

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD

Notes of the 85th Meeting of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration

Date: 20 November 2020
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Online meeting via Cisco Webex Meeting platform
Present: Dr. Alvin KWOK Ngai-kuen (Convenor),
Ms. Yvonne CHAK Tung-ching (co-opted member),
Ms. Morgan FAN Yee-kwan (co-opted member)
Ms. Cherry LAU Chiu-man (co-opted member),
Dr. Zeno LEUNG Chuen-suen,
Dr. NG Yut-ming,
Dr. TING Wai-fong,
Apology: Ms. Kathy CHEUNG Lai-yi,
Mr. YAU Tat-yu (co-opted Members)
Secretary: Mr. Eric LEE Wing-po (Registrar),
Ms. Emily CHAN May-shan (Assistant Registrar)

Confirmation of the notes of the last meeting

1. There were no proposed revisions to the notes (CQAR85-1) of said meeting, that they were confirmed the true record of the said meeting.

Review of the Principles, Criteria and Standards for Recognizing Qualifications in Social Work

2. The meeting first followed up the amended items agreed at the last meeting and accepted the proposed amendments made in CQAR85-2.2.
3. For the modification of the expression of the “seven professional standards” listed out on the paragraph of Foreword, members accepted (Anonymized)’s proposed version and further amended the words as “The Committee sees it as essential that RSW should embrace the following seven professional attributes that are being nurtured throughout the course of their study in the social work programme”. For sub-section 4.1.1(a), members agreed to delete it.
4. The Committee continued to review the comments collected during the second consultation period as compiled in meeting paper no. CQAR85-2.1.
5. Opinion 6: Suggest revising or removing the requirement of “at least two-third of the working hours to teaching and administration” of the minimum 3 designated staff listed in sub-section 4.2.2.

Members expected that at least some designated staff will devote adequate time to engage in teaching work and be responsible for overseeing the programme quality and development. Therefore, the meeting resolved to keep this requirement.

6. Opinion 7: Have concerns over the requirements of small class teaching stipulated in

sub-section 4.3 such as not less than one-third teaching hours, caps on the number of students of each small class.

There were arguments that lectures and small class teaching have no significant differences in the teaching effectiveness of certain core subjects such as welfare policy and human development, but the Committee disagreed with this view, members believed that even for some non-practice-based subjects, small class teaching can facilitate more in-depth discussions, which will undoubtedly help improve the learning outcomes. Members viewed that it was appropriate to require one-third of the teaching time, which is in line with the usual split of lectures and tutorials for such type of courses, and thus the Committee decided not to make any amendment.

7. Opinion 8: The requirement of being a “full-time” teaching staff listed in sub-section 5.2.2(a) may eliminate some experienced retired local academics from being nominated as Assessment Panel members.

The Committee agreed to add one more provision, i.e. “at time of appointment to this group, having retired from the full-time post for not more than 5 years”.

8. Opinion 9: The deletion of “Emeritus Professors” listed in sub-section 5.2.2(b) may eliminate some experienced retired overseas academics from being nominated as Assessment Panel members.

The Committee decided to align the criteria of local and overseas academics, i.e. accepting “those who have retired from the full-time post for not more than 5 years”.

9. Opinion 10: Suggest the Fieldwork Supervisors listed in sub-section 5.2.2(c) should possess a master degree instead of a bachelor degree.

Members accepted this suggestion.

10. Opinion 11: For the publication of the final report on the website of the Board listed in sub-section 5.6.11, it is suggested to put the summary instead of the full report.

After discussion and voting, the meeting resolved that an executive summary including the conditions and recommendations without releasing the business information should be posted on the website. Professional consultants should be reminded to write specific paragraphs on each condition and/or recommendation, which will be posted together.

11. Opinion 12: Suggest to review the requirement of at least 50% on-site supervision listed in sub-section 4.1.5(c)(ii)

Members considered this to be a minimum requirement as the supervisor should be familiar with the working environment of the student.

12. Opinion 13: Suggest to reduce the requirement of the minimum 3 Designated Staff from 5 years post-degree professional practicing experience to 3 years, or consider the experience after joining the TIs on pro-rata basis

Members perceived that 5 years' experience should remain the minimum requirement.

13. Opinion 14: Suggest to elaborate the meaning of "structure and profile" listed in sub-section 5.5.5(d) & 5.5.5(k)

Members believed that this commonly refers to the manpower structure, academic background and post-degree professional practicing experience that no further elaboration is required.

14. Opinion 15: For sub-section 3.3.3, ask for clarification of the types of "change"

Members recognized that it is not easy to define specifically which types of changes should be reported to the Board and the TIs should make judgements and notify the Board in case of any uncertainty. The Committee also considered reviewing previous cases submitted by the TIs for reference in the long-run.

15. Opinion 16: Suggest to stipulate that not less than one fieldwork placement should have exposure in either casework and/or groupwork practice

Since sub-section 4.1.5(b)(iii) clearly stipulates that "With different exposure to students in terms of nature and background of placement agencies and practice settings", the Committee did not see the need to restrict this aspect in detail.

16. Opinion 17: Suggest to add that "To strengthen the role of Fieldwork Supervisor, especially on risk management and code of ethics, e.g. personal data protection and legal liability"

The Committee did not see the need to restrict this aspect in detail.

17. Opinion 18: Suggest to add a requirement of at least one live supervision should be conducted with service users' consent

The Committee did not see the need to restrict this aspect in detail.

18. Opinion 19: Suggest to write clearly in sub-section 5.2.4(c) that the overseas academic member should take up the role of the convenor of the Assessment Team

Members viewed that such specification would introduce practical difficulties in case the overseas academic member resigns mid-way of the exercise.

19. Opinion 21: Suggest considering the role of Assessment Team to be limited to fact finding and clarification instead of making recommendations to the Board, as listed in sub-section 5.6.6.

Since the final decision rests with the Board, members perceived that it is appropriate for the Assessment Team to make recommendations to the Board.

20. Opinion 22: Concern on any role duplication and role conflict of the newly added group, i.e. Fieldwork Supervisor listed in sub-section 5.2.2(c)

As all Assessment Team members are required to declare any potential interests before they are nominated by the Committee for the Board's appointment, this is not an issue.

21. Opinion 23: Suggest stating out the requirements like hours, credit points, and specific topics of the subject areas.

Members did not see the need to restrict this aspect in detail and agreed that autonomy in this regard should be fully allowed for the TIs.

22. The meeting also discussed other issues and questions raised by the Association of Schools of Social Work that required further clarifications.
23. The Committee agreed to send a thank-you reply to all opinion givers when the new PCS is scheduled to announce in April 2021. The Committee's considerations of some key opinions will be included in the reply.
24. The Secretary will put forth a revised version of the PCS document for the Board's endorsement after seeking the Committee's approval via circulation and completing the legal vetting as well.

Date of next meeting

25. The next meeting would be held at 7:00 p.m. on 25 January 2021.
26. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00p.m.

END