

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendation	16

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 'paramedic' 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. The education provider has until 12 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. 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 considered the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. 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 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. The education provider produced minutes for the event. A separate report produced by the professional body outline their decision on the programme's status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Vince Clarke (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	80 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Marion Bond (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Louise Jenkins (Internal Panel Member) Matthew Capsey (External Panel Member) Mark Cutler (External Panel Member) Gary Smart (College of Paramedics) Paul Haddow (College of Paramedics)

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. This is a new programme; therefore there are no past external examiners' reports to review.

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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 37 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 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

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 programme team must provide further evidence that students will receive all relevant information about the programme through the admissions process, prior to accepting an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: The SETs mapping directed the visitors to a flyer for the programme and information on interviewing and selection as evidence for this SET, as well as the admissions policy at Anglia Ruskin University. The visitors also reviewed the webpage for the programme. In discussion with the programme team at the visit, some of the entry requirements were clarified, and the importance of ensuring students are aware of the demands of the programme, particularly concerning lifting, was discussed. The visitors could not find evidence in the documents as to where prospective students would be clearly informed of the full entry and selection requirements for the programme, including the IELTS language requirements that are applicable, any indication as to whether they will be required to undertake a lifting assessment either before entry or during the programme, or any occupational health requirements for the programme. The information concerning driving licence requirements was also inconsistent in the documentation, with some references to possession of a full clean driving licence as 'encouraged' (Course Specification in Document 2, page 10) and some stating this was essential, as on the webpage and in the programme's shortlisting grid (Document 6, page 138). This SET requires the programme's admissions process to ensure that students are clearly informed of all the relevant information for the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of where and how students will be provided with all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to apply to or take up an offer of a place on the programme.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must review the selection and entry criteria to ensure they clearly articulate the English language entry requirements for applicants who do not have English as a first language.

Reason: The SETs mapping referred the visitors to the education provider's English language requirements webpage for International students, which states that IELTS 6.0 or equivalent, with nothing lower than 5.5 in any of the four elements, is required for undergraduate degrees. However, the visitors found that the webpage for this programme states that at least IELTS 7.0 (Academic level) or equivalent English Language qualification is required. The programme flyer submitted stated that the entry requirement was IELTS 6.5, but the visitors could find no reference to IELTS requirements in the programme specification's entry requirements (Course Specification in Document 2, page 10). This inconsistency of information in the programme documentation submitted concerning the IELTS level meant that the visitors were unclear as to how this SET will be met. The visitors therefore require further clarity of what the English language entry criteria will be, and evidence that this is accurately reflected in the appropriate programme documentation.

2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must review the selection and entry criteria to ensure they clearly articulate any occupational health requirements for entry to the programme, and provide evidence of any screening process.

Reason: As stated in the condition against SET 2.1, the visitors were unclear from the flyer, webpage and information on interviewing and selection provided, what the occupational health requirements will be for the programme. The webpage states, “A satisfactory Occupational Health clearance” will be required, but the visitors could not find further reference to this in the course specification’s entry requirements (Course Specification in Document 2, page 10), or elsewhere in the documentation. In discussion at the visit, occupational health screening was discussed, but the visitors were unclear as to what the occupational health screening process is, whether this would be at cost to the students, and what the associated follow-up processes or reasonable adjustments would be. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the admissions procedures will apply selection and entry criteria for health requirements, and further evidence of how the health requirements for the programme are communicated to applicants.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the partnership arrangements that are in place in relation to the effective management of the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated this programme is delivered through partnership arrangements which will be detailed within a memorandum of agreement in place for this programme. This will be held between the Anglia Ruskin University and the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust. At the visit, discussion indicated the parties involved with this programme are in the process of agreeing and finalising the Memorandum of Agreement to be in place before the programme commences. In order to determine this programme is effectively managed between the parties, the visitors require details of the indicative content of the Memorandum of Agreement, including details of placement capacity and confirmation of when it will be finalised and agreed. The visitors also require assurance that there are plans in place if a partner wishes to withdraw from the partnership, to ensure that students on the programme are not disadvantaged if this occurs. This will ensure that the partnership agreement, and responsibilities of each partner in relation to the programme are clear, and therefore that the programme will be effectively managed going forward.

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must submit further information regarding staff recruitment and resourcing for the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated that staff recruitment to the programme was ongoing. Discussion at the visit confirmed staff recruitment for further programme team members including senior lecturers, clinical skills tutors and a principal lecturer / reader was underway. The visitors were not able to find detail in the documentation as to the indicative roles and responsibilities for these posts. In order to determine there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively the visitors require further evidence of these appointments. The visitors therefore require information demonstrating the programme team staff appointment time scales and progress, along with relevant job descriptions to ensure that this SET will be met.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure it is accurate in reference to the HCPC's guidance and standards.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology. For instance, within the module descriptors, (Document 2, page 15), there is reference to the 'HCPC Code and Fitness to Practice'. The student handbook refers to students' achieving the 'HCPC Standards of Practice' (Document 4, page 5). The HCPC holds professionals to standards of proficiency and standards of conduct, performance and ethics, but it is unclear which of the HCPC's standards these references are pertaining to. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and that 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 clearly informed about the HCPC and the current setting of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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 education provider must further outline the programme's attendance policy's triggers and associated follow-up procedures, and how this is communicated to students.

Reason: From a review of the programme handbook and the Student Charter, the visitors noted that students are expected to attend every session that is part of their course, and that an electronic tap system will be used to monitor attendance at the University, with time sheets monitoring attendance in the placement setting. However, it was not clear from the documentation, the amount of missed teaching that would trigger a follow up action, or what actions will be taken taken if a student has poor attendance on the programme. As such, the visitors could not see how students were made aware of the follow up process, and any consequences of missing practice or taught elements. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the process in place if student attendance falls below the requirement of 100 per cent, and how students are informed of this process.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The programme team must provide the revised programme documentation following updates indicated at the visit, to more explicitly reflect curriculum guidance.

Reason: At the visit, the curriculum was discussed with the programme team, the professional body and education provider's panel members, which highlighted some areas of the module descriptors which require review to more explicitly reflect the professional body's curriculum guidance. The visitors therefore need to see the revised programme documentation to ensure that the areas identified, particularly obstetrics and maternity and social policy, will be clearly addressed in the curriculum. In this way the visitors can be assured that this standard will be met.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of the mechanisms that will be in place to ensure that the curriculum will remain current.

Reason: The visitors were provided with evidence of the currency of the programme within the SETs mapping for this programme, outlining the guidance, frameworks and reports which have formed the foundations of the curriculum in its current form. The visitors were satisfied that the currency of the curriculum was fulfilled but were unclear as to how the programme team will ensure currency of the curriculum going forward. This standard requires evidence of how the activities of the programme team and any external stakeholders will make sure the curriculum stays relevant over time. As referred to in the condition against 3.5, the programme is in the process of recruiting staff to the programme. The visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms that the programme team will have in place, such as ongoing research or professional practice activity, to keep the curriculum up-to-date with the current practice for the profession.

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that the partnership arrangements will provide the required placements for the programme.

Reason: During the visit, a presentation was delivered outlining the scope of this programme for the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust. The visitors heard of the plans to ensure there will be enough practice educators (mentors) in place for the programme however, could not determine how the supply for practice educators would meet the needs of this programme, and the overall demands of the partnership. There was some discussion at the visit as to the parameters used in the projection figures but the visitors were unable to get a clear view of the supply of placements for this programme through this partnership. In order to determine that there will be an adequate number of practice placements through the partnership, and therefore that practice placements will be integral to the programme, the visitors require further information evidencing how future planning for practice placement educators has been carried out.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the number, duration and range of placements.

Reason: The SETs mapping states that the education provider are responding to the professional body requirements and will collaborate with practice placement providers to ensure that students get experience of working in different settings. At the visit, the senior team gave a brief overview of the placements that would be included in the programme, to include one month in each area, i.e. one month in obstetrics, one month in primary care, etc. The visitors could not find where this information was detailed in the documentation, or information on the rationale and process for allocating students to particular placement settings. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the range of settings, number, and duration of the placements to ensure this is appropriate in meeting this SET.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The programme team must provide further detail of how the education provider will ensure that the placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment, particularly where the students are not with a placement educator / mentor.

