Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Kingston University
Validating body	Kingston University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social Worker in England
Date of visit	10 – 11 September 2013

Contents

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

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. 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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 10 October 2013. At the Committee meeting, 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 as the Social Work profession came onto the register in August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the Standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker) Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist/Podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	55
Chair	Fiona Ross (University of Kingston)
Secretary	Nick Jeary (University of Kingston)
Members of the joint panel	June Sadd (The College of Social Work) Caroline Hickman (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	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators/mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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 56 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 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

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the Health and Care Professions Council. For example, Student Handbook page 8 states ‘‘an application has been made for accreditation from the Health and Care Professions Council’’, the word ‘‘accreditation’’ is associated with the HCPC in many of the documentation. HCPC does not accredit any programmes but approves Health and Care education and training programmes. Also, the visitors noted in the BA Social Work Programme Specification and Module Directory page 13 reads “As the BA (Hons) in Social Work leads to professional registration with the Health and Care Professions Council’’. This is an incorrect statement as students are eligible to apply for registration but this does not necessarily mean that they will be registered, as the HCPC performs a health and character test at the point of registration. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC’s role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

Kim Bown
Deborah Kouzarides
Paul Blakeman