



Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Brighton

Course approval: MSc Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Inspection dates: 23 – 25 April 2024

Report date:	19 June 2024
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	23 August 2024
Date conditions met and approved:	14 January 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	11
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	14
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	19
Standard five: Supporting students	25
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	28
Proposed outcome.....	29
Conditions	29
Recommendations	30
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	32
Regulator decision	39
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	40
Findings	41

Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses. Inspections form part of our process to make sure that courses meet our [education and training standards](#) and ensure that students successfully completing these courses can meet our [professional standards](#).
2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. One inspector is a social worker registered with us and the other is not a registered social worker (a 'lay' inspector). These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review information and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, placement provision, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, training placement providers, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.
3. The process we undertake is described in our legislation; the Social Worker Regulations 2018¹, and the Social Work England [\(Education and Training\) Rules 2019](#).
4. You can find further guidance on our course change, new course approval and annual monitoring processes on our website.

What we do

5. When an education provider wants to make a change to a course, or request the approval of a new course, they are asked to consider how their course meets our education and training standards and our professional standards, and provide evidence of this to us. We are also undertaking a cycle of re-approval of all currently approved social work courses in England following the introduction of the Education and Training Standards 2021.
6. The education quality assurance officer reviews all the documentary evidence provided and will contact the education provider if they have any questions about the information submitted. They also provide advice and guidance on our approval processes.
7. When we are satisfied that we have all the documentary evidence required to proceed with an inspection we assign one registrant and one lay inspector. We undertake a conflict of interest process when confirming our inspectors to ensure there is no bias or appearance of bias in the approval process.
8. The inspectors complete an assessment of the evidence provided and advise the officer if they have any queries that may be able to be addressed in advance of the inspection.

¹ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2018/9780111170090/contents>

9. During this time a draft plan for the inspection is developed and shared with the education provider, to make sure it is achievable at the point of inspection.
10. Once the inspectors and officer are satisfied that an inspection can take place, this is usually undertaken over a three- or four-day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final decision about the approval of the course.
13. The decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. Course details: the University of Brighton ('the university') wish to run a two year Masters of Science level 7 apprenticeship in Social Work.

Inspection ID	UBRI_CPP456
Course provider	University of Brighton
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	MSc Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of Study	Full Time
Maximum student cohort	20
Proposed first intake	September 2024
Date of inspection	23 – 25 April 2024
Inspection team	Nikki Steel-Bryan, Education Quality Assurance Officer Lainy Russell, Lay Inspector Jane Reeves, Registrant Inspector

Language

16. In this document we describe the University of Brighton as 'the university' or 'the course provider' and we describe the MSc Social Work Degree Apprenticeship as 'the course'.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 23 April – 25 April 2024. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

18. These meetings formed the basis of the inspection plan, agreed with the education provider ahead of inspection. The following section provides a summary of these sessions, who participated and the topics that were discussed with the inspection team.

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with 5 students, 2 were enrolled on the PG Dip course, 2 were enrolled on the MA course and one was enrolled on the BSc Apprenticeship. One student was also a student representative. Discussions included student experience of placements, the curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment, feedback, support available through the university, the student voice and attendance monitoring.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course team, those involved in selection and admissions, the senior leadership team, staff involved in placement-based learning and student support services.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with people with lived experience of social work, known within the institution as experts by experience. Discussions included their role in the admissions processes, their contributions to curriculum development, course design and course delivery and any support they received to carry out their duties.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including the NHS, East Sussex County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council.

Findings

24. In this section we set out the inspectors' findings in relation to whether the education provider has demonstrated that it meets the education and training standards and that the course will ensure that students who successfully complete the course are able to meet the professional standards.

25. In addition to documentary evidence the university also supplied a mapping document. The mapping document included narrative against the education and training standards and highlighted specific documentary evidence to be considered against each standard. This document is referred to as 'the mapping document'.