Reason: During the visit, a presentation was delivered outlining the scope of this programme for the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust. The visitors heard of the plans to ensure there will be enough practice educators (mentors) in place for the programme however, they could not determine how the supply of practice educators would meet the needs of this programme, and the overall demands of the partnership. There was some discussion at the visit as to the parameters used in the projection figures but the visitors were unable to get a clear view of the supply of placements for this programme through this partnership. It was indicated that the projections for the number of practice educators required were based on students being placed with their mentor for 40 per cent of the time, but it was unclear whether they would be placed with other mentors the other 60 per cent, or with staff who are not mentors and therefore have not been trained and prepared for supporting students in the practice setting. The education provider's internal panel at the visit stated that the 'aim' should be to have a mentor for all placements. However, to ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that all placement settings will provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence outlining the system in place for the initial approval and monitoring of all placements.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit and discussion at the visit indicated the education provider will conduct audits for their assigned placement area's placements using a uniform approach developed within the

partnership. However, the visitors were not able to see evidence of any audits having taken place. In discussion with the programme team, it was indicated that at least one paramedic member of staff would be appointed as an 'education champion', and would then be responsible for coordinating the audit visits to practice placement settings. There would also be appointed a 'link lecturer' to monitor placements, to be in place in time for the students going on first placement for the programme. The visitors require further evidence in the documentation to support these approval and monitoring processes, as well as examples of how they will be put into practice, in order to be assured the paramedic practice placement settings have been audited and that the approval and monitoring system in place will be appropriate in meeting this SET.

5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Condition: The programme team must further demonstrate how they will ensure that the practice educators (mentors) have relevant skills, knowledge and experience.

Reason: The SETs mapping for this standard stated "It is expected that local stakeholders select experienced paramedics to be put forward as potential Paramedic educators and will provide the required training to support student paramedics." It also states that the education provider will provide additional support and training via an online portal, and that the practice placement audit will ensure that practice educators have the relevant skills, knowledge and experience. However, the documentation did not provide further detail as to how the online portal will support practice educators specific to this programme or how the audit process will operate to ensure that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust will provide practice educator training and the programme team also indicated that they will be undertaking supplementary training through update sessions to prepare practice educators for the particular aspects of the Anglia Ruskin University programme's placements, as distinct from the other higher education institutions that are involved in the partnership. However the visitors were unable to find evidence as to where and how the education provider checks that the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the criteria for placement educators, in terms of the required knowledge, skills and experience, and the steps taken by the education provider to check that these criteria are met where the partnership or 'local stakeholders' put forward potential practice educators.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must further demonstrate how they will ensure that the placement educators (mentors) undertake appropriate training.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation and discussions at the visit that the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust will provide practice educator training through a level six module. The programme team will also be undertaking supplementary training through update sessions and workshops to prepare practice educators for the particular aspects of the Anglia Ruskin University programme's placements, as distinct from the other higher education institutions that are involved in the partnership. However, the visitors were unclear on the indicative content of these

sessions and whether practice educators were contractually obliged to attend updates or access the online portal's resources. The visitors therefore require further information on the update session's frequency, length, content and any attendance requirements as specified in the Memorandum of Agreement or in practice educator documentation. In this way the visitors can be satisfied that the training required for practice educators will be provided.

5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Condition: The programme team must further demonstrate how they will ensure that the practice educators (mentors) are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: As stated in the condition against SET 5.4, the visitors could not find sufficient evidence of the auditing policies and processes that the education provider will operate in approving placements and practice educators taking students for the programme. The SETs mapping states that the audit tool as presented in Document 11 will "...check the qualifications and registration of Trust appointed Paramedic Educators...", and arrangements are in place to check this on a regular basis. The audit tool refers to the 'mentor register' at the Trust, but the visitors could not find clear evidence to support the statement in the SETs mapping, in demonstrating the feed-in processes of HCPC registration details from placement providers or educators to the education provider, or detail how this will be checked and monitored by the education provider. They therefore require further evidence as to how this SET will be met.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: The documentation states that the education provider will meet 'regularly' with practice placement providers across the region, and will provide workshops to enable practice educators to feedback comments or concerns. However, the visitors were unable to determine how regularly meetings will take place, or identify the programme team members who will be in place to facilitate this collaboration or act as link lecturers with the placements. The visitors met with practice educators and representatives for the partnership from the practice placement provider at the visit. In discussions with placement provider representatives and the programme team, some communication channels were identified, such as the link lecturers and a portal between the practice educator, student and education provider. However, in discussion some parties appeared unclear on how these communication channels will operate and what the formal communication mechanisms will be. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the collaboration and joint work between the education provider and practice placement provider will be regular and effective.

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.**

Condition: The programme team must provide further information as to how practice placement educators (mentors) will be prepared for placements specific to this programme.

Reason: As stated in the condition against SET 5.8, it was confirmed at the visit that the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust are currently providing practice educator training through a level six module to ensure that they are appropriately qualified to support and assess students on placement. The programme team also indicated that they will be undertaking more training through update sessions and workshops to prepare practice educators for the particular requirements of the Anglia Ruskin University programme for students on placements, as distinct from the other higher education institutions that are involved in partnership with the Trust. The visitors therefore require further information on these update session's frequency, length, content and any attendance requirements for practice educators, to ensure that practice placement educators will be fully prepared for receiving students on placement, and therefore that this standard can be met.

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.**

Condition: The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

Reason: The visitors noted that there will be placements in non-ambulance service settings, as highlighted in Document 1, page 10: "The students will also have placement experience in the local healthcare community in the hospitals, acute trusts and other appropriate areas where care is delivered." The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations in the out of hospital care environments. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that

the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide the up-to-date version of the Practice Assessment Document, and information as to how it will be used to support students and practice educators (mentors) in assessment.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team indicated that there have been a number of changes to the Practice Assessment Document (PAD) since the documentation was submitted for the visit. The programme team displayed a 'traffic light system' and talked through how they envisage this will be used alongside the PAD in assessing students in the practice placement setting. The visitors were unclear as to how the two systems will complement each other in assessment, and how placement educators and students will be prepared in using it. They therefore require the full updated version of the documents to support placements, and further information on the way the placement educators and students will be prepared in working with these assessment tools.

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.

Condition: The programme team must provide further clarification in the documentation as to who can sign off assessments in placement at each level.

Reason: In discussions with the placement provider representatives and the programme team, the visitors heard how practice educators (mentors) will be allocated as appropriate to their level of experience, and may be allocated a more qualified practice educator to mentor them through the process. Associate mentors were also discussed as supporting students in placement. It was indicated that the projections for the number of practice educators required for the programme were based on students being placed with their assigned practice educator for 40 per cent of the time, but it was unclear whether they would be placed with other practice educators the other 60 per cent, or with staff who are not practice educators and therefore have not been trained

and prepared for supporting students in the practice setting. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the documentation to support students and placement staff in the practice setting clearly indicates the roles and remits of each of those placement staff who may be working alongside and supporting students in their learning, to include whether they are able to sign off on learning opportunities, at summative or formative level. In this way they can ensure that placement providers and students are prepared with an understanding of assessment procedures and the lines of responsibility.

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

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate the exit awards for the programme in the programme documentation.

Reason: The documentation submitted for this programme also included a separate programme specification for the exit award 'Certificate in Higher Education Emergency Care Practice'. The HCPC were not asked to look at this programme as it will not confer eligibility to apply to the Register. However, in discussion with the senior team at the visit, the name of this exit award, its connotations and the rationale for its distinction as a separate programme were discussed. The senior team confirmed the rationale for the Certificate exit award was not with the expectation that students would leave the programme with a named qualification at this stage and gain employment. The senior team also indicated that the name of this award will be changed to ensure there is no misinterpretation. It was also indicated that the Diploma in Higher Education Emergency Care Practice exit award's name would similarly be changed. The visitors therefore require evidence that the exit awards for the programme have been amended in the programme documentation as indicated in discussions at the visit.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. The external examiner policy for the education provider was provided but it was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register (unless other arrangements are agreed). The visitors therefore need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation, to demonstrate that this standard will be met.

