

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Edge Hill University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Learning Disabilities Nursing and 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>	24 – 25 April 2013

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 July 2013. At the Committee meeting on 4 July 2013, the programme was approved. 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 as the Social work profession (in England) came onto the register on 1 August 2012. The 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 validated the programme and the professional bodies considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work and BSc (Hons) Children's Nursing and Social Work. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. Separate reports exist for the other programmes. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Claire Brewis (Occupational therapist) Graeme Currie (Social Worker) Graham Noyce (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
HCPC observers	Jamie Hunt Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	10
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Susan Davies-Roper (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Jenny Barrett (Internal Panel Member) Claire Hawkins (Internal Panel Member) Sam Baron (External Panel Member) Irene Jones (External Panel Member) David Mudd (External Panel Member) Hilary Burgess (The College of Social Work) Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work)

	<p>Nigel Haydon (The College of Social Work)</p> <p>Bridget Crofts (The Nursing and Midwifery Council)</p> <p>Helen Collinson (Edge Hill University Observer)</p> <p>Emma Webster (Edge Hill University Observer)</p>
--	---

## 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. The programme has run for two academic years. The appointment of the external examiners was too late in the academic session for them to be able to complete external examiners reports for the first academic year. The Internal quality processes were not complete at the time of the visit for the second academic year. The visitors did review external examiner reports for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

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

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

## Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

## Conditions

### **3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.**

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

**Reason:** Within the documentation submitted for the visit the visitors noted there were inaccuracies when referring to HCPC and HCPC's role. The visitors recognise these inaccuracies will occur whilst the social work profession becomes accustomed to the HCPC as the new regulatory body; the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role so students fully understand the HCPC's function. The visitors noted the programme handbook had the statement, "To meet HCPC requirements you [students] must spend 200 days in practice" (p25). This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirement for students to complete a particular amount of time in practice. The visitors noted the practice learning handbook stated students would be "eligible to register with the NMC and HCPC at programme completion" (p7). The visitors considered this should be clarified to ensure students understand successful completion of the programme will confer them with 'eligibility to apply for HCPC registration' so they understand the process. The visitors also noted the module descriptor for Module PUP1190 had the statement, "The HCPC and TCSW require that students undertake and pass a distinct and discreet assessment within this module to determine their 'Readiness for Direct Practice'." This is incorrect, HCPC has no requirements for students to undertake particular assessments. With the changes to the regulatory environment for social workers the documentation should be reviewed to ensure the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the programme documentation to ensure the corrections above are made and the documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation of social workers in England throughout.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure students are appropriately informed about the implications surrounding consent for when they are expected to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** Documentation submitted and discussion at the visit indicated the programme uses a range of teaching methods including role play based scenarios and sharing personal information when appropriate. Discussions with the programme team indicated students were aware of the implications of consenting to participate and if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader, if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors could not determine from the documentation provided that students are fully aware of consenting to participate or of the procedures following opting-out. The visitors considered there are risks to students and the education provider when situations arise in the academic setting that may cause emotional distress and therefore it is important that clear information is provided by the programme team to the students to mitigate the risks. The visitors therefore

require further evidence to demonstrate students are fully informed about the implications of declining to participate in practical and clinical teaching.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the register.

**Reason:** The SETs mapping document submitted for the visit directed the visitors to various places within the submitted documentation including a SOPs mapping document and a SOPs (HCPC standards of proficiency)/PCF (the College of Social Work Professional Capabilities Framework) /SoCs (Nursing and Midwifery Council standards for competence) mapping document to demonstrate where the programme delivers the SOPs within the curriculum and learning outcomes. The visitors noted the HCPC's SOPs for social workers in England were mentioned in module descriptors and the practice assessment document; however there was no explicit reference to the SOPs themselves. The visitors could not determine the curriculum ensured students would be able to identify SOPs and so identify their own ability to meet them. The visitors considered that whilst the programme could ensure students met the SOPs it would be difficult for the students to be able to link them with their practice, and so demonstrate how they meet the standards, without the programme explicitly referring to the SOPs alongside the PCF and the SoCs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to demonstrate they meet the SOPs for their part of the register.

#### **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 further evidence to demonstrate how the programme ensures students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

**Reason:** Documentation provided prior to the visit included references to various sections to evidence this SET, "See MVD [Validation submission document], Section 1 Progression Social Work, Section 4 Design, Section 4 Practice learning, Module PUP 1190, Appendix E2: Practice Assessment Record " (SETs mapping 4.5). The visitors noted the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and the Guidance on conduct and ethics were mentioned in places; however there was no explicit reference to the standards themselves or evidence showing that the curriculum ensured students understand the implications of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the standards of conduct, performance and ethics are communicated to students and how it is ensured students understand the implications of the standards on graduation.



## Recommendations

### **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.

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the programme team consider incorporating the standards of proficiency more extensively within the practice assessment documentation.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the education provider ensures all parties are fully prepared for placement. The visitors noted within the practice assessment documentation that while the standards of proficiency (SOPs) are mentioned, the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) and the Nursing and Midwifery Council competencies form the basis of the competencies assessed. The visitors are aware that the PCF maps onto the SOPs so were assured the learning outcomes achieved at placement related directly to the SOPs. The visitors felt that by incorporating the SOPs more extensively alongside the PCF and the Nursing and Midwifery Council within the practice assessment documentation, students would gain a better understanding of how the SOPs and the PCF link together and how they differ. The visitors considered this consolidation would produce an enhanced student experience and ultimately an enhanced social worker.

Claire Brewis  
Graeme Currie  
Graham Noyce