

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD

Notes of the 68th Meeting of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration

Date: 28 June 2018
Time: 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, 26/F Eastern Commercial Centre, 83 Nam On Street, Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong.
Present: Mr. SHIU Ka-chun (Convenor)
Mr. IP Kim Ching
Mr. KWAN Wing-shing, Vincent
Dr. KWOK Ngai-kuen, Alvin
Dr. LEUNG Chuen-suen
Mr. LUN Chi-wai
Apology: Dr. CHU Cheong-hay
Ms. LAW Yee-ming
Ms. LUK Ka-mei
Secretary: Mr. LEE Wing-po, Eric, Registrar and
Ms. FAN Lai-yee, Veronica, Assistant Registrar

Confirmation of the notes of the last meeting

1. The notes of the last meeting were confirmed without amendment.

Matters arising from the previous meetings

Business information deleted

2. Business information deleted
3. Business information deleted
4. Business information deleted
5. Business information deleted

Qualification Recognition Assessment & Review

Business information deleted

6. Business information deleted
7. Business information deleted

Business information deleted

8. Business information deleted

Progress Reports

Business information deleted

9. Business information deleted

10. Business information deleted

Business information deleted

11. Business information deleted

12. Business information deleted

Overseas social work qualifications

Business information deleted

13. Business information deleted

Business information deleted

14. Business information deleted

15. Business information deleted

16. Business information deleted

Business information deleted

17. Business information deleted

18. Business information deleted

19. Business information deleted

Review of the PCS

20. A member expressed his opinions that paragraph 6.8.2 should be kept unchanged as the current one. He supported to have an appeal panel in the appeal mechanism and the panel may reach the decisions of either to uphold or not to uphold the Board's original decision.

(Dr. Alvin Kwok and Mr. Vincent Kwan left the meeting.)

SSR template

21. Business information deleted

Section 4.2 Minima for Persons Providing Professional Teaching

22. The Secretary highlighted the proposed changes after reviewing the result of the illustration.

- (a) In paragraph 4.2.3 (b) and 4.2.4(b), TI should ensure that, by head count, not less than 40% of its academic staff members are under its full-time engagement.
- (b) In paragraph 4.3.4 (a), social work subject areas should include “Social Work Knowledge”.

Section 4.3 Individual Attention to Students

23. The Committee expressed their views as follows:

- (a) In paragraph 4.3.4(a), the proposed rules in calculating value of FTE staff were broader and more relaxed than the current one. The Committee was invited to consider whether the value of SSR should be raised.
- (b) Another member held the view that the purpose of such change was to make the calculation of SSR in a simple way but not to bring hardship to the TIs.
- (c) Under paragraph 4.3.4(a)(iii), the side effect of such change was that TIs might engage less sessional staff.

Section 4.4 Academic Standard and Governance

24. The Secretary updated that in response to a recent case of dispute, the requirement of financial resources was added in paragraph 4.4.2 whilst paragraph 4.4.5 was added in response to a member’s comment at the last meeting.

Section 4.5 Supporting Facilities

25. It was noted that online journal could be of variable quality and it was suggested to revise it to be online resources or journals in hardcopy or subscribed online version.

Section 5.2 Assessment Panel and Assessment Teams

26. Taking into consideration the opinions collected from day-to-day operation, the Committee agreed to adopt the proposed restriction to exclude persons who were teaching staff in TIs offering social work programmes, no matter he/she was teaching social work programme or not, from category (c) social work professionals, (d) representing employing agency, and (e) non social work professionals.

Section 5.4 Instigation of Assessment or Review

27. The Secretary highlighted the major changes under 5.4.1 that, the TI had to apply for assessment or review in a prescribed form. In 5.4.2(e), the Committee reserves the right to conduct at the expense of the Board a review at any time during a period of recognition when necessary. Members had no comment on the changes.

Section 5.6 Protocol for Conducting Assessment or Review

28. In relation to the timeline of conducting Assessment or Review being proposed in the draft, members resolved to remove it so as to maintain flexibility of the operations.
29. From the recent experiences, the AT and the Committee held conflicting views on the conditions and recommendations set out in the interim report. In the new version of PCS, it was proposed that the Committee would be the party to issue the final report together with notice of decision to the TIs directly. The Committee had to bear greater responsibilities in the assessment and review exercise. The Committee would discuss the matter in the subsequent meeting.
30. The important change was that the Committee would be delegated by the Board to make the final decision whether to accept the recommendations of AT. A member had concern if it was within the ambit of the Committee. Another concern was how the new term of office could take over such important responsibilities and duties particularly those co-opted members who were not the Board members.

Section 6 Appeal Mechanism

31. Setting aside which body is to deal with appeals, regarding the possible decisions of the appeal body, the Secretary explained that it was not fair to the appellant not to provide the body with full options in the ruling.
32. After discussion, the Committee agreed to adopt the revised version as stated in paragraph 6.8.2.

Other issues

33. At the previous meeting, a member had suggested that duration of recognition should be in connection with the number of study years of the programme. At present, the maximum duration of recognition was three years for new programme whilst eight years for existing programme. The member had concern in the interim period how we monitor the TI when the study-year was two but eight years of recognition were granted. The meeting took note that if the duration of recognition would be pegged with the study-year, consideration should be given also to the 3-year rule for new programme as it does not fit well for a 4-year bachelor programme. After discussion, there was no need to change the current practice as it is safe to fix the maximum period of recognition as three years for new programme, and for the

programmes granted with 8 years be usually those with long history and good standing.

Any other business

34. Business information deleted

Date of next meeting

35. The next meeting will be held on 23 August 2018, Thursday at 7:30 pm.

36. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 pm.

9 July 2018