensure that a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff will be recruited to the programme team in advance of the programme starting. In addition, the visitors require the programme team to state the size of cohort intended for this programme. In this way, the visitors can determine whether there are an adequate number of staff that will be in place to deliver the programme to ensure the programme is delivered effectively.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information regarding the staff members that are responsible for each module of the programme, and their relevant specialist expertise and knowledge in regards to their role.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CVs and descriptions of the modules. From the documentation, the visitors noted that clinical tutors and unit leaders would teach the core of the programme. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not determine who the unit leaders were, and who the clinical tutors were from the list of CVs. Therefore, they were unable to determine which member of staff was responsible for each module. As a result, the visitors were unable to determine that subject areas are being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to determine whether subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, and therefore whether this standard is met, the visitors require further information that demonstrates who the module leaders are for each module.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the process undertaken to ensure Employer Partners have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and the meetings at the approval visit, the visitors were made aware of the resources that are available to all students on the programme, such as the online resources. In discussions at the visit, the visitors were made aware that the programme team recognise that due to different Employer Partners being involved, experience of resources could vary across different Employer Partner centres. The visitors were also informed that the programme team would approve Employer Partner centres to ensure that they have appropriate resources in place to support student learning before sending students to the centre. From this information, the visitors understood that this would mean that the education provider would physically visit all Employer Partner sites. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of Employer Partner centres would be conducted, or what processes would be enacted to identify if students at certain Employer Partner centres lacked access to any resources, such as accessible physical resources, or the security requirements of a placement provider restricting access to online resources. The visitors were also unclear how these processes would ensure that students' access to resources would be comparable in all placement areas, and what the team would do to address any issues of comparable access. In addition, the visitors were unclear of the expectation regarding the provision of equipment to support clinical study. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all students have access to the resources they require in order to successfully complete the programme. They also require further detail of the approval process in place that will enable the programme team to ensure that students across Employer Partners have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

### **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 several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, Volume 1 (Programme Specification) "Health Care Professions Council" page 4. This should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council'. Also, the visitors noted in the same document, "The programme will need to be approved by the professional body, the HCPC", page 40. The Health and Care Professions Council is a regulator, therefore references to us as a professional body are incorrect. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation following the approval visit.

**Reason:** During the approval visit, the visitors were informed that the programme team will no longer refer to NHS Trusts as 'Partner Providers' but as 'Employer Partners'. The programme team informed the visitors that they intend to revise the documentation to reflect the change in wording. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors also noted that the programme team intend to make other changes to the programme documentation following the visit. For instance, provide greater clarity for students on certain areas, such as what the "Flexi – week" means for students and what the expectations are during that period in the calendar. The visitors therefore require evidence of any changes to the programme documentation that the education provider makes as part of this approval process, to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings are being effectively used.

### **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 provide further information about how they ensure that the resources including IT facilities across Employer Partners are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the visitors were aware of the learning resources including IT facilities that are being offered by the education provider such as an online library and an academic skills community. However, the majority of this programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at Employer Partner centres. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the programme team would approve Employer Partner centres to ensure that they have appropriate resources including IT facilities. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of Employer Partner centres would be conducted, or what policies and procedures would be in place to allow the programme team to ensure that resources across all Employer Partner centres are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to student and staff. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to how the approval process conducted by the programme team ensures that there are sufficient resources including IT facilities across all Employer Partners. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will ensure that the resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff across all Employer Partners. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used and how the programme may meet this standard.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the facilities available at Employer Partners to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings and how students can access these facilities.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the visitors were aware of the resources offered by the education provider that are intended to support the welfare and wellbeing being of students. These resources include "student support services: students have 24/7 access to this information" (Partner Provider Handbook, Volume 3). However, the visitors noted that the majority of this programme will be delivered either remotely via "online learning via the Pearson College online learning environment ("OLE")" (Partner Provider Handbook, Volume 3) or at Employer Partner centres. During discussions with

the programme team, the visitors were informed that the programme team would approve all Employer Partner centres to ensure that they have adequate and accessible facilities in place to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of Employer Partner centres would be conducted, or what policies and procedures would be in place to allow the programme team to ensure that facilities across Employer Partner centres are adequate and accessible to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. As such, the visitors were unclear about how the programme team will ensure that there are sufficient resources available at all Employer Partner centres to support the welfare and wellbeing of students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures there are adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings, and in particular across different Employer Partners. In this way the visitors can determine how this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the attendance policy, where attendance is mandatory in relation to online learning environment (OLE), and how this will be communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors noted a lack of clarity in the programme documentation's description of the attendance policy, particularly regarding requirements around the online learning environment (OLE). Volume 3a Partner provider handbook, page 16, states "The Academic Tutor will also follow-up on any student who does not attend or participate in an online tutorial". The visitors were unable to determine from this information how many online tutorials a student could miss before an action is triggered from an academic tutor, as there is no explicit statement regarding this trigger point. The visitors could not determine how there could be a consistent approach across all Employer Partners if there was no explicit statement of mandatory attendance for online tutorials from the education provider for students to follow. As such, the visitors could not see how students were made aware of the follow up process, or of any consequences of missing OLE elements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the attendance policy in relation to OLE, at which stage a follow up process would be triggered, and how students are informed of this process.

