

## Visitors' report

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>         | University of Huddersfield |
| <b>Programme name</b>                     | BSc (Hons) 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>                      | 7 – 8 May 2014             |

## 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 26 August 2014. At the Committee meeting, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the conditions 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 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 visit also considered the 'MSc Social Work' 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 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 'MSc Social Work'. 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 programmes' status.

## Visit details

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession   | Jane McLenachan (Social worker)<br>Deborah Kouzarides (Social worker)   |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Hollie Latham   |
| Proposed student numbers               | 60 per year   |
| First approved intake                  | September 2014  |
| Chair                                  | Derrol Palmer (University of Huddersfield)  |
| Secretary                              | Elaine Carter-Burke (University of Huddersfield)<br>Susan Smith (University of Huddersfield)<br>Angie Sprawson (University of Huddersfield) |
| Members of the joint panel             | Caroline Hickman (The College of Social Work)<br>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<br>(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 54 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 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 submit further evidence that the resources to support students throughout the programme provide accurate and consistent information, particularly the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

**Reason:** The visitors noted a number of inaccuracies in the programme documentation. The BSc (Hons) Course Handbook states that “The Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC) is the professional body for health & social care workers.” (page 4). And “During your time with us we will be inspected by the Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC) who have professional body responsibility for social work.” (page 5). These statements, amongst others, incorrectly refer to the HCPC as the professional body instead of the regulator. In a meeting with the programme team it was highlighted that the programme does not offer any interprofessional learning (IPL). However, The BSc (Hons) Course Handbook makes reference to the IPL opportunities within the school, specifically “Our commitment as a School is to offer you as many interdisciplinary learning opportunities as possible.” (page 19). This information could be misleading to students and potential applicants.

The visitors also noticed discrepancies in the information available to applicants regarding entry criteria. The BSc (Hons) Course Handbook states that students must have “..Obtained or predicted DDD at BTEC...”. (page 12). Whereas the admissions process summary stated that student must have “Obtained or predicted DDM at BTEC”. (page 2). To be satisfied this SET is met, the visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to ensure that details of the programme and references to the HCPC are consistent and accurate throughout.

### **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 provide further evidence that the attendance policies are communicated clearly to students.

**Reason:** Page 19 of The BSc (Hons) Course Handbook directs students to the university of Huddersfield attendance monitoring policy which states “Students should be aware that there are specific attendance requirements on some courses and that they must comply with these as well as the general expectations of the University.” (page 1). In a meeting with the programme team it was made clear that for this particular programme students were expected to attend all lectures and placement days. In addition to this if a student were to miss three consecutive sessions they would receive contact from the University and for five consecutive sessions, contact from the dean. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the processes in place to monitor student attendance. However, in a meeting with students it was evident that students were unclear of the attendance requirements for their programme. In addition to this, students were unclear of the process that would be followed should their attendance fall below expectation. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the process regarding attendance is clearly communicated to students.

**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 programme team must submit further evidence 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 were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to this programme. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard will be met.

Deborah Kouzarides  
Jane Mclenachan