

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	BA (Hons) in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	1 – 2 March 2017

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' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 25 May 2017. At the Committee meeting on 25 May 2017, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

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 – the programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The 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	David Childs (Social worker in England) Gary Hickman (Social worker in England) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec (Lead executive for the Social work panel) Rebecca Stent (Lead executive for the Diagnostic radiography/ Occupational therapy panel)
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
First approved intake	July 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Damian Coleman (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Andrew Whittaker (External Panel Member) Colm Fearon (Learning and Teaching representative) Lauren Smyth (Quality and Standards Officer) Gary Davy (Student Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 ongoing 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 5 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 the information provided to potential applicants, which ensures they are given the information they require to make an informed choice about applying to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that potential applicants are directed to information about the social work bursary for students via a link to NHS Business Services Authority social work bursaries page on the university programme website. The visitors noted that the education provider is in receipt of a capping allocation for the bursary. As such, the education provider decides which students receive the bursary based on capping criteria set by the Department of Health. The website the students are directed to, does not hold information about how the education provider decides which students will be in receipt of the bursary. In this instance, students need to contact their education provider for information about how they select which students will be eligible for the bursary. However, the visitors could not see where this is communicated to the potential students. In discussion with the students, the criteria for eligibility was understood to be an achievement level of 60 per cent across assessments and attendance level of 40 per cent across the programme in the first year. However, in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard the criteria is 60 per cent attendance and 40 per cent for assessments. Because of the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require additional information demonstrating what the education provider's eligibility criteria is for students to apply for the social work bursary and how this communicated to potential students so that they can make an informed choice before applying to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students from elements of learning and / or assessment and how this is communicated to potential applicants and students.

Reason: From a review of the proposed programme specification, the visitors noted that accreditation of prior (experiential) learning with regards to practice learning is not permitted. However, in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that applicants can apply for AP(E)L using the university wide accreditation of prior learning (APL) policy. Due to the disparity in the information provided the visitors were unclear about whether AP(E)L would be accepted on this programme and if it is, how the AP(E)L scheme would be used to appropriately exempt students from having to attain certain learning outcomes during practice learning. The visitors also could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, or whether any 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 to clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning with regards to practice learning will be permitted in this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students

from elements of the learning and / or assessment and how it is communicated to applicants and students.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, in the proposed programme specification, the visitors noted a statement with regards to accreditation of prior (experiential) learning to say that HCPC allows AP(E)L of practice learning in exceptional circumstances, however the HCPC does not stipulate that. The visitors also noted, at the top of the student consent form for students to participate as a service users in practical sessions, it is specified that this is an “HCPC requirement”. However, the HCPC does not stipulate that a consent form specifically must be used to obtain a student’s consent to act as a service user. In review of the proposed student programme handbook on page 5, the visitors noted that reference is made to The College of Social Work (TCSW) endorsing the professional aspects of the programme, however TCSW is no longer in existence and therefore cannot endorse this programme. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC so that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used.

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 demonstrate that there will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the communication between the practice placement provider and the education provider ensures the education provider has access to the information they require to be assured that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the number of students on the programme in both statutory and private, voluntary and independent (PVI) practice placements. From discussions with the programme team and the statutory practice placement providers, the visitors learned that there exists a Teaching Partnership Operational Board of which Canterbury Christ Church University, Kent County Council and Medway Council are members. The visitors heard that Medway Council and Kent County Council hold lists of their qualified placement educators and they ensure that their practice educators have undertaken the relevant training Practice Educator Professional Standards for social work training (PEPs). Also, the practice placement providers informed the visitors that local work is currently on going to ensure that more staff will be trained as practice educators over the next three years. However, it was unclear how the education provider ensures that they are aware of the numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at placements and how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings, including PVI placements, have an adequate number of

appropriately qualified and experienced staff. Therefore, the visitors require information which demonstrates how the education provider and practice placement providers regularly and effectively collaborate in order to ensure that the education provider can be sure that all practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for the programme.

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

Conditions: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they inform students about their ability to progress and achieve should they fail to complete any part of the programme.

Reason: On page 28 of the proposed practice learning handbook, it is stated that students are only permitted one opportunity to repeat a placement. However, on the chart found on page 7 of the proposed student handbook, the visitors noted that students will get two reassessment opportunities. The programme team confirmed that this was a typing error and that students will get only one chance at reassessment of a placement. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors could not clearly identify how the education provider clearly communicates to students the number of times they would be able to repeat a placement on the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence as to how students are informed about the requirements for student progression and achievement with regards to placement, on the programme.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider that when they make changes to the programme, to include interprofessional learning, they will need to engage with the HCPC to identify how these changes may change how the programme continues to meet the standards.

Reason: It was the visitors' understanding that since the programme is unlinking from the interconnected, interprofessional programme delivery of the previous programme model that inter professional learning is not a part of the new programme model, but there are some elements of shared learning. The visitors noted that the education provider intends to integrate interprofessional learning into the programme, in future. Therefore when the education provider is ready to introduce this element into the programme the visitors recommend that the education provider considers how this may impact the programme continuing to meet this standard and how best to engage with HCPC about these changes.

David Childs
Gary Hickman
Frances Ashworth