### **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 in the programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were directed to the Partner Provider Handbook (Volume 3) which states "Service users and carers will be asked to review different sections of the learning materials and to provide feedback and comment" page 44. From discussions with the service users and carers, the visitors were unsure of the training offered to enable them to review and comment on the learning materials. Furthermore, the visitors were unsure of the appropriate protocols and procedure should the service users wish to contribute to the programme in different ways. 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. The visitors considered that there were risks to service users and carers involvement in its current form, especially if individuals from the service user and carer group or the programme team change. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for continuing service user and carer involvement in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for further service user and carer involvement and how service user and carer involvement is embedded more formally into the programme's structure.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the mechanisms that will be in place to ensure that the curriculum will remain current.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the Partner Provider Handbook (Volume 3) and Programme Specification (Volume 1). From the documentation provided, the visitors were unable to see the mechanisms that will be in place to ensure that the curriculum will remain relevant to current practice. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed of a number of mechanisms that will be employed by the education provider, for example that the curriculum will go through the quality committee group, which includes individuals with specialist subject area knowledge, who will provide feedback and will comment on the currency of the curriculum. The visitors were also informed that feedback from stakeholders will be used to inform the curriculum. However, from the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to how feedback from colleagues across a number of Employer Partners in practice, and from students, would be fed back to the programme team to ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. In particular the visitors could not determine what arrangements are in place and what mechanisms would allow this feedback to influence the development of the curriculum, particularly as there will be a number of Employer Partners giving feedback. As such, the visitors were unable to make a judgement whether there are appropriate mechanisms in place that will ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms that the programme team will have in place that will ensure that the curriculum will remain current. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms that are in place to gather relevant feedback from practice colleagues and students to ensure that the curriculum remains relevant to current practice. In this way the visitors will be able to determine how the programme meets this standard.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of where the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics are taught throughout the programme, and that students understand the implications of these standards, including how and when they apply.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not identify how students are made aware of the implications of the HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). The visitors were guided to the unit directory (Volume 2) in particular, unit 401, 402, 501 and 503, however, from a review of these modules descriptors, the visitors could not see how the SCPEs were incorporated into the

curriculum, and therefore how the education provider ensures that students understand the implications of the SCPEs. At the visit, the programme team informed the visitors that at the beginning of the programme students will be given a copy of the SCPEs publication to inform them of the standards. However, this standard requires that the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the SCPEs, including any impact on their behaviour while studying. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of where within the curriculum the SCPEs are taught throughout the programme, and how the students understand the implications of these standards, to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about how the learning and teaching activities of the programme will ensure that the curriculum is effectively delivered.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided the visitors were unclear as to how the curriculum would be delivered to students on the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was clarified that this programme would be delivered to students while they were in practice and at Employer Partners' centres via an online learning environment (OLE). The programme team also highlighted during discussions that a two-day prep workshop would be undertaken by members of the programme team going out to placement sites and by the staff of Employer Partners who deliver some elements of the programme directly to students. However, the visitors could not identify what the workshop would consist of, and how the content ensures that the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the teaching and learning approaches that are used and how they are appropriate to ensure the effective delivery of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the range of placement settings required to be facilitated by the Employer Partners to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the vast majority of placements would take place in an ambulance setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and the Employer Partners, but it was also stated that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative settings, such as Accident and Emergency and care homes. This was not reflected in the programme documentation. We do not stipulate the number, duration or range of placements which a student must undertake, but the visitors consider that the learning outcomes of the programme would be difficult to achieve in the current range of placement settings. In a meeting with the placement providers it was highlighted that students were required to achieve 150 hours of supernumerary placement, but it was unclear in which placement setting these hours would be achieved. The visitors were unable to gain a clear outline of the placement settings that students would be required to attend as opposed to those that they may attend. Therefore, the visitors require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly articulate where students are

required to achieve their supernumerary hours and how the full range of placements, required and suggested, are appropriate to supporting the delivery of the programme, and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

### **5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure a safe and supportive environment at all placement settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team, it was clear that the responsibility for ensuring that practice placement are safe and supportive lies with the Employer Partners. “The responsibility of Pearson College is to take reasonable steps to ensure that the placement provider has appropriate policies and processes in place” (Clinical Placement Handbook, Volume 5, page 17). From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine what the reasonable steps would be to ensure a safe and supportive environment for students. The visitors also noted from the documentation that the education provider would be responsible for approving and monitoring non-ambulance service placements. However, during discussions with the programme team the visitors were informed that, due to the vast volume of non-ambulance service placement available, the responsibility of approving and monitoring these placement will shift from the education provider to Employer Partners. This was not reflected in the programme documentation. The visitors were not provided with any information on how Employer Partners will ensure non-ambulance service placements settings will provide a safe and supportive environment. Therefore, the visitors are unclear how the education provider’s system for approving and monitoring placements ensures that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence to show what steps the education provider takes to ensure that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

### **5.4 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 for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However, in considering the initial documentation submitted and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. From discussions with the programme team, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess placements or the overall process undertaken to approve them. The visitors were also unclear how monitoring activities, such as the practice educator and student questionnaires, feed into this process. This applies to all placements, both at ambulance services and in other settings. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this

standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how their processes ensure that placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, and that any issues which arise as a result of these policies are fed back effectively to the education provider.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were directed to the clinical placement handbook section 7 (Volume 5), which gives details about the education provider's commitment to equality and diversity. In addition the visitors were sign posted to the pre-placement audit check list, which includes an item on equality and diversity. However the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how the equality and diversity policies, both at the education provider and the placement setting, would work in tandem to ensure that any relevant equality and diversity data was being monitored. They were also unsure how any issues, if they arose, would be flagged and who would be responsible for resolving these issues. Therefore the visitors require further information about how any issues which are flagged by monitoring of equality and diversity data at the practice placement are fed back to the education provider and dealt with appropriately. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how this standard can be met by the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each placement setting.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were directed to Clinical Placement Handbook Section 3 (Volume 5) which states "Partner providers are responsible for allocating suitably qualified and experienced clinical mentors to support students on placement" (page 9). However, the visitors were provided with limited evidence of the quality assurance processes used by the education provider to monitor the qualifications and experience of staff at placement, and to ensure that Employer Partners adhere to the requirements set out in any documentation. As practice placements are sourced and managed by Employer Partners the visitors were unable to confirm that adequate numbers of appropriate and qualified staff would be present in the placement setting to support students in their learning. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show the quality assurance processes used by education provider to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure that placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors were directed to Clinical Placement Handbook Section 3 (Volume 5) which states “Partner providers are responsible for allocating suitably qualified and experienced clinical mentors to support students on placement” page 9. However, the visitors were provided with limited evidence of the quality assurance processes used by the education provider to monitor the qualifications and experience of staff at placement, and to ensure that Employer Partners adhere to the requirements set out in any documentation. As practice placements are sourced and managed by Employer Partners the visitors were unable to confirm that placement educators would have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show the quality assurance processes used by Employer Partners to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure practice placement educators receive appropriate training.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, as well as discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider offers all clinical mentors access to mentor induction orientation programme. They similarly noted “clinical mentors who have not attended a mentoring programme with the previous five years will be encouraged to attend refresher training” Clinical placement handbook, Volume 5 (page 10). From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unclear about what programme specific training practice placement educators would be required to undertake before they could supervise and assess students’ performance based on the requirements of this programme. The visitors were also unclear how the programme team monitors the training that practice placement educators have undertaken prior to supervising students. The visitors were therefore unclear about how the programme team ensures that all practice placement educators have undertaken the required training activities so that they can undertake the role that is being asked of them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence of the training that practice placement educators are required to undertake before they supervise a student on this programme. They also require further information of the programme specific training that is offered to practice placement educators to ensure they can assess students in line with the assessment requirements of the education provider. In this way the visitors can determine whether the programme meets this standard.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all Employer Partners.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and the current Employer Partner, it was clear that the processes to provide information to this Employer Partner were working well and both parties understood what to expect. However the visitors noted that this was due to the close relationship between the education provider and current Employer Partner, who has helped to develop the programme. As it was highlighted at the visit that there were likely to be additional Employer Partners joining the programme, the visitors require further information about the formal mechanisms which are in place to provide all Employer Partners with the necessary information to ensure effective collaboration.

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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate how students will be fully prepared for placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was clear that each Employer Partner programme co-ordinator would be responsible for ensuring that students and practice educators were fully prepared for placement. From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted the Clinical Placement Briefing Document Form, Appendix 8, would be used as guideline to prepare students for placement. From this form, the visitors were unable to see how students will be prepared in relation to the learning outcomes to be achieved, the expectation of professional conduct, the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress or communications and lines of responsibility. The visitors were signposted to other sources of evidence, but from the documentation the visitors were unable to see how students and placement providers would consistently be prepared for placement. Therefore, the visitors require further information on how students and Employer Partners providing placement would be fully prepared for placement.

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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate how placement providers will be fully prepared for placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers it was clear that each Employer Partner programme co-ordinator would be responsible for ensuring that students and practice educators were fully prepared for placement. From discussions with the placement providers it was clear that the current Employer Partner was confident of the information to be passed to the practice placement educators and to the students. However, the Employer Partner recognised that, as they had been involved in the development of the programme, they knew the processes to follow but that new Employer Partners may require further information. The visitors were unclear as to how new Employer Partners, and therefore students and practice placement educators, would be fully prepared for placement. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the arrangements which are in place to ensure that Employer Partners are preparing both practice educators and students with the information they need before starting their placement.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit any revised assessment of practice documents for the programme.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit included module booklets, module specifications and standards of proficiency mapping document. However, during discussions at the visit, the programme team indicated that they will be making revision to the assessment practice documents, such as the Clinical Placement Summary Report (Volume 5a) along with other documents that give detail into the assessment methods. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussions the extent of the changes intended by the programme team. Without seeing the final documents that specify the assessment methods, the visitors will not be able to determine if the chosen assessment methods are in line with the learning outcomes for each module. Therefore, the visitors will need to review changes made to documentation to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the practice assessment documents so the visitors can determine this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information on the processes in place to ensure that assessments undertaken at Employer Partner locations are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

**Reason:** From the documentation received, the visitors noted that the education provider ensured students' performance will be assessed in both academic and placement settings. The visitors noted in the module descriptors that assessment criteria including Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) were used to assess students' performance. However, the visitors had questions around the standardisation in the measurement of student performance in being objective and ensuring fitness to practise. For example, "Practice skill 26: Implement appropriate acute care for the patient with GU complaint" (Volume 5b), the visitors were unsure how the education provider will ensure practice skills (such as the above) being assessed at level 4 will be objective across different Employer Partners. Parity in assessments is a vital part of ensuring that the measurement of student performance is objective and

ensures fitness to practice. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place in ensuring assessments undertaken at Employer Partner locations are objective and ensure fitness to practise.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms used to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment at Employer Partners.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings with the programme team and Employer Partners the visitors were clear that students would undergo a number of assessments which will be managed by Employer Partners. During discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that each Employer Partner would carry out the same types of assessment at the same time. Employer Partners would be provided with guidelines outlining the assessment criteria to be used to ensure consistency. Further to this, the visitors were also informed that the education provider would monitor assessments via video link to ensure marking is fair and appropriate. However, the visitors were unable to locate the monitoring mechanisms mentioned in discussion with the programme team, to ensure that each Employer Partner would implement and follow the same assessment methods with the same level of scrutiny. The visitors noted that assurance of consistency across Employer Partners is vital to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. The visitors therefore require further information on the monitoring processes used by the education provider to show that effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations and programme documentation clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement for the programme.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to Appendix 11 in Volume 3a (Partner provider handbook appendices) as evidence for this standard. This document presented information on compensation provisions for the Higher National Diploma (HND) and Higher National Certificate (HNC) programme as well as overall marks for the programme. From the documentation submitted, the visitors were unable to find detail within the module descriptors or programme specification as to which modules are core for the programme, and need to be passed in order to progress from Level 4 on to Level 5. They were therefore unable to determine the progression and achievement requirements for the programme. The visitors also noted that there was limited information in the documentation to indicate the maximum credit that a student may carry over to enable them to proceed to the next stage of the programme, or whether all assessment elements must be passed. Therefore the visitors require further clarification of the progression and achievement arrangements for the programme, and how this information would be communicated to students.

