

Raminder Parmar

-v-

**General Social Care Council
[2006] 0848.SW**

Before:

**Anthony Wadling (Chairman)
Ms Margaret Halstead
Dr Jill Low**

Hearing date: 16 March 2007

1. This is an appeal under Section 68 Of the Care Standards Act 2000 (The Act) against a decision of the General Social Care Council (the Council) to refuse an application dated 27 October 2005 for the Appellant to be registered under Section 58 of the Act.
2. Neither party to the appeal was present or represented at the hearing. Both parties made written representations and submitted documents, which included the witness statement of Catherine Clarke who is the GSCC Education Standards and Information Manager. This statement sets out the criteria to be satisfied before an applicant can be registered. This document and all others provided to us were taken into account by the Tribunal in reaching its decision.
3. The Appellant is resident in India and obtained her qualifications and experience in that country. Section 64 of the Act provides that if an applicant has elsewhere than in England undergone training in relevant social work, they satisfy the requirements if that training is recognised by the Council as being to a standard sufficient for registration.
4. The standard to be satisfied is that of the training and experience equivalent to the requirements of the UK qualification, the Diploma in Social Work (which for students in the UK has now been superseded by the BA degree in Social Work). In order to determine whether those in the Appellant's position satisfy this test, the GSCC

commissions International Recognition Service (IRS) which in turn instructs the National Recognition Information Centre for the UK to undertake an assessment of an Applicant's qualifications. The Appellant has an MA in Sociology, which was assessed as equivalent to a taught MA in the UK. She is also pursuing a PHD which is a study of working women in urban areas. The final IRS report concluded that the Appellant "does not demonstrate that she has sufficient depth of knowledge, or application of skills required of a qualified social worker as she has not trained as a social worker".

5. We agree with this conclusion. The Appellant has submitted no evidence of having either worked as a social worker or undertaken professional social work training, which, in addition to academic study in a number of disciplines, currently requires 200 days of supervised and assessed social work practice. Previously the DipSW required 130 days but the Appellant also fails to meet this requirement. She cannot, therefore, be considered for registration by the GSCC, although her academic qualification in Sociology might assist her were she to apply to do a social work course in this country.

6. The unanimous decision of the Tribunal is to dismiss the appeal.

The Appeal is dismissed



Anthony Wadling (Chairman)
Ms Margaret Halstead
Dr Jill Low

20 March 2007