Recommendation

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider is reminded to inform the HCPC if there are significant changes to student recruitment to the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation outlines a minimum student cohort of 20, and a maximum of 120. The visitors' recommendation for approval of the programme is based on the expected target cohort of 80 students. The education provider should therefore keep the HCPC informed through the major change process if the actual recruitment to the programme is significantly higher or lower than 80 students in order for the programme's ability to continue to meet the SETs under the new conditions to be considered.

Paul Bates
Vince Clarke

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd)
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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 'operating department practitioner' 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. The education provider has until 17 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 July 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. 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 also considered their accreditation of 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 of HCPC visitors and profession	Nick Clark (Operating department practitioner) Joanne Thomas (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	60 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Claire Morgan (Cardiff University)
Secretary	Clive Brown (Cardiff University)
Members of the joint panel	Lloyd Howell (External Panel Member) Paul Wicker (External Panel Member) Clare Hughes (Internal Panel Member) Brian Jenkins (Internal 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 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 as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the approved DipHE Operating Department Practice, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two 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

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to confirm the staffing strategy for programme.

Reason: In the transition from 'Dip HE Operating Department Practice' to 'BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice' the programme team intend to increase student numbers from 50 students per year to 60 students per year. The 'BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice' will also run over 3 years (in contrast to the previous 2 year programme) bringing the potential total student numbers from 100 to 180 across the programme at any one time. In a meeting with the senior team it was stated that, to accommodate the increase to student numbers, budgets had been agreed and staffing arrangements are underway. Although it had been outlined that staff arrangements are underway, the visitors were unclear of the overall intended increase to staffing levels. Therefore, the visitors require further clarification to show that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must submit an up to date version of assessment methods and criteria.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the current assessment methods, as evidenced in the documentation, would ensure that students meet the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for operating department practitioners. However, in a meeting with the programme team, it was stated that some of the current assessment methods will be changing before the September intake. The visitors did not receive any documentation evidencing the changes. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of any changes made to the assessment methods to ensure that a student who completes the programme can meet the SOPs for operating department practitioners.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor and develop the practice equipment available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support currency.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the current resources to support student learning were available and appropriate for the delivery of the programme and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from a tour of the facilities, the visitors noted that there was an opportunity for the practice equipment to be updated. More specifically, not all of the practice equipment available to students was reflective of current practice. The visitors recommend that the programme team review the currency of the practice equipment available to students to best reflect the resources used in current practice.

Nick Clark
Joanne Thomas

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme name	Graduate Diploma in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	8 – 9 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 11 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes: MSc in Social Work and PG Dip in Social Work (Master Exit Route Only) - both full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	42 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derrick Chong (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Secretary	Louise O'Connor (Royal Holloway, University of London)

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 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 five 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

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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy which they referred to as 'credit transfer' in their generic college wide policy. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicants through this process. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers, and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the HCPC. For example, the website makes reference to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The HCPC holds regulatory responsibility for social workers in England. References to the GSCC are incorrect as they no longer exist. Also, the visitors noted the programme specification (page eight) states that the programme is "accredited" by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors consider incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as the statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation, and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, these discussions were

not clear in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The SETs mapping document (SET 6.9) clearly stated “condonement is not allowable for the professional qualification”. Discussion with the senior team indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. However there was no mention in the documentation that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The programme should consider revising the 'consent form' given to student at the point of admission, to clearly articulate that they may be expected to participate as a service user 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 of personal information. Discussions with the students indicated that they were aware of the implications of consenting to participate. They outlined that if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader and if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors were satisfied with this and suggest that further clarification can be provided in the consent form to clearly articulate to students they may be expected to participate as a service user in a practical and clinical teaching.

Kim Bown
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme name	MSc in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	8 – 9 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 11 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes: Graduate Diploma in Social Work and PG Dip in Social Work (Master Exit Route Only) - both full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	67 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derrick Chong (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Secretary	Louise O'Connor (Royal Holloway, University of London)

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 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 five 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

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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy which they referred to as 'credit transfer' in their generic college wide policy. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicants through this process. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers, and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the HCPC. For example, the website makes reference to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The HCPC holds regulatory responsibility for social workers in England. References to the GSCC are incorrect as they no longer exist. Also, the visitors noted the programme specification (page eight) states that the programme is "accredited" by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors consider incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as the statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation, and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, these discussions were

not clear in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The SETs mapping document (SET 6.9) clearly stated “condonement is not allowable for the professional qualification”. Discussion with the senior team indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. However there was no mention in the documentation that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The programme should consider revising the 'consent form' given to student at the point of admission, to clearly articulate that they may be expected to participate as a service user 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 of personal information. Discussions with the students indicated that they were aware of the implications of consenting to participate. They outlined that if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader and if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors were satisfied with this and suggest that further clarification can be provided in the consent form to clearly articulate to students they may be expected to participate as a service user in a practical and clinical teaching.

Kim Bown
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Royal Holloway, University of London
Programme name	PG Dip in Social Work (Master Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	8 – 9 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 11 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes: Graduate Diploma in Social Work and MSc in Social Work - both full time. Separate reports exist for these programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Kim Bown (Social worker) Gary Dicken (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	42 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Derrick Chong (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Secretary	Louise O'Connor (Royal Holloway, University of London)

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 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 five 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

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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy which they referred to as 'credit transfer' in their generic college wide policy. However, the visitors were unable to locate any information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicants through this process. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current landscape of statutory regulation for social workers, and contains accurate information about the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the HCPC. For example, the website makes reference to the previous regulator, the General Social Care Council (GSCC). The HCPC holds regulatory responsibility for social workers in England. References to the GSCC are incorrect as they no longer exist. Also, the visitors noted the programme specification (page eight) states that the programme is "accredited" by HCPC, rather than it is 'approved' by HCPC, which is the correct terminology. The visitors consider incorrect and inaccurate statements may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as the statutory regulator. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation, and avoids any potential confusion for students.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate what awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and those exit awards which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, these discussions were

not clear in the documentation. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The SETs mapping document (SET 6.9) clearly stated “condonement is not allowable for the professional qualification”. Discussion with the senior team indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. However there was no mention in the documentation that an aegrotat award does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy.

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 include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard continues to be met

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: The programme should consider revising the 'consent form' given to student at the point of admission, to clearly articulate that they may be expected to participate as a service user 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 of personal information. Discussions with the students indicated that they were aware of the implications of consenting to participate. They outlined that if a student declined to participate then this would be discussed with the personal tutor or the module leader and if needed additional measures would be put in place to ensure there is no detrimental effect to learning. The visitors were satisfied with this and suggest that further clarification can be provided in the consent form to clearly articulate to students they may be expected to participate as a service user in a practical and clinical teaching.

Kim Bown
Gary Dicken

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Southampton Solent 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	16 – 17 April 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work – Work based learning. 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	Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	76 Full time once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2014
Chair	Alan Robinson (Southampton Solent University)
Secretary	Liz Hall (Southampton Solent University)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Strachan (Internal Panel Member) Stewart Bruce-Low (Internal Panel Member) Andrea Collins (External Panel Member) Glynis Marsh (External Panel Member) Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) June Sadd (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 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, the website states ‘Accredited by the professional body that approves social work qualifications’, the word “accreditation” and ‘professional body’ is associated with the HCPC in much of the documentation. HCPC does not accredit any programmes but approves health and care education and training programmes. These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the documentation to ensure the relationship between re-sits and progression on the programme is accurately and clearly articulated in the documentation.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors found inconsistent information regarding re-sit and students’ progression on the programme. For example, course handbook page 16 states ‘there is no automatic right to resit’ but page 32 of the student handbook states ‘you will automatically have one resit’. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that students are given the opportunity to re-sit modules and the team explained how students progress on the programme clearly. As such, the visitors were satisfied by this discussion that the progression requirements of the programme were appropriate as set out by the assessment regulations. However, visitors considered it to be important for students to fully understand how many re-sit opportunity they have and how they progress on the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the documentation in place to support students and ensure correct information is given to students throughout the programme.