Vince Clarke  
Graham Harris

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Southampton
<b>Programme name</b>	MSci Healthcare Science (Audiology)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Hearing aid dispenser
<b>Date of visit</b>	11 February 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 'Hearing aid dispenser' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 May 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 4 June 2015.

## Introduction

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

This visit was 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	Richard Sykes (Hearing aid dispenser) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor) Derek Adrian-Harris (Radiographer)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	No chair supplied
Secretary	Claire Brockman (University of Southampton)

## 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review programme specification, descriptions of the modules, mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs, Practice placement handbook and External examiners' reports from the last two years, prior to the visit as this was a focus visit purely looking at changes to SET 2 and SET 3.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not meet with the placement providers and educators / mentors as this was a focus visit so there was no requirement to meet them.

## 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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 2 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 provide further evidence of how potential applicants are provided with the necessary information about the programme in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** In the documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how potential applicants will be provided with the information they require to make an informed choice whether to take up a place on the programme. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that students on the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) do not have to make a decision to take up a place on the programme until their last year on the undergraduate programme as this programme is only open to third year students on the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology). The programme team spoke in detail about the support and information that would be provided to these students in order to help them make a decision about whether to take up a place on the programme. However, the visitors were unable to see clearly how potential applicants at the point before entry on to the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Audiology) programme will be given enough information in order to make an informed choice about the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how potential applicants are provided with the necessary information about the programme in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **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 the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that service users and carers are involved in the programme. Discussions at the visit indicated there were dedicated service users who contributed to the programme in a number of ways. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be made to involve service users in the programme. The programme team recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages. It was clear from the discussions that formal strategic future plans have yet to be made to involve service users in the programme. It was indicated during discussions, that the intention is to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this would be developed, and how future service users and carers would be involved. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place on how service users will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for further service user and carer involvement.

Richard Sykes  
Christine Morgan  
Derek Adrian-Harris

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of the West of England, Bristol
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	4 – 5 March 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 '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 20 April 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 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 accreditation 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	Beverley Blythe (Social worker in England) Nicholas Drey (Lay visitor) David Ward (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	58 per cohort including full time and part time routes; one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Roger Conlon (University of the West of England)
Secretary	Lisa Connors (University of the West of England) Rebecca Smith (University of the West of England)
Members of the joint panel	Amanda Thorpe (The College of Social Work) Kausur Iqbal (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 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 ensure that all information regarding the programme's entry requirements and potential costs of the programme are up to date and communicated consistently in admissions.

**Reason:** The visitors noted inconsistencies in the professional and academic entry requirements laid out in the programme specification document (page 15) and advertising materials on the website. The programme specification states 280 UCAS points are required, whereas the website references 300 tariff points. The programme specification also states, "There is no requirement of previous experience in social work or social care", which appears to contradict the website: "Applicants must have some knowledge and direct experience of working in social work or social care". The programme team confirmed that the UCAS points are currently set at 300 and that language may vary in describing experience required for the programme. In discussions with students at the visit, the visitors heard that student ambassadors present at the open day, were key in providing information on the student experience including placement information and potential associated costs which students may encounter once enrolled on the programme. The visitors were unsure how applicants would be provided with this information if they did not ask the student ambassadors at the open day. The visitors require the programme team to revisit the key documentation for the programme in conjunction with guidance given in admissions to ensure all entry requirements and potential costs of the programme are clearly and consistently presented for potential applicants to the programme. This way the programme team can ensure that all applicants are given the information they require in order to make an informed choice as to whether to apply or accept an offer of a place.

### **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 as to what process and criteria are used in determining health requirements are met for students coming on to the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed programme documentation and advertising materials prior to the visit. They noted a statement in the entry requirements that applicants must be in 'good health' in order to be able to undertake the programme, and therefore those offered a place are required to fill in an occupational health form (provided at the visit). In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that a contract with the occupational health service determined the implementation of this entry requirement, and applied the health requirements for the programme. However, from the evidence and discussions it was unclear what criteria and decision-making process were used in determining the threshold health requirements for the programme in admissions. The visitors also discussed with the programme team the policy used to determine whether students required vaccination for occupational exposure to pathogens such as hepatitis B, amongst others, in placement settings, and how students are responsible for keeping abreast of their own immunity status. The visitors could not determine how this process was robust in ensuring the safety of students and service users in relation to their

occupational health, and therefore require further evidence of the health requirements and their implementation in order to ensure this SET is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that there are appropriate protocols to provide all students with the required information on their consent where they are required to participate in practical teaching activities, including any implications of non-consent.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a Consent form (page 137) as evidence for this standard. The form contains this statement: "I hereby give my consent to take part in practical exercises on the BSc (Hons) Social Work programme. I understand that I have the right to withhold any personal information from the group which I do not wish to share." However, in discussion with the students, there was some uncertainty as to whether they had signed consent to participate in practical teaching, and what would happen if they felt unable to share or participate. The visitors could not find further detail of how this right not to participate with appropriate reasons, and associated form is introduced to the students, or if any verbal or written explanation would accompany the form to ensure students' consent is fully informed. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the specific participation requirements within the programme. There was further uncertainty about how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, and how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so that there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical teaching sessions.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must evidence that there are robust attendance monitoring mechanisms in place.

**Reason:** The evidence provided prior to the visit indicated that an electronic signing in process was used to monitor student attendance at taught sessions. In discussion with students at the visit, the visitors heard that there had been some issues experienced with this electronic system. There had been occasions where some students were mistakenly recorded as absent, which potentially would have affected bursary allocations and had further implications if mandatory course requirements have not been met. The programme team outlined how they were working with the students and IT staff to resolve the issue, and had withdrawn the link with bursary allocations for this particular cohort in order to ensure fairness. The programme team stated that it was now too late in the year to start manually taking attendance records. From this evidence, the visitors could not see how this SET had been met for this cohort or how it would be ensured that attendance is monitored effectively going forward. The visitors therefore require further evidence that a robust monitoring mechanism is in place and being implemented to ensure student absenteeism is picked up and dealt with appropriately.

