

## **SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD**

### **Notes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Taskforce on Review of Code of Practice**

Date: 23 October 2018  
Time: 9:15 a.m.  
Venue: Room HJ417, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University  
Present: Mr. WONG Ka-ming (Acting Convenor)  
Dr. CHENG Yuk-tin, Carl (co-opted member)  
Dr. LEUNG Chuen-suen  
Mr. LUN Chi-wai  
Apology: Dr. LAM Chiu-wan (co-opted member)  
Secretary: Mr. LEE Wing-po, Eric, Registrar  
Ms. FAN Lai-ye, Veronica, Assistant Registrar

1. The meeting originally scheduled on 3 October 2018 was cancelled due to the absence of a quorum at three. The meeting was therefore re-scheduled to 23 October 2018.

#### Confirmation of notes of last meeting and agenda

2. Members endorsed the notes of last meeting.

#### Matters Arising

3. Members endorsed the revisions made in Section 4 Ethical Practice and Decision Making (Appendix B) and it was agreed to discuss the captions at subsequent meeting.
4. Members continued the discussion on Section 6 Definition and Interpretation (Appendix C).
  - (a) Members endorsed the definition of “client” and agreed to use “engaged to receive social work service” which covered those potential clients who had interaction in initial stage such as signing of form, telephone enquiry. When this definition was translated to Chinese, it should be read as “正在安排接受社會工作服務”.
  - (b) Members endorsed the proposed definitions of “social worker” and “professional qualification” and did not make any comment.
  - (c) The proposed definition of “social work relationship / professional relationship” was with reference to a social work journal of Proctor, E.K as the crux in his definition was about effective social work intervention addressing three concerns in establishing an appropriate and effective social work relationship. The proposed definition was describing the “functional relationship” without mentioning the “nature of relationship”. If this definition was adopted, it would be confined to a contractual relationship between social worker and client but in other social work journals, the meanings could be broader. It was a decision to be made for the adoption of a broad or confined

definition. In the ensuing discussion, members agreed that it was difficult to work out the appropriate definition and it was agreed not to include social work relationship in this section.

- (d) To be precise and concise, it was proposed to make minor amendments to the definition of “social work intervention”. “Other collaterals” would be changed to “other related parties” whilst the second sentence revised as “they are implemented for the purpose of improving well-being of the clients or bettering related social structures and systems”.
- (e) Regarding the definition of “clinical service”, it was proposed to add “psychological, emotional, mental or family issue” in the first sentence.
- (f) It was proposed to replace private practice or independent practice by “self-employed” in related paragraphs.
- (g) It was proposed to revise the sentence to become, “...or part-time capacity, including but not limited to...”.
- (h) It was also agreed that it was not necessary to have definitions about values, beliefs, standards and rules, principles and practice which appeared in the captions of each section.
- (i) The revisions were marked in Annex 1.

### Summary of revisions

- 5. Mr. Lun walked through Appendix D1 and D3 in which some paragraphs were omitted in the revised COP. He suggested that the existing paragraphs 1.2.3, 4.3, 7.5, 8.1 and 27 should be maintained in the revised COP. Members were reminded that if we decided not to keep some paragraphs, we would be challenged to offer justifications. After discussion, members had the following conclusions:
  - (a) Existing paragraphs 7.4, 8.1 and 27 had already been covered in the revised COP paragraphs 7.1, 9 and 2.
  - (b) It was agreed that existing paragraphs 1.2.3, 4.3 and 7.5 should be maintained and moved under other paragraphs. The secretariat suggested moving the above to paragraphs 21.4, 5.5 and 8.3 in the revised COP, respectively.
  - (c) Members suggested revising paragraph 1.2.3 to “如遇緊急情況，社工應在能力範圍內予以處理，提供即時所需服務；如所需服務超乎機構的服務範圍，在有需要時作出轉介” to make it comparatively reasonable and applicable.
  - (d) Regarding paragraph 4.3, the second sentence should be deleted. RSW had discharged the duties if client was informed of complaint channel. If RSW stopped clients to

make complaints, it should be dealt with under other rules and standards in the COP.

(e) It was agreed that it was not necessary to highlight the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance as everyone is binding by law and orders of the Hong Kong regime.

(f) The revisions were marked in Annex 2.

6. Regarding Appendix 2, members had made some minor comments and the suggestions made at this meeting were all marked in Annex 3.

7. Next step

The revised COP would be incorporated in one document and sent to the service provider for translation. It was estimated to take more than one month time to finish the translation and the completed work would then be submitted to the Taskforce for overall review at subsequent meeting.

Date of next meeting

8. The next meeting would be decided when the translation work was completed.

9. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:20 pm.

29 October 2018