Beverley Blythe
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Southampton Solent University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Worked based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social Worker in England
Date of visit	16 – 17 April 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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 2 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 education provider and awarding body reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Social Work – Work based learning. 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	Christine Stogdon (Social worker) Beverley Blythe (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	10 Full time once per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2014
Chair	Alan Robinson (Southampton Solent University)
Secretary	Liz Hall (Southampton Solent University)
Members of the joint panel	Lesley Strachan (Internal Panel Member) Stewart Bruce-Low (Internal Panel Member) Andrea Collins (External Panel Member) Glynis Marsh (External Panel Member) Bob Cecil (The College of Social Work) June Sadd (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 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, the website states 'Accredited by the professional body that approves social work qualifications', the word "accreditation" and 'professional body' is associated with the HCPC in much of the documentation. HCPC does not accredit any programmes but approves health and care education and training programmes. These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate.

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

Condition: The programme team must revise the documentation to ensure the relationship between re-sits and progression on the programme is accurately and clearly articulated in the documentation.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors found inconsistent information regarding re-sit and students' progression on the programme. For example, course handbook page 16 states 'there is no automatic right to resit' but page 32 of the student handbook states 'you will automatically have one resit'. The visitors heard from discussions with the programme team that students are given the opportunity to re-sit modules and the team explained how students progress on the programme clearly. As such, the visitors were satisfied by this discussion that the progression requirements of the programme were appropriate as set out by the assessment regulations. However, visitors considered it to be important for students to fully understand how many re-sit opportunity they have and how they progress on the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the documentation in place to support students and ensure correct information is given to students throughout the programme.

Beverley Blythe
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	BA Honours in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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 or 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. The education provider has until 6 June to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 July 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

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 considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes “MA in Social Work” and “Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice”. 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 professional body outline their decisions on the programmes’ status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker in England) David Ward (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	75
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Deborah Allcock (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) Robert Johns (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 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 have also made a number of 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

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit provided little evidence of the arrangements that are in place to ensure the continued security of the programme for future cohorts. In a meeting with the senior team the visitors heard several statements regarding the security and future of the programme, however, the visitors were unable to contextualise this information in the format provided. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme fits into the education providers' business plan to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided it states that; "HCPC guidance sets targets for social work courses" BA Handbook, page 5. The HCPC does not set targets for education providers we set standards of education and training (SETs). "...no person may be awarded the MA without completing all modules" BA Handbook, page 19. This statement should reference the BA programme not the MA. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols are in place to obtain consent.

Reason: Through documentation and discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The programme team clarified that they emphasise to students only to share what they feel comfortable with. However, the visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider provides a more formal training process to all those involved in the interview process to ensure that the equality and diversity policy is being applied consistently and clearly at programme level.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided at the visit and in discussion with the programme team that the education provider has an equality and diversity policy in relation to applicants and students. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, from the evidence given the visitors could not determine how all those involved in the interview process were trained to implement the equality and diversity policies. In particular, the visitors heard that service users and carers had an involvement in the interview process but were not given any formal training for the interview days. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider provides formal training for all those involved in the interview process to ensure that equality and diversity policies are being applied clearly and consistently at programme level. In this way the education provider may be better able to identify where issues concerning equality and diversity may occur and put in place actions to circumvent any such issues arising.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that staff development strategies are revisited to take into consideration the feedback from staff and enable staff to maintain their own professional and research development.

Reason: The visitors discussed the system in place for staff development for the programme team and it was clear that, although difficult at times, the staff were engaging in CPD activities. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, it was noted that finding time and resources to enable CPD could sometimes be restrictive for staff. The visitors understood the difficulties faced; however they wish to stress to the programme team the need to continually ensure that the time and resources are available to aid members of staff in their CPD and research activities. The visitors also noted the programme team's desire to further develop themselves with higher level qualifications. Therefore, the visitors wish to encourage the programme team to revisit staff development strategies to take into consideration the feedback from staff.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team consider maintaining currency of records for practice placement educators and their training.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was clear that the education provider runs regular initial training courses for

practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend the programme team consider implementing a formal system to provide and monitor refresher training to practice placement educators. In this way the visitors felt that the programme team may be able to more easily evaluate the currency of placement educators training and evaluate where any additional training may or should be delivered.

David Childs
David Ward

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	15 – 16 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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 or 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. The education provider has until 13 June to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 14 July 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

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 considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the following programmes “BA Honours in Social Work” and “Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice”. 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 professional body outline their decisions on the programmes’ status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Childs (Social worker in England) David Ward (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Deborah Allcock (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)
Members of the joint panel	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work) Robert Johns (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 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 four 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 number of 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

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit provided little evidence of the arrangements that are in place to ensure the continued security of the programme for future cohorts. In a meeting with the senior team the visitors heard several statements regarding the security and future of the programme, however, the visitors were unable to contextualise this information in the format provided. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme fits into the education providers' business plan to ensure that this standard continues to be met.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided it states that; "As well as regulating individual social workers and students, the HCPC also regulates the performance of social work courses." The HCPC does not regulate students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence that, where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols are in place to obtain consent.

Reason: Through documentation and discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that consent was obtained verbally from students when participating as service users in practical teaching. The programme team clarified that they emphasise to students only to share what they feel comfortable with. However, the visitors were not presented with clear protocols to demonstrate that a formal system is in place for explicitly gaining students' informed consent before they participate as service users in practical teaching. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider provides a more formal training process to all those involved in the interview process to ensure that the equality and diversity policy is being applied consistently and clearly at programme level.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documentation provided at the visit and in discussion with the programme team that the education provider has an equality and diversity policy in relation to applicants and students. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, from the evidence given the visitors could not determine how all those involved in the interview process were trained to implement the equality and diversity policies. In particular, the visitors heard that service users and carers had an involvement in the interview process but were not given any formal training for the interview days. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider provides formal training for all those involved in the interview process to ensure that equality and diversity policies are being applied clearly and consistently at programme level. In this way the education provider may be better able to identify where issues concerning equality and diversity may occur and put in place actions to circumvent any such issues arising.

3.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that staff development strategies are revisited to take into consideration the feedback from staff and enable staff to maintain their own professional and research development.

Reason: The visitors discussed the system in place for staff development for the programme team and it was clear that, although difficult at times, the staff were engaging in CPD activities. Therefore the visitors are satisfied that this standard is met. However, it was noted that finding time and resources to enable CPD could sometimes be restrictive for staff. The visitors understood the difficulties faced; however they wish to stress to the programme team the need to continually ensure that the time and resources are available to aid members of staff in their CPD and research activities. The visitors also noted the programme team's desire to further develop themselves with higher level qualifications. Therefore, the visitors wish to encourage the programme team to revisit staff development strategies to take into consideration the feedback from staff.

5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team consider maintaining currency of records for practice placement educators and their training.

Reason: From the discussion with the programme team and the practice placement providers it was clear that the education provider runs regular initial training courses for

practice placement educators as well as ensuring a currency in their knowledge. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, the visitors recommend the programme team consider implementing a formal system to provide and monitor refresher training to practice placement educators. In this way the visitors felt that the programme team may be able to more easily evaluate the currency of placement educators training and evaluate where any additional training may or should be delivered.

David Childs
David Ward

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bradford
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma Mental Health Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	15 – 16 April 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 a protected title 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.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health professional (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until Friday 13 June to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on Wednesday 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by Monday 14 July 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on Tuesday 26 August 2014.

Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

This visit was part of a joint event. The visit also considered the following programmes – BA (Hons) Degree in Social Work and MA Degree in Social Work. The professional body (reviewing social work provision only) 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 criteria for approving approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	Dorothy Smith (Approved mental health professional) Lynn Heath (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	12 per intake once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Deborah Allcock (University of Bradford)
Secretary	Kirstin Bell (University of Bradford)

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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<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"/>

During the visit the HCPC also met with service user and carer representatives.

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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 36 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion 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 criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

A.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 to demonstrate how they inform potential applicants of the different stages of the admission process and requirements including prior experience in mental health.

Reason: Documentation received prior to the visit included the programme specification which outlined the education provider admission requirements including prior experience in (page 8) “Applicants who wish to apply for only the Postgraduate Certificate in Mental Health ...will need to demonstrate significant prior experience in mental health through employment, voluntary work or as service users or carers”. During the visit, the visitors learnt students need to have two years’ experience in mental health before they will be considered as potential students for this programme.