**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 demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who, unless other arrangements are agreed, is from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors were directed to Part F of the Assessment regulations and procedures as evidence for this SET. However, the visitors could not find sufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard will be met going forward.

Beverley Blythe  
Nicholas Drey  
David Ward

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Warwick
<b>Programme name</b>	MA in 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>	11 – 12 February 2015

## 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 31 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 14 May 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 7 May 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 4 June 2015.

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker) David Ward (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Gillian Hundt (University of Warwick)
Secretary	Andrea Wyld (University of Warwick)

## 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review the programme specification prior to the visit as the education provider did not submit it. However, they did provide the proposal of the amendments to the current programme specification previously submitted to an internal validation event. It is the policy of the education provider that programme specifications are not created for amendments of a programme.

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the last two years as one of the reports has not been submitted from the external examiner for academic year 2013–14.

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 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 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

### **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 clearly specify in the admissions documentation that it is the responsibility of the applicant to pay for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed documentation available to potential applicants. This information, found on page 12 of the programme handbook and the programme web page stated “An enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service check (DBS)... is mandatory, however applications will be considered on a case by case basis”. Further, the letter inviting applicants to selection day’s states that applicants should bring the original DBS certificate to the day. During the meeting with students and the programme team, the visitors were informed that it was the responsibility of the applicant to cover the cost of the DBS check. However, this is not reflected in the admissions documentation presented to the visitors which could be misleading to potential applicants. Therefore, the visitors require that the education provider amends the admissions documentation so it clearly states the cost of the DBS check and that the applicant would need to cover this cost prior to application.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that there are appropriate protocols to obtain explicit consent where students participate as service users in practical teaching.

**Reason:** The documentation reviewed by the visitors prior to the visit did not state whether or not the programme team obtain formal consent from students when they participate as service users in practical teaching. The SETs mapping document provided as part of the education provider’s documentary submission stated that this standard was “not applicable”. The students stated that throughout their experience on the programme they have not given formal consent when participating as service users in practical and clinical teaching, and that there was no formal appropriate protocol for giving consent. During the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that there is an informal agreement with students that they have given consent to participate in role play and that if they did not want to participate they could opt out of the session. However, the visitors could not see how students were formally told about the risk of physical or emotional distress through participating in these activities, and any impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. Therefore the visitors require the introduction and implementation of appropriate protocol for gaining consent from students for the learning activities that are undertaken as part of the teaching on the programme which involve students participating as service users.

### **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 review associated monitoring mechanisms so that absences are formally reported on a more regular basis in order that the protocol for missed teaching can be triggered.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the visitors reviewed the documentation about attendance. The SETs mapping document states that “Student attendance is monitored through an attendance register that is circulated and completed by students during each teaching session”, the mapping document further states that the attendance register is collated on a monthly basis. However at the visit, the programme team confirmed that attendance records were collated on a semesterly basis. The visitors noted that this could be misleading as the stated policy on attendance is different to how attendance is recorded in practice. As a consequence, teaching could be missed and not identified in enough time to trigger the protocol for compensatory work. The visitors also noted that the policy regarding how attendance is recorded and monitored was not in the programme handbook or any documentation that is circulated to the students. This could be misleading to students as they may be unaware as to how attendance is recorded throughout the programme. Therefore in order for the standard to be met the programme team must review associated monitoring mechanisms so that absences are formally reported allowing sufficient time for the protocol for missed teaching to be triggered. The programme team are also required to demonstrate how they communicate the procedure of recording attendance to students on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all staff placement settings are appropriately qualified and experienced.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted included the “Protocol for independent and offsite practice educators which outlined process of selection and expectations of practice educators. Page three of this document outlined the minimum requirements that the education provider makes of independent and off-site practice educators that supervise students on practice placements. Requirements included “[b]e a registered social worker” and “hold a current Disclosure and Barring Service enhanced clearance”. The visitors were satisfied with the arrangements for independent and off site practice educators. During the meeting with the programme team the visitors were informed that all practice educators meet these requirements, but noted that there was not a formal policy in place setting out requirements for other practice educators, such as those in statutory and agency settings. Therefore, the visitors were not satisfied that the education provider was ensuring that all practice educators were appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that all practice educators are appropriately qualified and experienced.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers.

**Reason:** In the mapping document for this standard, the education provider stated that “The MASW course has a team of Placement Coordinators, from both academia and

practice, who establish and maintain strong and consistent relationships with Practice Educators and Agencies”. However there was no formal policy which outlines the collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers. Throughout the visit the visitors discovered that the collaboration was embedded in a historical relationship between the education provider and practice placement providers. Although the visitors were satisfied that there is collaboration between the two interest groups, there was concern about the regularity of the feedback and evaluation mechanisms which are formally embedded in the collaboration. During the meeting with practice placement providers it was identified that although there were feedback mechanisms they did not receive the feedback about the students experience of the placement from the education provider. During the meeting with the programme team the visitors were told that the response to feedback from practice educators was limited, and that the only regular feedback about practice placements was from the students as part of their placement portfolios. During discussions with the programme team the visitors were told that there is a formal memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the education provider and practice placement providers, but that this was first created when the programme started in 2004, and has not been updated since. The visitors were unsure how this MOU in its current form supported the regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider. Therefore the education provider is required to produce documentation which clearly outlines the policy allowing the regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

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

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

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted that an aegrotat award was not mentioned, nor was it made clear that aegrotat award do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were told that there is no aegrotat award given. The programme team were able to confirm that there is an exit award which students who complete the first year and accumulate enough credits will receive (a Postgraduate certificate in health studies). The HCPC defines aegrotat as an award given to a student who was not able to complete the programme due to illness. This standard requires the education provider to specify that the awarding of an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. Therefore the programme team are required to revisit the programme documentation and ensure that it clearly states that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team review the policy on external examiners to ensure external examiners submit finalised reports within a reasonable timeframe so that actions can be taken on any issues raised.

