

## **SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD**

### **Notes of the 61<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration**

Date: 25 September 2017  
Time: 3:00 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)  
Dr. KWOK Ngai-kuen, Alvin  
Dr. LEUNG Chuen-suen  
Mr. LUN Chi-wai  
Apology: Dr. CHU Cheong-hay  
Mr. IP Kim Ching  
Mr. KWAN Wing-shing, Vincent  
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 60<sup>th</sup> meeting**

1. The notes of the 60<sup>th</sup> meeting were confirmed without other amendments.

#### **Matters arising from the previous meetings**

##### Review of the approval status of activity organizers under the Voluntary Continuing Professional Development Scheme (“VCPD Scheme”)

2. The Secretary invited the Committee to consider the proposal to review the approval status of activity organizer under the VCPD Scheme. Among 49 organizers with their approval granted more than 5 years i.e. approved in years 2011 and 2012, 33 organizers were inactive for more than one year whilst 16 organizers were still active in 2017.
3. The Committee considered that it would be appropriate to write to these 33 organizers to confirm whether they were still offering any activities in 2017 but with commencement date prior to 1 January 2017. If the answer was in the negative, they would be informed of the expiry of the approval status by 31 December 2017 whilst the rest would be informed of the continuation of the approval status up till 31 December 2019. The same protocol would be applied to the other organizers when their approval status were due to expire in year 2018 and afterwards.
4. A member concerned that some Organizers might make use of the platform to provide activities of natures not social work related. The Committee suggested inviting the organizer to provide statistics about the activities they have offered in the past two years to facilitate

the Committee in assessing the Scheme's effectiveness.

5. The Committee considered that it would not be cost-effective to spend extra money to enhance the system for the Board office sending emails to notify those RSWs whose accounts have been updated.

(Business information deleted)

6. (Business information deleted)

7. (Business information deleted)

### **Qualification Recognition Assessment**

(Business information deleted)

8. (Business information deleted)

9. A few members shared their general observations that some self-financed programmes had substantial changes in membership of the programme advisory board or the programme team after the recognition was approved by the Board. The Committee shared worries that the corporate governance of these tertiary institutes was in doubt and the quality of programmes would be affected. It was necessary to discuss how to address the issue in the PCS.

### **Qualification Recognition Review**

(Business information deleted)

10. (Business information deleted)

11. (Business information deleted)

12. (Business information deleted)

(Business information deleted)

13. (Business information deleted)

14. (Business information deleted)

15. (Business information deleted)

16. (Business information deleted)

17. (Business information deleted)

### **Progress report on qualification recognition review and assessment exercises**

18. Members noted that a total of 7 review and 2 assessment exercises were in progress.

### **Discussion on evaluation of both Professional Consultant and Assessment Team Members**

19. The Secretary walked through the proposal of evaluating both Professional Consultant and Assessment Team Members. The Committee had reservation on evaluating the performance of Assessment Team Members as they were not employees or service provider of the Board.

20. The Committee noted that the Board entered into services contract with Professional Consultants and it was reasonable to evaluate their performances. The Committee had the following comments about the evaluation form:

- (a) The total score should be 100.
- (b) Item 1 to 6 would carry 60 score while three general check-points would carry 40 score.
- (c) The rating of each item/question would be from 0 to 10.
- (d) Only AT members and a representative from TI concerned would be invited to complete the form.
- (e) A summary result would be sent to the Professional Consultant concerned for their information.

21. The Board office would revise the proposal for discussion at subsequent meeting.

### **Review of the recognition of non-local social work qualifications**

22. The Secretary explained to the Committee the current practice of recognizing the non-local social work qualifications and the problems encountered by the Board office. Subject to further adjustments after the review of the PCS was completed, the Board office proposed to adopt some enhancements to the website information during the interim.

23. The Secretary walked through the proposed enhancements and the Committee made the decisions as follows:

- (a) The Board would not be listing out the social work qualifications which were assessed individually, hence those of Singapore would be removed from the website.
- (b) For Taiwan, the additional requirement of applicant having passed the Taiwan examination may stand the test of reasonableness when it was taken as one of the fit and proper criteria, so as to justify its being imposed on top of holding of a degree or diploma in social work, if it be recognized by the Board after individual assessment. This might have to be generalized and be applicable to other countries which were with an examination scheme for licensing or registration, but this might still be criticized to be onerous as the applicants might argue that they have acquired the recognized degree or diploma but never intending to practice in those countries, hence not interested in

passing or obliged to pass the examinations at all. The Committee decided to remove the requirement of passing the Taiwan examination.

- (c) The Committee had no comments on other parts of the proposal. The revised proposal incorporating the above suggestions would be put forth to the Board for endorsement.

**(Business information deleted)**

24. (Business information deleted)

**Proposed new forms to be specified by the Board for making statutory declaration**

- 25. The Secretary proposed to the Committee the introduction of a new document to replace the existing form for making statutory declaration, with online form to be provided. The Committee was also invited to consider the cessation of accepting a declaration made elsewhere outside Hong Kong.
- 26. The Committee has considered the proposal and no further comments were made. The proposal would be put forward to the Board for endorsement.

**Discussion on fit and proper person for registration**

- 27. The Secretary invited the Committee to consider how the qualification of “fit and proper person” was to be incorporated into the vetting and approval procedures of application for registration.
- 28. The Social Workers Registration Ordinance has provided that “fit and proper” was one of the statutory requirements when the Board considered the application for RSW. However, in the current protocol, the Board had not included this requirement in the vetting and approval procedures. To manage the possible risks, the issue was brought up to the Committee for discussion. In the proposal, the Secretary had made reference to the health caring professionals in Hong Kong, professions in commercial sectors and the social workers regulatory regime in New Zealand.
- 29. The Committee decided to proceed the issue as follows:
  - (a) It was proposed to seek the Board’s directive on whether it was obliged to specify anything in the application protocol to test applicants or RSWs as if they are fit and proper persons.
  - (b) The Board was asked to consider if legal advice should be sought.
  - (c) If the advice of the legal advisor were in the affirmative, the Committee would then deliberate how to address the situation and how to define the fit and proper criteria.

**(Business information deleted)**

30. (Business information deleted)

31. (Business information deleted)

32. (Business information deleted)

**Date of next meeting**

33. Members agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled on 30 October 2017 at 7:15 pm to discuss specifically on other sections of the first revised draft of PCS.

34. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm.

3 October 2017