During the visit it was also indicated there are different stages to the admissions process which are held within the local authorities and then the education provider. The visitors noted an applicant may be approved through the local authority process but then not be accepted via the education provider’s process. The visitors considered it to be important for applicants to be aware they may not get through all stages of the admissions process. The visitors also felt that exact details of the admission requirements should be clearly laid out to potential students so they are able to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they inform potential applicants about the requirements and different stages of the admissions process.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the management structure of the programme, including the lines of responsibility and links to the practice placement providers.

Reason: At the visit the panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement providers and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions, the visitors were unable to determine the management processes in place for the programme. The visitors were subsequently unable to determine if there are effective structures in place to manage the programme. The visitors require the programme team to provide further evidence which clearly articulates:

- the management structure of the programme;
- the roles and lines of responsibility;
- where the links to the management of practice placement providers are; and
- any associated processes.

This will enable the visitors to determine this programme will be effectively managed.

B.14 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 education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they monitor attendance at practice placement and revise the programme documentation to include these processes and policies for absence and monitoring.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted the mandatory attendance requirements. The visitors learnt students' attendance was recorded and monitored to deal with any issues around attendance in the academic setting. For the practice placement settings students must inform their practice educators of any absences. The visitors however could not determine how the education provider would be made aware of the students' attendance at practice placements. The education provider may need to become involved if there are any issues with attendance at practice placement. The visitors require the education provider to submit evidence to demonstrate how they monitor attendance at practice placement and to revise the programme documentation to include these processes and policies for absence and monitoring.

C.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the current regulatory landscape of the HCPC.

Reason: The programme intends to deliver graduates that are eligible to be approved as an AMHP. The visitors noted from the criteria mapping document, reading the documentation and from discussions with the students that the programme is heavily focused on the key competencies laid out in the mental health regulations 2008 England (AMHP). The visitors noted during the meetings with the students that they knew very little about the role of the HCPC and the importance of the HCPC's Criteria for AMHPs section two. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme curriculum to reflect the role of HCPC. In order to be satisfied this criterion is met, the visitors require the education provider to submit revised curriculum documentation to reflect the current regulatory landscape of the HCPC.

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation to ensure students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors could not identify where students are made aware of the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP. The visitors therefore require particular evidence about where in the programme students are made aware of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP, if they are included in any teaching, and if there is opportunity for students to access any of these standards. In this way the visitors can determine

how the programme team ensure that students understand the implications of these standards.

D.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme would use the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) system for approving and monitoring placements through the QAPL Audit. Discussion at the visit indicated this system was in the process of being implemented for this programme and the education provider will be able to ensure the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. Due to the placement systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors note this condition relates to other criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme would use the QAPL system for approving and monitoring placements through the QAPL Audit. Discussion at the visit indicated this system was in the process of being implemented for this programme. Due to the placement audit systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors note this condition relates to other criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the QAPL system will be used for this programme to ensure the education provider maintains overall responsibility for the approval and monitoring of placements.

D.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme would use the QAPL system for approving and monitoring placements through the QAPL Audit. Discussion at the visit indicated this system was in the process of being implemented for this programme and the education provider will be able to ensure the practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. Due to the placement systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors note this condition relates to other criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure the practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in relation to students.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme would use the QAPL system for approving and monitoring placements through the QAPL Audit. Discussion at the visit indicated this system was in the process of being implemented for this programme and the education provider will be able to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. Due to the placement systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors note this condition relates to other criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

D.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: Documentation provided prior to the visit indicated the programme would use the QAPL system for approving and monitoring placements through the QAPL Audit. Discussion at the visit indicated this system was in the process of being implemented for this programme and the education provider will be able to ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Due to the placement systems being in development the visitors are unable to determine how this criterion is met. The visitors note this condition relates to other criteria in section D. The visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Condition: The education provider must ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: Documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated the programme has a requirement for practice educators to have completed a practice educator training programme delivered externally. This was reiterated during the visit in discussions with the programme team. The visitors were concerned that although the programme has the requirement for all practice educators to have completed the training, they could not determine how the programme specific information was disseminated to practice educators initially or the ongoing processes for informing practice educators of changes made to the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating the education provider ensures all practice educators have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training.

D.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 of the collaboration between the programme team and practice placement providers.

Reason: During the practice placement providers meeting, the visitors were made aware that some of the placement providers were dissatisfied with the limited collaboration arrangements in place. For example, several of the placement provider representatives commented that they did not meet sufficiently and as regularly with the education provider. The visitors consider effective collaboration should mean there are strong links from the management of practice placements to the programme management team. This criterion links to criterion B.2. In order to be satisfied this criterion is met the visitors require evidence showing the links between the management of practice placement providers and programme team.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to correct the progression and achievement requirements.

Reason: Documentation indicated the programme is made up of two parts. The first three modules undertaken could lead to an exit point with a Postgraduate Certificate. The final two modules lead to the final AMHP award of Postgraduate Diploma. The documentation indicated that students could not progress onto the final two modules without successfully completing the first three modules (Programme Specification, page 5). Discussion at the visit with the programme team however, indicated this is not the case and students can progress to the final two modules if they need to re-sit from the first three modules. The visitors considered the documentation to be misleading and therefore require the education provider to revise programme documentation to correct the progression and achievement requirements.

E.8 Assessment regulations must clearly specify that any requirements for an aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to be approved as an AMHP. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to be approved as an AMHP.

Lynn Heath
Dorothy Smith

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Hertfordshire
Programme name	Postgraduate Certificate Applied Mental Health Practice Formerly: 1) MSc Social Interventions (Mental Health) and 2) Postgraduate Diploma Social Interventions (Mental Health).
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	6 – 7 May 2014

Contents

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

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health professionals (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider also 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 all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the criteria for approving approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes. A separate report produced by the education provider, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and visitor role	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional) Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Ruth Wood
Proposed student numbers	30 maximum per cohort, two intakes a year (September and January)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Jo Cahill (University of Hertfordshire)
Secretary	Liz Mellor (University of Hertfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Jan Bowyer (Internal Panel Member) Alison Fraser (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Korek (Internal Panel Member) Mandy Schofield (External 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 criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<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 approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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 41 of the criteria have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine criteria.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be recommended for approval. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion 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 criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

A.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 revisit the admissions materials to ensure it is clear, consistent and provides applicants with the information they require making an informed decision about the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted before the visit the visitors noted further clarifications could be added for some of the entry requirements. The applicants are asked for a “reference as to suitability” (Programme specification, section F). Upon discussion it was clarified applicants needed to be recommended by the lead Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) along with an agreement from their line manager. The requirements also ask for “Achievement of a further relevant programme of study” (Programme specification, section F). Discussion with the programme team indicated this could mean a specific pre-AMHP module but may not. There was limited information about the pre-AMHP module within the information provided. Discussion also indicated the local authority or the programme team makes the decision of whether or not the pre-AMHP module is an entry requirement for an applicant. From the documentation the visitors were also unclear as to how the admissions processes apply the accredited prior certificated learning (APCL) and accredited prior experiential learning (APEL) policies. Through discussion it was indicated these would be used for students who had interrupted their studies and were re-joining the programme. The visitors considered the admissions materials should enable applicants to make an informed decision about the programme and therefore should include clarifications about:

- the suitability reference;
- the further relevant programme of study;
- the pre-AMHP module; and
- the APCL / APEL policies).

The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the admissions materials to ensure it is clear, consistent and provides applicants with the information they require making an informed decision about the programme.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation.

