

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD

Notes of the Fifty-second Meeting of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration

Date: 16 June 2016

Time: 7:15 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room, 26/F Eastern Commercial Centre, 83 Nam On Street,
Shau Kei Wan, Hong Kong

Present: Mr. SHIU Ka-chun (Convener)
Mr. KWAN Wing-shing, Vincent
Dr. LEUNG Chuen-suen
Ms. LUK Ka-mei
Mr. LUN Chi-wai

In-attendance: Mr. Thomas LEUNG Sui-keung, Registrar
Ms. Veronica FAN, Assistant Registrar (Secretary)

Notes

1. Member adopted the meeting notes and the agenda.
2. Matters arising
 - 2.1 (Business information deleted)
 - 2.2 (Business information deleted)
 - 2.3 (Business information deleted)
3. (Business information deleted)
4. (Business information deleted)
5. (Business information deleted)
6. (Business information deleted)
7. (Business information deleted)
8. Perusal of the list of candidates for appointment of co-opted members of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration

- 8.1 Further to the previous Committee and Board meeting held in March 2016, it was agreed that four co-opted members would be appointed with one co-opted member nominated by the Committee and three members appointed through an open nomination exercise.
 - 8.2 The Convenor nominated Mr. Ip Kim-ching (business information deleted) as a co-opted member to the Committee. Mr. Ip's curriculum vitae was tabled for members' consideration. Members agreed to recommend Mr. Ip as co-opted member.
 - 8.3 An open nomination exercise was conducted. The list of candidates received through this nomination exercise was circulated for members' consideration. After discussion, members agreed to recommend the following three candidates for appointment of co-opted members:
 - (a) Dr. Chu Chi-keung (business information deleted);
 - (b) Dr. Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin (business information deleted); and
 - (c) Ms. Law Yee-ming (business information deleted).
9. Perusal of the list of candidates for appointment of Assessment Panel members
 - 9.1 The Board office had sent invitation to the current Assessment Panel members to continue their appointment for the next term. Majority of the current DC Panel members had confirmed willingness to take up appointment for another term. The Board office would follow up with other members who had not replied to the Board.
 - 9.2 An open nomination exercise was conducted. The list of candidates received through this nomination exercise was circulated to the Committee. The lists included nominations from five categories namely social work professionals, local academics in social work, overseas academics in social work, representatives of employing agencies and other professionals. After examining the backgrounds of candidates, members recommended the following candidates to appoint as the Assessment Panel members:
 - (a) Social work professionals: (anonymised)
 - (b) Local academics in social work: (anonymised)

- (c) Overseas academics in social work: (anonymised)
- (d) Representatives of employing agencies: (anonymised)
- (e) Other professionals: (anonymised)

9.3 As a few current Assessment Panel members from overseas academic in social work had retired, the Registrar invited members to recommend more candidates from this category.

10. Discussion on the review exercise of the Principles, Criteria and Standards for Recognizing Qualifications in Social Work for Registration of Registered Social Workers

Due to time constraint, the discussion on this agenda item would be deferred to the next meeting.

11. Any other business

11.1 (Business information deleted)

11.2 (Business information deleted)

11.3 Handling of applications from applicants without social work trainings vis-à-vis applications lodged by fresh social work graduates

- (a) The Registrar briefed members the current practice of handling applications lodged by persons without recognized social work training but claiming that the post to be occupied by the applicant was a social work post. To avoid any possible abuse of the Category 2 registration, each application would be scrutinized and discussed at the Committee in a vigorous manner. The Committee would then put up the recommendation and justifications to the Board for consideration.
- (b) Additional information would be sought from the applicant, for example the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the employing agency, information on whether the employing agency was a charitable institution with exemption from tax under the Inland Revenue Ordinance, duty list, recruitment advertisement or any other information.
- (c) The key issue was whether the post to be occupied by the applicant

was a social work post. The Committee always assessed whether the post was a social work post in an objective manner. The Committee would not dispute that the post was a social work post. In one case handled by the Committee, the Committee advised the agency to employ an RSW to fill the post for the interest of the clients. Alternatively, there was also a case that the Board had approved the application in which the applicant had training in counseling in overseas and he planned to obtain social work qualification in Hong Kong.

- (d) Apart from the above, the Board office would receive large number of applications from fresh social work graduates at the end of every academic year. Such applications would be handled under Category 2 registration on the ground that they had completed the social work courses and were accepted to social work posts. It was a transitional arrangement to facilitate these fresh social work graduates to obtain their registration status under the circumstances that the graduation lists were not yet available. The registration status would be changed to Category 1 when the graduate list reached the Board office. Therefore, the duration during which these fresh social work graduates were registered as Category 2 RSWs would be very short.
- (e) In handling such applications, the applicant was required to provide documentary proof of confirmed offer and acceptance of social work employment. The employing agency had to confirm that the employment was a social work employment. This policy has been in used since 1998.
- (f) Some members expressed that in handling any kind of Category 2 registration, we should use the same requirements. In this regard, members requested the fresh social work graduates to provide job duties and the recruitment advertisement which were certified by the employing agency. The requirements were more stringent than before.
- (g) The Registrar reported that the Board office received grievances from employing agencies and fresh social work graduates in recent months because such request was different from our usual practices.
- (h) It was proposed that if members would like to change the current policy, the proposal should first be discussed in details at the Committee. The pros and cons of the change in policy should be considered. The proposal would then be put up to the Board for consideration.

- (i) Members agreed that at present, the policy of handling applications from fresh social work graduates would remain unchanged. Members who had doubts on approving the fresh social work graduates would abstain from approving or rejecting the applications until the issue was fully discussed and resolved at the Board.

12. Date of next meeting

Members agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled on 26 August 2016 at 7:00 pm.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 pm.

13 July 2016