**Reason:** The programme has incorporated regular monitoring and evaluation systems outlined in the programme handbook which the visitors review prior to the visit. The feedback and monitoring systems gathered feedback from students, practice educators, the Practice assessment Panel, stakeholder agencies, service users and carers and external examiners. These systems of feedback were discussed with the programme team and the visitors were satisfied that the standard was met. However the programme team stated that an external examiner report from the previous academic year had not yet been submitted by one of the external examiners. The visitors reviewed the eligibility for appointment of external examiners document and noted that there were no deadlines set for the submission of the external examiner's report. Consequently this meant that if there are delays in external examiner reports being submitted, actions cannot be taken on any issues raised or recommendations in good time. The visitors therefore recommend that the policy is amended so that the external examiner is subject to a deadline regarding the submission of their report so that any issues raised can be taken into consideration within a reasonable timeframe.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the programme team review the criteria for selecting placements for students, to ensure that all students experience contrasting placements.

**Reason:** Pages 56 through to 61 of the programme handbook detailed the procedure for selecting placements. Students on the programme undertake a 70 day placement in the first year and a 100 day placement in the second year. Placements are allocated to students after students have completed student profiles which summarise previous experience and learning. Students are then linked to a placement based on these profiles and consideration is given to previous experience and learning needs as outlined in the student profiles. For this reason the visitors were satisfied that the programme met this standard at a threshold level as the number range and duration of placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. However, during the meeting with students it was noted that there is a possibility of similar children's service settings in both year one and two.. The visitors explored this further in the meeting with the programme team where it was established that there were occasions where students were placed on similar placements in second year. The visitors noted that all students graduating from the programme must be qualified as generic social workers, and that therefore the curriculum must provide opportunities to experience all aspects of social work. It is therefore advisable that students undertake placements with contrasting service user groups, using a range of different legislation, rather than specialise during the course of the programme. If two placements in children and

families social work, for example, are unavoidable due to a paucity of opportunities, they must be sufficiently contrasting to fulfil the generic requirements of the curriculum. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team review the process of selecting placements.

Vicki Lawson-Brown  
David Ward

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Worcester
<b>Programme name</b>	MA in 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>	17 – 18 March 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 12 May 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 May 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 4 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a BA (Hons) Social Work – Full time programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2016
Chair	Marie Stowell (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Teresa Nahajski (University of Worcester)
Members of the joint panel	Suzanne Horton (Internal Panel Member) Madalina Brait (Internal Panel Member) Gabrielle Hesk (External Panel Member) Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays.

**Reason:** The completed SETs mapping document stated that this was not applicable for the programme. The visitors noted through discussions with the students that participation in practical role play activities was a regular learning activity on the programme. However, the visitors could not see evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated in practical teaching. In discussion with the programme team, they explained that their understanding of this standard was that it applied to situations where students would need to share or roleplay their own service user experiences. The visitors considered that even in situations where students are not directly playing out their own story, there is the potential for issues to arise which cause personal discomfort. The visitors could not identify how the programme team worked consistently across the programme to identify any potential issues that may arise and how they mitigate any risk of emotional distress involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not identify how students were informed about the implications of participating in role play, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students, and how these protocols are put into practice as part of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review the process for gathering and handling student feedback on placements to ensure it is effective in gaining quality feedback for monitoring purposes.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme uses the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) framework in monitoring the quality of placements. As part of this, students are required to submit a feedback form for their placement within their portfolio, prior to this being assessed. The visitors heard from discussions with the students and programme team at the visit, that this had been raised as a cause for concern by some students, as there was a limit to the level of honest, quality feedback that can be given where the student remains in a vulnerable position pending the assessment of their portfolio by the practice placement educator. This student feedback form is a key element in monitoring the placement experience and influences decisions on whether the education provider will use the placement again. The visitors could therefore not determine that the process of gathering student feedback on placements was effective and robust for monitoring placements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to ensure this SET will be met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that changes to the social work provision at the education provider are reported to the HCPC through the major change process to demonstrate how the programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan.

**Reason:** The provision presented under this approval process is for 20 students per cohort on the new BA (Hons) Social Work programme starting in September 2015, and the current MA in Social Work programme numbers as outlined. The visitors heard from the senior management team that there were ongoing discussions with regards to a Bachelor level programme previously validated by the University of Worcester and delivered at a partner college. This programme ceased recruitment in 2014, but there are students in all years who will need to complete their studies. The education provider has offered places directly into years two and three in September 2015 to any students who wish to continue their studies towards the University of Worcester award, and has assured students that there will be sufficient resource in place for this. Given the large shifts in parameters in the scenario that some, or all, of the students from the previously validated programme transfer in to complete their studies, the visitors recommend that the education provider keep the HCPC abreast of the situation through the major change process. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that one of the placement providers was currently undergoing a tendering process for collaborative activities with education providers in the region. The senior management team outlined their approach to offering places on their programmes in line with the number of placements that were confirmed currently, with a view to expanding the BA (Hons) Social Work programme's intake in future if they secure arrangements for additional placements through the tendering process with this placement provider. There are also initiatives under development for post-registration and continuing professional development to be delivered by the education provider's social work team. The way in which the education provider meets this SET, and potentially other SETs, would be affected by the above changes to social work provision at the education provider. The programme team is therefore reminded to report to the HCPC through the major change process to ensure that this programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan, and sufficient resources are in place for its effective delivery.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that changes to the social work provision at the education provider are reported to the HCPC through the major change process to demonstrate how the number of qualified and experienced staff continues to be appropriate.