Reason: During discussions at the visit it was indicated for the education provider revalidation purposes the programme team would be making extensive changes to the programme specification, programme handbook, module descriptors and placement portfolio. The visitors additionally noted some errors through the documentation that require correcting. The programme handbook (page 7) states that graduates “will need to register as an AMHP with HCPC”. HCPC do not register AMHPs and so this statement needs to be corrected. The Practice Assessors Guidance document (page 1) states HCPC have specified terminology to be used for the role of practice supervisors / practice assessors. This is incorrect; the HCPC does not specify any terminology in this way. The visitors also noted there was inconsistency when referring

to the number of placement days required. Discussion indicated there are 30 placement days and 2 additional days for writing up the portfolio. The visitors are required to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used and therefore require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation as specified above and ensure the incorrect references are corrected.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the criteria in section 2

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 criteria in section 2 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Reason: From the section 2 criteria mapping submitted the visitors could not identify how the learning outcomes for the modules mapped to the criteria because the mapping document referred in the main to timetabled lectures. The visitors were particularly concerned with where in the programme content and learning outcomes, child protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice (criterion 1.8) would be covered. Discussion with the programme team indicated adult protection procedures were specifically included however the programme team were unable to identify where and how child protection was located within the curriculum. The visitors suggest the education provider submit another mapping document which clearly identifies the module learning outcomes which will address each criterion and provides further explanations and evidence for criterion 1.8. As indicated above, the visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating this criterion is met.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: During discussion at the visit, it was indicated there are formal relationships between the education provider and the practice placement provider held within a contract. It was further discussed this contract is at strategic level and does not include operational management procedures. The programme team highlighted placement quality assurance processes occurred through initial meetings prior to involving students, through mid-way meetings as part of the students' placements and then were reinforced by feedback after the students' placements had ended. The programme team indicated there were no formal procedures and associated documentation in place and that they would need to do further work to formalise the quality and monitoring arrangements. The visitors note that Section D of the criteria should be considered when approving and monitoring all placements. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors therefore require further evidence.

D.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence demonstrating how they ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: During discussion at the visit, it was indicated there are formal relationships between the education provider and the practice placement provider held within a contract. It was further discussed how the contract is a strategic level contract and does not include operational management procedures. The programme team highlighted placement quality assurance processes occurred through initial meetings prior to involving students, through mid-way meetings as part of the students' placements and then were reinforced by feedback after the students' placements had ended. The programme team indicated there were no formal procedures and associated documentation in place and that they would need to do further work to formalise the quality and monitoring arrangements. The visitors note that criterion D.4 should be considered here. The visitors suggest the programme team work to hold lists of appropriate practice educators as part of the formal approval and monitoring processes. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors therefore require further evidence.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the competencies set out in section 2 of the criteria

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the assessment strategy and design ensures those who successfully complete the programme will be able to meet the criteria in section 2 of the approval criteria for approved mental health professional (AMHP) programmes.

Reason: From the section 2 criteria mapping submitted the visitors could not identify how the assessment of the learning outcomes for the modules mapped to the criteria because the mapping document referred in the main to timetabled lectures. The visitors were particularly concerned with where child protection procedures in relation to AMHP practice (criterion 1.8) would be assessed. Discussion with the programme team indicated adult protection procedures were specifically included however the programme team were unable to identify where and how child protection was assessed within the curriculum. The internal revalidation panel indicated to the programme team they could use module guide templates which allow for the mapping of module learning outcomes to assessments. The visitors suggest this could be appropriate method of evidencing this criterion. This condition is linked to the condition under C.1. As indicated above, the visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating this criterion is met.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes

Condition: The education provider must submit revised programme documentation demonstrating the assessment methods.

Reason: During discussions at the visit it was indicated the programme team would be making extensive changes to the module descriptors to update the content, correct any inaccuracies in the assessment methods listed and ensure they were complete. In order to determine that the assessment methods are appropriate to ensure the learning outcomes are being met the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation demonstrating the assessment methods.

E.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective practice as an AMHP

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to assure the visitors the measurement of student performance ensures safe and effective practice as an AMHP.

Reason: Discussion at the visit articulated the assessment processes for the programme portfolio. The portfolio is assessed in the first instance by the student's practice assessor. The portfolio is then reviewed by two practice assessors who are unknown to the student. The two practice assessors then come together to agree final outcomes on the student's demonstration of whether the AMHP competencies have been met. Members of the programme team then undertake the academic assessment of the portfolio before the recommendation on the student is taken to the Board of Examiners. The visitors noted this is an integrated programme with academic and practical elements of the programme delivered and assessed. However, the visitors were concerned there is no integration of the academic theory and practice learning assessments. The visitors reflected this may not appropriately assess the students' demonstration of evidence based practice and how it informs their safe and effective practice as an AMHP. The visitors therefore require further evidence to assure the visitors that the measurement of student performance ensures safe and effective practice as an AMHP.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme

Condition: The education provider must confirm the programme awards and ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates it clearly.

Reason: This criterion requires education providers to clearly articulate the awards that can and cannot lead to eligibility to apply to work as an AMHP. At the visit, the internal panel indicated the programme award title presented for validation could not be used as it was already in use for an existing programme award. In order to determine this criterion is met the visitors require the education provider to confirm the approved programme title and ensure the programme documentation, including advertising materials, articulates it clearly.

Recommendation

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives on their practice as an AMHP

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider reviews the programme documentation with the intention to further emphasise the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and the discussion with the students the visitors were satisfied this criterion is met. The visitors did note that there were areas in the documentation provided that could also have mentioned the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives. The visitors therefore recommend the education provider reviews the programme documentation with the intention to further emphasise the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics and / or the NMC's code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics for nurses and midwives where appropriate.

David Abrahart
Christine Stogdon

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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. The education provider has until 17 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

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 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 education provider did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the MA in Social Work and PG Diploma in Social Work (masters exit route only). 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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Ward (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	55 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Peter Jeffries (University of Kent)
Secretaries	Chloe Ewen (University of Kent) Taryn Duhig (University of Kent) Louise Tollervey (University of Kent) Annikki Laitinen (University of Kent) Justine Reid (University of Kent)
Members of the joint panel	Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work) Andrew Linton (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 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 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 have also made a number of 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

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must further demonstrate how they prepare those involved in assessing applicants in the admissions process in relation to equality and diversity policies in admissions.

Reason: The visitors noted that service users and carers are involved in the admissions process through observing and assessing group discussions, and social work practitioners sit alongside lecturers on interview panels. In discussion the visitors heard how the programme team have good working relationships with the practitioners. As social workers, it is expected they will come with the appropriate values for implementing equality and diversity policies and fairness in interviewing applicants. The practitioners are often asked to attend early on interview days to prepare with the academic staff for the interviewing process. Service users and carers receive preparatory training and will sit in on a group discussion prior to being an observer who is assessing. The visitors were not clear as to whether this preparation covers equality and diversity, or whether there is a formal process in place to ensure everyone involved in the admissions process, including academic staff, are informed on the education provider's policies, and are implementing them appropriately. The visitors also reviewed the Admissions Handbook document, and noted there is a section on Equality and Diversity (page 4). This information details the equality and diversity initiatives in place for students once they are on the programme, but the visitors could not clearly see how assessors or interviewers are prepared to implement the policy in the admissions process. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the mechanisms used to ensure the education provider's equality and diversity policies are put into practice in the admissions process.

Recommendations

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to monitor the communication mechanisms with students and external examiners to ensure the appropriate feedback loops are in place.

Reason: In discussion with students at the visit, there were a number of instances where students were unclear on the reasons behind decisions on the programme, or where they would appreciate further information in response to feedback they give. For instance, students were unclear on the reasons for the decision taken in bursary allocation or the consistency of decisions in the concessions process. The visitors clarified these matters with the programme team and were satisfied that the programme was being managed effectively, but advise the programme team to monitor the way they communicate decisions, processes and actions with students. The visitors also noted that the external examiners for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme had raised the issue of anonymity at examination boards for the last two years. The visitors heard the education provider's response to this at the visit and were satisfied this standard of education and training is met, however, the fact that the issue was raised by the external examiners over a number of years indicated that the response provided to them by the education provider had not clarified the matter for them. They also state that they did not receive a response to their recommendations to the University the previous year (page 12, Appendix 1). The visitors therefore recommend the communication mechanisms with external examiners are also kept under review.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to review the provision of transport arrangements for those who require wheelchair access to ensure there are accessible facilities for students in all settings.