Standard one: Admissions

Standard 1.1

26. The course provider submitted documentary evidence that included the MSc (PG Dip) Social Work programme specification document (PSD), interview questions, details of the written task and a link to the course webpage. Also supplied was a document detailing the apprentice learner journey and a slide deck from a recruitment session aimed at the undergraduate apprenticeship, as an example of previous recruitment events. The inspection team acknowledged that the admissions processes were mapped to the professional capabilities framework (PCF) at entrance to the course level.

27. The narrative on the mapping document detailed that applicants were identified through an expression of interest with their employer and those shortlisted attended an admissions event. The admissions event included participation from university staff, people with lived experience and employers, and included a written test and an individual interview. Applicants were required to demonstrate ICT skills throughout the admission process through engaging with Word documents and proformas and by using the online admissions portal.

28. The entry requirements to the programme were consistent with expectations for a level 7 programme and included an honours degree in any subject with a minimum classification of second-class honours and relevant experience. GCSE grade C/4 or above in maths and English language, or level 2 Functional Skills, or International English Language Testing System (IELTS) at 7 or above, was also required. The inspection team understood that applicants should be an employee of the sponsoring partner and relevant experience was involvement in social or care services.

29. The inspection team noted that interviews were online as standard and were keen to better understand what other options were available to applicants who may be unable to

attend an interview digitally, or who may not have access to MS Teams. Through discussion with staff involved in admissions and selection, the inspection team heard that interviews could be offered in person, or via alternative software such as Skype. Support needs of potential students were communicated to the course team via university central admissions and would then be addressed. The course team provided an example of recent 'in person' interviews that had taken place to the inspectors during inspection. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

30. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included the PSD which detailed the entry criteria. The inspection team noted that these criteria included requirement for applicants to have experience of providing social or caring services, and an understanding of, and preparedness for, social care and social work practice. The narrative included on the mapping document explained that the initial expression of interest identified applicants' prior work experience.

31. An interview record template was also included as documentary evidence for this standard. The template included an explanation of interview scoring, and interview questions, and the mapping document identified those interview questions which were designed to encourage applicants to draw on their experience when answering.

32. During the inspection the inspection team triangulated the information provided in the documentary evidence with stakeholders. They highlighted that the interview questions gave applicants the opportunity to talk about their experiences and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

33. The university provided narrative within the mapping document that the course would have the same level of involvement of stakeholders as other social work courses at the university. This included:

- Information sessions co-delivered with practitioners and current apprentices.
- Applicant shortlisting completed alongside the employing agency.
- Joint interview panel that included a qualified social worker from the employing agency, a member of academic staff and an expert by experience.

34. Inspectors acknowledged that training was provided to co-interviewing practitioners. Experts by experience were provided with informal bespoke coaching, however, they had been invited to attend an anti-racist and inclusive recruitment training session.

35. Through discussion with staff involved in admissions and selection the inspection team heard that an expert by experience was not included on all interview panels. It was explained that the expert was usually from the local authority experts by experience group, and not all employer partners chose to include an expert. If all parties agreed, the university could include one of their own experts by experience. The inspection team queried whether panels were equitable for all applicants when the interview panels were inconsistent. It was reported that panels were the same within an employing organisation, however, there may be difference across employers.

36. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met with the recommendation that the university work towards including an expert by experience on all interview panels. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard 1.4

37. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the institutional suitability and safeguarding process, the suitability and safeguarding panel terms of reference, the MSc (PG Dip) Social Work applicant guide and the initial suitability declaration which included references to the Social Work England professional standards. From the narrative included in the mapping document the inspection team understood that the employer partner was responsible for ensuring the suitability of applicants was assessed and confirming the enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) and health status of candidates to the university.

38. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the process of suitability assessment worked in practice. Through discussion with employer partners, the inspection team heard that, employers required apprentices to undertake a new enhanced DBS to work with children and adults at the start of the course, and the number was confirmed to the university via a standard clearance check form.

39. The university provided the clearance check template to the inspection team during the inspection. The form was issued by central admissions services and applied to all apprentice programmes within the university and was saved to the student record. The form required employers to confirm the date of the enhanced DBS clearance, the certificate number and date on the certificate, and date of the occupational health check.