**Reason:** The provision presented under this approval process is for 20 students per cohort on the new BA (Hons) Social Work programme starting in September 2015, and the current MA in Social Work programme numbers as outlined. The visitors heard from the senior management team that there were ongoing discussions with regards to a Bachelor level programme previously validated by the University of Worcester and delivered at a partner college. This programme ceased recruitment in 2014, but there

are students in all years who will need to complete their studies. The education provider has offered places directly into years two and three in September 2015 to any students who wish to continue their studies towards the University of Worcester award, and has assured students that there will be sufficient resource in place for this. Given the large shifts in parameters in the scenario that some, or all, of the students from the previously validated programme transfer in to complete their studies, the visitors recommend that the education provider keep the HCPC abreast of the situation through the major change process. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that one of the placement providers was currently undergoing a tendering process for collaborative activities with education providers in the region. The senior management team outlined their approach to offering places on their programmes in line with the number of placements that were confirmed currently, with a view to expanding the BA (Hons) Social Work programme's intake in future if they secure arrangements for additional placements through the tendering process with this placement provider. There are also initiatives under development for post-registration and continuing professional development to be delivered by the education provider's social work team. The way in which the education provider meets this SET, and potentially other SETs, would be affected by the above changes to social work provision at the education provider. The programme team is therefore reminded to report to the HCPC through the major change process to ensure that this programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan, and sufficient resources are in place for its effective delivery.

### **5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team are advised to review the credit weighting allocated to the practice learning module in relation to the dissertation module in year two, to ensure the structure of the programme reflects the importance of practice learning.

**Reason:** Through their review of the programme documentation prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the practice learning module SOWK 4006 in year 2 carries 20 credits, and the dissertation module SOWK 4007 carries 60 credits. The visitors discussed this with the students at the visit, in relation to the relative value placed on the assessment of practice and theory on the programme. The visitors were satisfied that the importance of practice learning was demonstrated by students' reflections on the programme and from the integration of theory and practice throughout the programme. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated that the modules were set at their respective credit ratings due to regulations at the education provider on dissertation credit ratings, though it was unconfirmed from this discussion as to whether 60 credits was indeed the minimum, or 40 credits. The credit values placed on the respective modules for this programme could create a perception of a relative lower value placed on the practice learning element for students. The visitors therefore advise the programme team to review the relative credit ratings.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team are advised to monitor the number of practice placements and practice placement educators available, to ensure there continues to be sufficient quality placements to support the delivery of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed partnership agreements for the programme with a number of placement providers in the region, and discussed the education provider's approach to securing placement provision. In the meeting with placement providers and educators, the number of available practice placement educators was acknowledged as a challenge in the region. The visitors noted that a placement provider was currently out to tender for education providers for their placement provision and collaborative activities. The visitors also heard intentions to develop an 'Enabling Others' programme at the education provider, which would provide training to widen the pool of practice educators available for placements for the programme. From the evidence, the visitors were content that this standard was currently being met. However, given the introduction of the new BA (Hons) Social Work programme and the vulnerability of placement provision where Social Work education provision is set to grow in the region, the visitors recommend the programme team keep under review the number of practice placements and practice placement educators to ensure there continues to be appropriate numbers available.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider is recommended to review the examination and invigilating arrangements for the MA Applied Law module to ensure that this is objective in applying assessment standards and measuring student performance.

**Reason:** The Applied Law module SOWK 4001 is assessed by an examination in which students are permitted to bring some notes and key references, which are reviewed by the invigilator, or invigilators, on entrance to the examination. The visitors were unable to determine the criteria used by the invigilator(s) to assess the content of each student's notes as acceptable, or not acceptable. The programme team outlined their approach which seemed to focus on a review of the amount, i.e. font size and number of pages, rather than the content. The visitors noted that the enforcement of font size and page format requirements could have equality implications for those students who have disabilities or require reasonable adjustments in learning materials. The visitors therefore advise the programme team to review the implementation of the examination and invigilating arrangements for the module to ensure that they are objective and applied consistently to ensure fairness and effective assessment processes.

### **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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider is reminded to ensure that approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors noted references to another programme provided by the education provider: MA Social Work and Community Studies. The visitors discussed this programme with the senior team, who indicated that the programme had now closed for recruitment. The education provider also provided documentation to confirm this at the visit. The visitors also heard that a summer school was under development under a similar title. The HCPC requires approved programmes to be the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or

part of the Register in their award, and therefore formally note with the education provider to ensure any future provision adheres to these regulatory requirements.

Paula Sobiechowska  
Diane Whitlock  
Dorothy Smith

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Worcester
<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>	17 – 18 March 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 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 12 May 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 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.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 May 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 4 June 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 education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered a MA in Social Work – Full time programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Marie Stowell (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Teresa Nahajski (University of Worcester)
Members of the joint panel	Suzanne Horton (Internal Panel Member) Madalina Brait (Internal Panel Member) Gabrielle Hesk (External Panel Member) Robert Johns (The College of Social Work) Helen Tipton (The College of Social Work)

## Sources of evidence

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

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

The HCPC did not review External examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 MA in Social Work and Heart of Worcestershire College (validated by University of Worcester) - BA (Hons) Social Work programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be 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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit information provided to applicants to ensure it is clear about the programme's academic calendar and the requirements of the placement experience.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the admissions documentation provided to applicants, including the relevant webpages, prior to the visit. In discussion with the programme team at the visit, it was evident that there would be the need for students to return to study earlier than the standard term dates as set out at the education provider, in order to complete the required amount of placement days within the programme structure. The visitors therefore require this to be communicated to students at the admissions stage to ensure that they are given the information required to make an informed choice about joining the programme. The visitors noted that there was detail on placements, including the nature of placement experience, when placements happen, how settings are allocated and the commitment required by students provided on the webpage for the MA in Social Work programme. However, the visitors were not able to find this level of detail on the webpage of the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. They therefore require further evidence that the programme will provide all applicants with the information they need to make an informed choice as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must evidence how they implement appropriate protocols to obtain consent where students participate in practical teaching, such as roleplays.