Reason: The visitors noted a comment in the minutes of the Partnership Initiative Meeting (Monday 14th October 2013) with service user and carer contributors to the programme, referring to the lack of wheelchair access on the campus shuttle buses which serve the University of Kent at the Medway Campus. The education provider confirmed at the visit that there is currently no wheelchair access on the shuttle service, but that anyone requiring transport with wheelchair access will have a taxi supplied. A travel coordinator will also work with anyone requiring wheelchair access to discuss their travel plan. The visitors were satisfied that the facilities to support students were sufficient, but recommend that the availability and accessibility of transport for wheelchair users be monitored to ensure there are accessible facilities to support students and programme contributors on campus.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to keep under review the collaboration and contributions of placement providers at strategic level, to ensure this continues to be effective.

Reason: In discussion with the practice placement providers and educators, and the programme team at the visit, the visitors heard the various communication channels which help to build effective collaboration with the education provider and partners. The visitors heard how the practice assessment panel, partnership agreements and social work education group provide the required mechanisms for collaborative working to ensure that there are quality placements available for the students. The placement provider representatives discussed the way they communicate with the programme team and attend the Board of Studies when they are able. Many also stated that they were not consulted about the new programme provision, and the visitors heard that there is currently only a limited amount of collaborative working with practice placement providers at a strategic, management level. The programme team confirmed that they have upcoming meetings and plans to try and encourage more regular collaborative opportunities at director level. The visitors recommend that the collaboration at a strategic level is kept as a focus to ensure it is effective in providing overarching direction for the provision and support of quality placements on the programme.

David Ward
David Childs

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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. The education provider has until 17 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

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 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 education provider did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social Work and PG Diploma in Social Work (masters exit route only). 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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Ward (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	15 per year inclusive of students from the PG Diploma in Social Work (masters exit route only) programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Peter Jeffries (University of Kent)
Secretaries	Chloe Ewen (University of Kent) Taryn Duhig (University of Kent) Louise Tollervey (University of Kent) Annikki Laitinen (University of Kent) Justine Reid (University of Kent)
Members of the joint panel	Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work) Andrew Linton (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"/>

The HCPC saw external examiner reports for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. There are no past external examiner reports for this programme because it is a new 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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, and one student on the MA in Social Work was present for part of the meeting.

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 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 have also made a number of 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

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must further demonstrate how they prepare those involved in assessing applicants in the admissions process in relation to equality and diversity policies in admissions.

Reason: The visitors noted that service users and carers are involved in the admissions process through observing and assessing group discussions, and social work practitioners sit alongside lecturers on interview panels. In discussion the visitors heard how the programme team have good working relationships with the practitioners. As social workers, it is expected they will come with the appropriate values for implementing equality and diversity policies and fairness in interviewing applicants. The practitioners are often asked to attend early on interview days to prepare with the academic staff for the interviewing process. Service users and carers receive preparatory training and will sit in on a group discussion prior to being an observer who is assessing. The visitors were not clear as to whether this preparation covers equality and diversity, or whether there is a formal process in place to ensure everyone involved in the admissions process, including academic staff, are informed on the education provider's policies, and are implementing them appropriately. The visitors also reviewed the Admissions Handbook document, and noted there is a section on Equality and Diversity (page 4). This information details the equality and diversity initiatives in place for students once they are on the programme, but the visitors could not clearly see how assessors or interviewers are prepared to implement the policy in the admissions process. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the mechanisms used to ensure the education provider's equality and diversity policies are put into practice in the admissions process.

Recommendations

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to monitor the communication mechanisms with key stakeholders to ensure the appropriate feedback loops are in place.

Reason: In discussion with students at the visit, there were a number of instances where students were unclear on the reasons behind decisions on the programme, or where they would appreciate further information in response to feedback they give. For instance, students were unclear on the reasons for the decision taken in bursary allocation or the consistency of decisions in the concessions process. The visitors clarified these matters with the programme team and were satisfied that the programme was being managed effectively, but advise the programme team to monitor the way they communicate decisions, processes and actions with students. The visitors also noted that the external examiners for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme (there were no external examiner reports for this programme as this is the first year running) had raised the issue of anonymity at examination boards for the last two years. The visitors heard the education provider's response to this at the visit and were satisfied this standard of education and training is met, however, the fact that the issue was raised by the external examiners over a number of years indicated that the response provided to them by the education provider had not clarified the matter for them. They also state that they did not receive a response to their recommendations to the University the previous year (page 12, Appendix 1). The visitors therefore recommend the communication mechanisms with external examiners are also kept under review going forward.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to review the provision of transport arrangements for those who require wheelchair access to ensure there are accessible facilities for students in all settings.

Reason: The visitors noted a comment in the minutes of the Partnership Initiative Meeting (Monday 14th October 2013) with service user and carer contributors to the programme, referring to the lack of wheelchair access on the campus shuttle buses which serve the University of Kent at the Medway Campus. The education provider confirmed at the visit that there is currently no wheelchair access on the shuttle service, but that anyone requiring transport with wheelchair access will have a taxi supplied. A travel coordinator will also work with anyone requiring wheelchair access to discuss their travel plan. The visitors were satisfied that the facilities to support students were sufficient, but recommend that the availability and accessibility of transport for wheelchair users be monitored to ensure there are accessible facilities to support students and programme contributors on campus.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Recommendation: The programme team is advised to keep under review the collaboration and contributions of placement providers at strategic level, to ensure this continues to be effective.

Reason: In discussion with the practice placement providers and educators, and the programme team at the visit, the visitors heard the various communication channels which help to build effective collaboration with the education provider and partners. The visitors heard how the practice assessment panel, partnership agreements and social work education group provide the required mechanisms for collaborative working to ensure that there are quality placements available for the students. The placement provider representatives discussed the way they communicate with the programme team and attend the Board of Studies when they are able. Many also stated that they were not consulted about the new programme provision, and the visitors heard that there is currently only a limited amount of collaborative working with practice placement providers at a strategic, management level. The programme team confirmed that they have upcoming meetings and plans to try and encourage more regular collaborative opportunities at director level. The visitors recommend that the collaboration at a strategic level is kept as a focus to ensure it is effective in providing overarching direction for the provision and support of quality placements on the programme.

David Ward
David Childs

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Kent
Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (masters exit route only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	13 – 14 May 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	7

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. The education provider has until 17 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

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 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 education provider did not review the programme, but the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social Work and MA in Social Work. 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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	David Ward (Social worker) David Childs (Social worker)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Nicola Baker
Proposed student numbers	15 per year inclusive of students from the MA in Social Work programme
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Peter Jeffries (University of Kent)
Secretaries	Chloe Ewen (University of Kent) Taryn Duhig (University of Kent) Louise Tollervey (University of Kent) Annikki Laitinen (University of Kent) Justine Reid (University of Kent)
Members of the joint panel	Kate Johnson (The College of Social Work) Andrew Linton (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"/>

The HCPC saw external examiner reports for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme. There are no past external examiner reports for this programme because it is a new 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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, and one student on the MA in Social Work was present for part of the meeting.

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 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 have also made a number of 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

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must further demonstrate how they prepare those involved in assessing applicants in the admissions process in relation to equality and diversity policies in admissions.

Reason: The visitors noted that service users and carers are involved in the admissions process through observing and assessing group discussions, and social work practitioners sit alongside lecturers on interview panels. In discussion the visitors heard how the programme team have good working relationships with the practitioners. As social workers, it is expected they will come with the appropriate values for implementing equality and diversity policies and fairness in interviewing applicants. The practitioners are often asked to attend early on interview days to prepare with the academic staff for the interviewing process. Service users and carers receive preparatory training and will sit in on a group discussion prior to being an observer who is assessing. The visitors were not clear as to whether this preparation covers equality and diversity, or whether there is a formal process in place to ensure everyone involved in the admissions process, including academic staff, are informed on the education provider's policies, and are implementing them appropriately. The visitors also reviewed the Admissions Handbook document, and noted there is a section on Equality and Diversity (page 4). This information details the equality and diversity initiatives in place for students once they are on the programme, but the visitors could not clearly see how assessors or interviewers are prepared to implement the policy in the admissions process. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the mechanisms used to ensure the education provider's equality and diversity policies are put into practice in the admissions process.

Recommendations

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to monitor the communication mechanisms with key stakeholders to ensure the appropriate feedback loops are in place.