40. The university also supplied a training plan template during the inspection. The training plan set out the responsibilities of each party under the training agreement where it was clear that employers were obligated to ensure that the apprentice had an enhanced DBS and occupational health clearance.

41. The inspectors explored the role of the safeguarding and suitability panel with the course team during inspection and heard that the panel was jointly run with East Sussex

County Council and Brighton and Hove City Council. University representation was at course leader level, or the academic admissions tutor if the person was an applicant at the time of the panel. Local authority representation was at the principal social worker level.

42. Following a review of the evidence the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

43. The university submitted the institutional equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) policy, a link to the institutional pages on EDI and the course handbook which linked to the institutional EDI policy. Additionally, the mapping document reported that university staff undertook mandatory eLearning in dignity at work, equality and diversity in practice and unconscious bias. Email invites to anti-racist and inclusive recruitment training for panel members organised by the teaching partnership were also provided.

44. The university also provided documentary evidence that demonstrated how they support applicants during the admissions process, including guidance for the interview day that included a section on how to disclose any need for reasonable adjustments during interview.

45. Through discussion with a variety of stakeholders across the inspection, the inspection team heard that EDI data on applicants was not monitored by the university. It was explained that the university interviewed those applicants put forward by the employer partners, and while they provided a decision on whether an applicant was suitable for entry to the course, the final decision was the employers. The inspectors reported that, without data to track the diversity of applicants who made an expression of interest, through the process to course registration, they could not be assured that the EDI policies in relation to applicants were implemented, and monitored.

46. In addition, the inspection team heard that, although experts by experience were contractually considered hourly-paid staff, they were not offered and therefore did not undertake the mandatory EDI training. Additionally, on occasion, the format of online interviews did not enable all experts to fully participate in the admission activities due to the challenges a virtual environment posed for them due to their varying disabilities.

47. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against 1.5 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 1.6

48. The course provider shared a link to the course page for the social work degree apprenticeship as an example of the online information that would be implemented for the course. Also included as evidence in support of this standard were slide decks from recruitment events, and a social work research flyer.

49. Throughout the inspection, the inspection team heard that there were a number of opportunities for information to be disseminated from both the university centrally via the apprenticeship office, and the course team via recruitment events. Overall, students reported having enough information to make an informed decision about whether to take up their courses and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

50. The mapping document reported that students undertook a 70-day placement in year 1, a 100-day placement in year 2 and 30 additional skills days. Apprentices were understood to have both placements within their employing agency and the university maintained oversight of placement allocation to ensure appropriate contrast. Documentary evidence included in support of this standard included the PSD, minutes from the practice assessment panel (PAP), placement spreadsheets, placement provider audit form templates, placement handbook and slide decks from preparation for placement sessions.

51. The mapping document narrative noted that it was the responsibility of the employer agency to identify appropriate placements for apprentices. However, during inspection it was confirmed by the university that, for apprentices employed in the voluntary sector, the university was responsible for finding the 100-day placement in a statutory agency.

52. As a secondary submission of evidence, the university also provided a list of the skills day topics planned for each year of the programme. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team understood that although some aspects of the skills days may change following student and employer feedback the themes and topics would remain the same.

53. During inspection the staff involved in practice education explained that in addition to the 70- and 100-day placements, as part of readiness for direct practice students also undertook 3 days of shadowing within local authorities, third sector agencies and NHS trusts. Students met by the inspection team noted being overall satisfied with the quality and content of their placements. They reported knowing when skills days were held and that their attendance at those days was monitored. They explained that missed skills days were made up by a written submission based on the topic. However, students felt confused about what happened to those submissions as they did not receive feedback on them and it was not clear to them that they were reviewed (c.f. [standard 4.10](#)).

54. The inspection team reviewed the evidence and concluded that, the skills day were timetabled and understood across stakeholders and agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 2.2

55. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the PSD, placement spreadsheets, practice learning module handbooks, placement feedback forms, a template for recording evidence against the apprentice occupational standards and the training plan template. In addition, the university also supplied workshop evidence from the PEPS programme and proformas for students' personal development within placement.

