

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of East London
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	19 – 20 June 2013

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	3
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. 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 ongoing approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 22 August 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. The professional body also considered their endorsement of the programme. The professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Dicken (Social worker) Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Robert Stratford (Practitioner psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	60
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2013
First approved intake	August 2003
Chair	David Rowley (University of East London)
Secretary	Debbie Brearley (University of East London) Laura Scott (University of East London) Jinder Thind (University of East London)
Members of the joint panel	Anne Kelly (The College of Social Work) Bill Turner (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 ongoing 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 52 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 be recommended for ongoing 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.

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 evidence of how applicants are informed that any exit awards of the programme do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the Health and care professions council (HCPC).

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the programme handbook contained clear information regarding exit awards of the programme, and that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. However, the visitors felt that the handbook would be provided to students of, rather than applicants to the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how applicants to the programme are informed that exit awards do not lead to eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register, which will allow them to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of 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 revise the admissions documentation to clarify the English language requirement required for successful admission to the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that the English language requirement for admission to the programme was stated as IELTS 'level 7' (Admissions guidebook, prospective students, p29). At the visit, the programme team clarified that the requirements for this programme were of an overall minimum IELTS level of 7, with no element below 6.5. This is correctly stated on page 2 of the programme specification. The visitors therefore require that the admissions documentation is revised to clarify the minimum reading, writing and spoken English requirements of the programme, and ensure that the requirements are consistently stated across all programme documentation, to allow potential applicants to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply for 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 provide evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain students' consent when they are acting as service users in role play situations.

Reason: From discussion with students at the visit, the visitors were informed that on occasion, students play the role of service users when participating in elements of the programme. Some students said that there were discussions in these sessions around who wanted to participate, and the programme team confirmed this arrangement, that students were asked if they wanted to act within this role, rather than nominated to do so. However, from a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see evidence of the information students are provided with regarding these sessions. As such it was unclear on what information they were basing their decisions to give

consent to participate, and how the programme team ensures students grant their consent to be part of these sessions. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how students are informed of the expectations of them when acting as service users, and how the team ensures that students provide their consent to act as service users.

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 provide evidence that the programmes approved by the HCPC are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC part of the Register, or protected title, in their named award.

Reason: From a review of the postgraduate programme information on the education provider website, the visitors noted two programmes; 'Social Work and Emotional Wellbeing (D60M) (MA)' and 'Social Work & Emotional Wellbeing (Professional Doctorate)'. As these programme titles contain reference to the Social work part of the HCPC Register, the visitors felt that this could be misleading, as it is not clear from these titles that students would not be able to apply for registration as a Social worker, in England upon successful completion of these programmes. The visitors therefore require that these programme titles are revised to ensure that applicants, students, staff and the public understand that these programmes do not provide successful graduates with eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way the visitors can determine how the education provider is ensuring that only approved programmes are those which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award, and how this programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion with the programme team indicated that there is a university wide policy regarding aegrotat awards in the 'Manual of General Regulations' (part 10) but upon review of these, the visitors could not determine where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy, to ensure that this standard is met.

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 revisit the programme documentation to make it clear that external examiners appointed to the programme must be from the relevant

part of the HCPC register, unless alternative arrangements have previously been agreed with the HCPC.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not locate any information regarding the registration requirements of external examiners for the programme. This standard requires assessment regulations of the programme to state that at least one external examiner needs to be appropriately registered, or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. The visitors therefore require evidence of the documentation where it clearly specifies the requirement 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.

Gary Dicken
Christine Stogdon
Robert Stratford