Reason: In discussion with students at the visit, there were a number of instances where students were unclear on the reasons behind decisions on the programme, or where they would appreciate further information in response to feedback they give. For instance, students were unclear on the reasons for the decision taken in bursary allocation or the consistency of decisions in the concessions process. The visitors clarified these matters with the programme team and were satisfied that the programme was being managed effectively, but advise the programme team to monitor the way they communicate decisions, processes and actions with students. The visitors also noted that the external examiners for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme (there were no external examiner reports for this programme as this is the first year running) had raised the issue of anonymity at examination boards for the last two years. The visitors heard the education provider's response to this at the visit and were satisfied this standard of education and training is met, however, the fact that the issue was raised by the external examiners over a number of years indicated that the response provided to them by the education provider had not clarified the matter for them. They also state that they did not receive a response to their recommendations to the University the previous year (page 12, Appendix 1). The visitors therefore recommend the communication mechanisms with external examiners are also kept under review going forward.

3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to review the provision of transport arrangements for those who require wheelchair access to ensure there are accessible facilities for students in all settings.

Reason: The visitors noted a comment in the minutes of the Partnership Initiative Meeting (Monday 14th October 2013) with service user and carer contributors to the programme, referring to the lack of wheelchair access on the campus shuttle buses which serve the University of Kent at the Medway Campus. The education provider confirmed at the visit that there is currently no wheelchair access on the shuttle service, but that anyone requiring transport with wheelchair access will have a taxi supplied. A travel coordinator will also work with anyone requiring wheelchair access to discuss their travel plan. The visitors were satisfied that the facilities to support students were sufficient, but recommend that the availability and accessibility of transport for wheelchair users be monitored to ensure there are accessible facilities to support students and programme contributors on campus.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Recommendation: The programme team are advised to keep under review the collaboration and contributions of placement providers at strategic level, to ensure this continues to be effective.

Reason: In discussion with the practice placement providers and educators, and the programme team at the visit, the visitors heard the various communication channels which help to build effective collaboration with the education provider and partners. The visitors heard how the practice assessment panel, partnership agreements and social work education group provide the required mechanisms for collaborative working to ensure that there are quality placements available for the students. The placement provider representatives discussed the way they communicate with the programme team and attend the Board of Studies when they are able. Many also stated that they were not consulted about the new programme provision, and the visitors heard that there is currently only a limited amount of collaborative working with practice placement providers at a strategic, management level. The programme team confirmed that they have upcoming meetings and plans to try and encourage more regular collaborative opportunities at director level. The visitors recommend that the collaboration at a strategic level is kept as a focus to ensure it is effective in providing overarching direction for the provision and support of quality placements on the programme.

David Ward
David Childs

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sussex
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 visit also considered the MA in Social work and the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only).

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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	45 per cohort once a year
First approved intake	September 2014
Chair	Robert Johns (University of East London)
Secretary	Jana Valekova (University of Sussex)
Members of the joint panel	Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) Annie Hudson (The College of Social Work) (Observing)

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 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 four 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

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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the bursary arrangements in relation to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted some references to a limited number of bursaries for social work students, and changes to the system for social work bursaries. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how information around the new bursary structure and allocation process will be communicated to potential applicants of the programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for potential applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students have a clear understanding of the bursary allocation process, and are kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on 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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme, whereby applications through this route will be considered on an individual basis, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what 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 of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing an HCPC approved programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award other than the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how this was clearly communicated to students, and therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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 there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards, that they 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.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider making the equality and diversity policy available to potential applicants of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the programme has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, and therefore that this standard is met. Whilst the equality and diversity policy was included in the student handbook, the visitors recommend that this is also made available to potential applicants of the programme, to ensure that applicants are able to understand them in relation to the admissions procedures of the programme.

Gary Hickman
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sussex
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social work and the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only).

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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year (across both Masters and PG Dip exit route)
First approved intake	September 2014
Chair	Robert Johns (University of East London)
Secretary	Jana Valekova (University of Sussex)
Members of the joint panel	Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) Annie Hudson (The College of Social Work) (Observing)

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 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 four 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

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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the bursary arrangements in relation to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted some references to a limited number of bursaries for social work students, and changes to the system for social work bursaries. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how information around the new bursary structure and allocation process will be communicated to potential applicants of the programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for potential applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students have a clear understanding of the bursary allocation process, and are kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on 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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme, whereby applications through this route will be considered on an individual basis, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what 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 of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing an HCPC approved programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award other than the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how this was clearly communicated to students, and therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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 there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards, that they 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.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider making the equality and diversity policy available to potential applicants of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the programme has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, and therefore that this standard is met. Whilst the equality and diversity policy was included in the student handbook, the visitors recommend that this is also made available to potential applicants of the programme, to ensure that applicants are able to understand them in relation to the admissions procedures of the programme.

Gary Hickman
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Sussex
Programme name	PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	29 – 30 April 2014

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

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 approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 2 July 2014.

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 visit also considered the BA (Hons) Social work and the MA in Social Work.

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 professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Gary Hickman (Social worker) Graham Noyce (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Louise Devlin
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year (across both Masters and PG Dip exit route)
First approved intake	September 2014
Chair	Robert Johns (University of East London)
Secretary	Jana Valekova (University of Sussex)
Members of the joint panel	Jim Greer (The College of Social Work) Terry Williams (The College of Social Work) Annie Hudson (The College of Social Work) (Observing)

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 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 four 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

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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students are made aware of the bursary arrangements in relation to the programme.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted some references to a limited number of bursaries for social work students, and changes to the system for social work bursaries. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation how information around the new bursary structure and allocation process will be communicated to potential applicants of the programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for potential applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants and students have a clear understanding of the bursary allocation process, and are kept up to date regarding possible changes to the bursary structure. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on 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 revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there is an accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy in place for the programme, whereby applications through this route will be considered on an individual basis, and there is a thorough matching process between an applicants' prior learning and the learning outcomes of the programme. However, the visitors could not see how applicants to the programme would be informed about the process, told what 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 of how the education provider informs potential applicants of the AP(E)L policy and process for the programme. This will ensure that applicants are given the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

Reason: From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing an HCPC approved programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award other than the PG Diploma in Social Work (Masters Exit Route Only) would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors could not determine how this was clearly communicated to students, and therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

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 there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards, that they 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.

Recommendations

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider making the equality and diversity policy available to potential applicants of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the programme has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, and therefore that this standard is met. Whilst the equality and diversity policy was included in the student handbook, the visitors recommend that this is also made available to potential applicants of the programme, to ensure that applicants are able to understand them in relation to the admissions procedures of the programme.

Gary Hickman
Graham Noyce

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of the West of England, Bristol
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	20 – 21 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 'paramedic' 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. The education provider has until 26 June 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 2 July 2014. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 July 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 August 2014.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. 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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name of HCPC visitors and profession	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Sue Boardman (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	32 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2014
Chair	Jackie Rogers (University of the West of England, Bristol)
Secretary	Dave Noman (University of the West of England, Bristol)

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"/>

The HCPC reviewed external examiners' reports from the last two years for the Foundation degree paramedic programme. This programme is new and therefore there are no external examiners reports for it.

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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Foundation Degree Paramedic Science, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two 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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly outline the agreed placement arrangements with placement providers including the numbers, range and structures of placements.

Reason: At the visit, the HCPC panel met with the programme team, senior staff and practice placement providers and discussed how various aspects of the programme are managed. However, from the documentation provided and discussions, the visitors were unable to determine the placements arrangements in place for the programme or how the education provider maintains overall responsibility for the practice placements. Discussion indicated that a memorandum of understanding would be agreed before the programme starts. The visitors noted the education provider has strong informal arrangements with placement providers and suggest a memorandum of understanding with the placement providers would formalise placement arrangements including the numbers, range and structures of placements. The visitors require the programme team to provide the agreed memorandum of understanding as further evidence which clearly articulates:

- the number of placements;
- the placements' structure;
- ranges of placements; and
- any associated processes.

This will enable the visitors to determine this programme will be effectively managed.

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 demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find evidence to outline where HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the programme curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Paul Bates
Sue Boardman