56. The inspection team were keen to better understand the process of placement allocation to student learning need. Through discussion with staff involved in practice learning the inspection team heard that the matching process was facilitated by a profile completed by students where learning needs and goals were identified. Where apprentices remained in their substantive role for the first placement the differentiation between the work on placement, and the substantive role, was monitored and discussed in tripartite meetings. The course team reported that students came back into university for recall days almost weekly and were encouraged to discuss any concerns around their learning on placement. An example was given where a student was moved teams to increase the range of learning opportunities.

57. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

58. The practice learning agreement (PLA) held within the placement handbook included an induction checklist and set out supervision arrangements in hours per week for an onsite practice educator, and per fortnight where there was a practice supervisor. In addition, tripartite meetings were understood to be conducted every 12 weeks where student workload was considered, placements included a mid-way review and students positively discussed the support provided by their personal academic tutor (PAT).

59. Through discussion with staff involved in practice education the inspection team understood that the PLA was returned to the university within three weeks of the start of the placement where it was checked, and gaps were raised with the placement provider.

60. Through discussion with employer partners the inspection team heard that the PLA checklist was used to maintain oversight of induction, and that largely students received the same induction as a staff member. However, students met by the inspection team reported that inductions were dependant on their placement, and practice educator, with some students reporting having to organise their own inductions.

61. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.3 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was

given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 2.4

62. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the placement handbook, practice learning module handbooks, slide decks from presentations for student preparation for placement and slide decks from 4 PEPS workshops. The narrative on the mapping document highlighted that students undertook an initial skills scan and that responsibilities were reviewed during the tripartite review meetings. The placement handbook included the midway, and end of placement report form, which required practice educators to assess apprentices against the PCF and the Social Work England professional standards.

63. Through discussion with university staff the inspection team heard that the placement team reviewed the student placement profile form to ensure that the student had provided enough detail on their learning needs. In addition, the PLA was reviewed on its return to the university (c.f. para [59](#)). The students and practice educators met by the inspection team did not raise any concerns regarding the appropriateness of tasks on placements and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

64. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the PSD which detailed the readiness for direct practice assessment components. Also supplied were the module handbook, examples of assessed readiness PAP minutes, a practice shadowing form template and shadowing frequently asked questions (FAQs) document. The inspection team noted that experts by experience participated in the video interview for readiness for practice and that students spoke positively about this element of assessment noting that it had impacted their practice. Neither students, nor practice educators, raised any concerns regarding preparedness for practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

65. The university submitted 18 pieces of documentary evidence in support of this standard including a placement provider audit form which collected the name, qualifications and Social Work England registration number for practice educators who were located within the local authority. Also provided was a spreadsheet that recorded independent practice educators, their Social Work England registration number and the date the register had been cross-checked. A further information sheet demonstrated that new independent practice educators were required to provide copies of their practice education certificates.

66. During inspection it was confirmed that the placement administrator cross-checked the registration status of practice educators with the Social Work England register.

67. Through discussion with the staff involved in practice education, the inspection team understood that the university offered practice educator training and retained MS Teams registers from these sessions. In addition, they were happy to respond to requests for individualised support and reported providing a bespoke session to a practice educator who asked for support with report writing. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.7

68. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the placement handbook which provided guidance on raising and escalating concerns. The students met by the inspection team responded positively when asked if they understood the term 'whistleblowing' and if they would know where to find the policy. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

69. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included School Executive Board (SEB) terms of reference, a university governance structure and a management statement from the school dean. Also submitted were team CVs, agendas and minutes from the Qualifying Courses Management Group (QCMG), role descriptors for the course leadership roles and information from the teaching partnership.