**Reason:** The completed SETs mapping document stated that this was not applicable for the programme. The visitors noted through discussions with the students that participation in practical role play activities was a regular learning activity on the programme. However, the visitors could not see evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated in practical teaching. In discussion with the programme team, they explained that their understanding of this standard was that it applied to situations where students would need to share or roleplay their own service user experiences. The visitors considered that even in situations where students are not directly playing out their own story, there is the potential for issues to arise which cause personal discomfort. The visitors could not identify how the programme team worked consistently across the programme to identify any potential issues that may arise and how they mitigate any risk of emotional distress involved with students participating as service users. The visitors could not identify how students were informed about the implications of participating in role play, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students, and how these protocols are put into practice as part of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must review the process for gathering and handling student feedback on placements to ensure it is effective in gaining quality feedback for monitoring purposes.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme uses the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) framework in monitoring the quality of placements. As part of this, students are required to submit a feedback form for their placement within their portfolio, prior to this being assessed. The visitors heard from discussions with the students and programme team at the visit, that this had been raised as a cause for concern by some students, as there was a limit to the level of honest, quality feedback that can be given where the student remains in a vulnerable position pending the assessment of their portfolio by the practice placement educator. This student feedback form is a key element in monitoring the placement experience and influences decisions on whether the education provider will use the placement again. The visitors could therefore not determine that the process of gathering student feedback on placements was effective and robust for monitoring placements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to ensure this SET will be met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that changes to the social work provision at the education provider are reported to the HCPC through the major change process to demonstrate how the programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan.

**Reason:** The provision presented under this approval process is for 20 students per cohort on the new BA (Hons) Social Work programme starting in September 2015, and the current MA in Social Work programme numbers as outlined. The visitors heard from the senior management team that there were ongoing discussions with regards to a Bachelor level programme previously validated by the University of Worcester and delivered at a partner college. This programme ceased recruitment in 2014, but there are students in all years who will need to complete their studies. The education provider has offered places directly into years two and three in September 2015 to any students who wish to continue their studies towards the University of Worcester award, and has assured students that there will be sufficient resource in place for this. Given the large shifts in parameters in the scenario that some, or all, of the students from the previously validated programme transfer in to complete their studies, the visitors recommend that the education provider keep the HCPC abreast of the situation through the major change process. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that one of the placement providers was currently undergoing a tendering process for collaborative activities with education providers in the region. The senior management team outlined their approach to offering places on this programme in line with the number of placements that were confirmed currently, with a view to expanding the programme's intake in future if they secure arrangements for additional placements through the tendering process with this placement provider. There are also initiatives under development for post-registration and continuing professional development to be delivered by the education provider's social work team. The way in which the education provider meets this SET, and potentially other SETs, would be affected by the above changes to social work provision at the education provider. The programme team is therefore reminded to report to the HCPC through the major change process to ensure that this programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan, and sufficient resources are in place for its effective delivery.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should ensure that changes to the social work provision at the education provider are reported to the HCPC through the major change process to demonstrate how the number of qualified and experienced staff continues to be appropriate.

**Reason:** The provision presented under this approval process is for 20 students per cohort on the new BA (Hons) Social Work programme starting in September 2015, and the current MA in Social Work programme numbers as outlined. The visitors heard from the senior management team that there were ongoing discussions with regards to a Bachelor level programme previously validated by the University of Worcester and delivered at a partner college. This programme ceased recruitment in 2014, but there

are students in all years who will need to complete their studies. The education provider has offered places directly into years two and three in September 2015 to any students who wish to continue their studies towards the University of Worcester award, and has assured students that there will be sufficient resource in place for this. Given the large shifts in parameters in the scenario that some, or all, of the students from the previously validated programme transfer in to complete their studies, the visitors recommend that the education provider keep the HCPC abreast of the situation through the major change process. The visitors also noted from discussions at the visit that one of the placement providers was currently undergoing a tendering process for collaborative activities with education providers in the region. The senior management team outlined their approach to offering places on this programme in line with the number of placements that were confirmed currently, with a view to expanding the programme's intake in future if they secure arrangements for additional placements through the tendering process with this placement provider. There are also initiatives under development for post-registration and continuing professional development to be delivered by the education provider's social work team. The way in which the education provider meets this SET, and potentially other SETs, would be affected by the above changes to social work provision at the education provider. The programme team is therefore reminded to report to the HCPC through the major change process to demonstrate that there continues to be an appropriate number of qualified and experienced staff in place for the delivery of the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The programme team is advised to monitor the number of practice placements and practice placement educators available, to ensure there continues to be sufficient quality placements to support the delivery of the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed partnership agreements for the programme with a number of placement providers in the region, and discussed the education provider's approach to securing placement provision. In the meeting with placement providers and educators, the number of available practice placement educators was acknowledged as a challenge in the region. The visitors noted that a placement provider was currently out to tender for education providers for their placement provision and collaborative activities. The visitors also heard intentions to develop an 'Enabling Others' programme at the education provider, which would provide training to widen the pool of practice educators available for placements for the programme. From the evidence, the visitors were content that this standard was currently being met. However, given the introduction of this new programme and the vulnerability of placement provision where Social Work education provision is set to grow in the region, the visitors recommend the programme team keep under review the number of practice placements and practice placement educators to ensure there continues to be appropriate numbers available.

**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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider is reminded to ensure that approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors noted references to another programme provided by the education provider: MA Social Work and Community Studies. The visitors discussed this programme with the senior team, who indicated that the programme had now closed for recruitment. The education provider also provided documentation to confirm this at the visit. The visitors also heard that a summer school was under development under a similar title. The HCPC requires approved programmes to be the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their award, and therefore formally note with the education provider to ensure any future provision adheres to these regulatory requirements.

Paula Sobiechowska  
Diane Whitlock  
Dorothy Smith