70. The inspection team were clear about the lines of accountability within the school. The qualifying programmes were overseen by the subject lead for social work who reported to the Dean of the school. From the narrative in the mapping document the inspection team understood that, in addition to teaching partnership meetings there were:

- The Social Work Group (SWG), attended by the social work team. SWG met monthly for planning, review and operational discussion.
- The Qualifying Social Work Management Group (QSWMG), attended by experts by experience, employers, and university representatives. QSWMG fed into the Board of Study (BoS) and considered any quality assurance issues, all aspects of learning, teaching and assessment, EDI and professional frameworks.
- The Student Staff Forum (SSF), attended by student and apprentice representatives and course team representatives. SSF conducted ongoing monitoring and evaluation activity with a steer towards learning experiences, environment and resources.

71. Through discussion with the senior leadership team (SLT), the inspection team heard a commitment to social work and an understanding of the unique management and assurance systems in place to support an apprenticeship programme effectively. It was clear to inspectors that the leadership staff within the course team were appropriately supported in their work by the senior leaders. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

72. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included a practice agreement form, the placement audit form, placement provider audit forms, information on the practice review process (PRP), the terms of reference for the PRP and the placement handbook.

73. The inspectors noted that the practice agreement form set out the placement responsibilities and required placement providers to return the placement audit form. The placement audit form covered equality principles, health, safety and risk, whistleblowing, practical factors such as working space, IT access and working pattern. Also covered were induction requirements, supervision and identification of practice educators. There was explicit confirmation that placements offered met the end of last placement level descriptors within the PCF.

74. During the inspection, the inspection team heard that the PRP was a new process for academic year 2023/24. The course team reported that the process had been enacted twice since its commencement and context was provided regarding those examples. It was explained that the new format of the panel was more efficient, was clearer and provided an immediate decision to the student. The inspectors acknowledged that the PRP was chaired by the course or subject lead, and included representation from practice educators. Employer representation could be sought if appropriate. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

75. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the placement audit form and the placement handbook. The inspection team acknowledged that the PLA was housed within the placement handbook and included an induction checklist with key policies to be reviewed including health and safety (incorporating guidance on managing aggressive behaviour of service-users) and the lone working policy. Additionally, the PLA included equality arrangements where any reasonable adjustments were clearly documented.

76. The checklist also contained a series of induction requirements under the heading 'familiarisation within agency' which included the requirements for apprentices to be shown where they could access self-care facilities such as restrooms or space to make drinks, and any staff canteen or break away spaces.

77. Through discussion with university support services the inspection team heard that wellbeing support, including counselling, continued to be available to students when on placement, and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

78. The inspection team reviewed the documentary evidence submitted by the course provider and noted that the university was a member of a teaching partnership. The university submitted agendas and minutes from QCMG showing discussions relating to the management and monitoring of social work courses and attended by representatives from Brighton and Hove City Council, East Sussex County Council and experts by experience.

79. Also provided were the teaching partnership, South Coast Regional Centre for Social Work Education (SCRC) Steering Group terms of reference which laid out the role of the steering group. Also detailed were membership requirements which included local authority representation and the heads of social work from the University of Brighton and other local providers.

80. As part of a secondary request for evidence the university provided additional narrative on the process of practice educator allocation which was considered satisfactory.

81. Additionally, provided in the initial documentary submission of evidence were 3 emails from principal social workers working within the local authorities supported by the course. The email text provided context on the way in which the university was viewed in practice and included testimony that discussed a willingness to engage and collect feedback, opportunities for practitioners to become involved in educational activities such as teaching and spoke to how well newly qualified social workers from the university were prepared for professional practice upon graduation. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

82. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the placement provider audit form, agendas and minutes from the QSWMG, minutes from the PAP and agendas and minutes from the Qualifying Social Work Course Examination Board (QSWCEB). Also supplied were minutes from the SSF, the Annual Quality Assessment (AQA) action plan and placement feedback forms.

83. The documentary evidence also included the terms of reference from an Experts by Experience Forum, and an invite for that forum. However, as part of the secondary collection of evidence the university confirmed that the forum was no longer active following feedback from the experts by experience group who reported that they would prefer to engage with the course team on an individual basis. The inspection team

triangulated the position of the forum with experts by experience during the inspection and heard that it had been challenging to bring the group together and they felt it did not work.

84. The experts by experience discussed being involved in interviews, assessment, interprofessional practice, teaching and one of the group was a member of the QSWMG. They spoke positively about their involvement and felt their views were valued, highlighting that the team made it easy to give feedback.

85. The students met by the inspection team highlighted the SSF, module evaluation forms and the tripartite meetings as being opportunities for them to provide feedback to the course team and discussed an example where feedback to the SSF had resulted in a change.

86. Employers highlighted providing feedback to the SWQMG, and reported raising a query relating to content within one of the courses, and the university worked with employers to resolve the gap. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.6

87. The inspection team were satisfied that the number of apprentices proposed for the course took into consideration the local and regional placement capacity and noted that admissions was discussed as a standing item at the SWQMG. As part of a secondary submission the university provided additional context around where the strategy for numbers was considered for the apprenticeship and the inspection team understood that recruitment was discussed with employers as part of the SCRC Steering Group.

88. Through discussion with employer partners the inspection team heard that there was a commitment from local authorities to support the course and each local authority indicated anticipated student numbers. It was reported that the expressions of interest received had attracted a different demographic of applicants to the BA apprenticeship route and was felt to enhance opportunity for local authority staff rather than detract from other courses. The inspection team acknowledged that the course had been designed in response to employer need and concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

89. The evidence provided to support this standard included the CV for the lead social worker which detailed relevant qualifications, experience and research. As part of the secondary submission of evidence the inspection team requested the Social Work England registration number of the professional lead and this was cross checked with the Social Work England register. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

90. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included a breakdown of staff full-time equivalence (FTE) and CVs for the social work staff. As part of the secondary

submission of evidence the university also supplied information on the current research areas of staff. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met, noting that staff engaged in continuing professional development (CPD) to remain current.

Standard 3.9

91. The inspection team reviewed the AQA plan and the institutional Access and Participation Plan (APP), Race Equality Action Plan and Inclusive Language Guidance. From the narrative included on the mapping document the inspection team understood that data on performance, progression and outcomes was collected at exam boards and as part of the AQA process. Data was also collected through the institutional evaluation and policy department who were responsible for monitoring students' outcomes, part of which included a focus on student characteristics and differential outcomes.

92. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the course team evaluated information about students' progression and outcomes at a course level. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that a data system, *ClickView*, provided them with comprehensive data including the risk of students not continuing or progressing. The team was able to filter this data using preset characteristic factors and noted that the system was improving.

93. At the time of the inspection the course had not run, however, the inspection team heard examples from other social work courses within the school. Examples of how the course team used data to make changes included amending the course structure to provide the shadowing practice experience earlier in year 1, following an increase in 16 – 18 year old school leaver applicants.

94. The course team reported that the university as a whole had recognised an awarding gap for students from Black and Asian ethnic groups and the university had worked with the University of Sussex to facilitate a reflective forum for students who may be impacted either academically or on placement. The forum was attended by staff and students from both institutions and considered practical support. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

95. The inspection team reviewed the institutional workload allocation model and information about the academics in practice initiative. The inspection team understood that staff had protected time in their workload to undertake practice or scholarly activity and through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard about a diverse range of CPD opportunities, including PhD study and the postgraduate certificate in academic practice (PG CAP) which provided fellowship of AdvanceHE. The course team further explained that staff were able to request to study on, and complete internal university

modules and that in the previous academic year 5 staff members spent at least one day in practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

96. Documentary evidence submitted to support this standard included a mapping document that demonstrated how the course mapped to the Social Work England professional standards, module specification documents (MSDs), practice learning module handbooks, and the course handbook.

97. The narrative supplied within the mapping document noted that the course was mapped to the following frameworks:

- Social Work England Professional Standards
- QAA Benchmark Statement for Social Work
- The Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Educations (IfATE) Social Worker Statement

And that placements were assessed against the following frameworks:

- Social Work England Professional Standards
- Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF)

The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.2

98. The documentary evidence submitted prior to inspection in support of this standard included QSWMG minutes, the course handbook, practitioners who teach schedule of input, and module handbooks. Inspectors noted examples of specific input into the course from experts by experience and practitioners in the module SS791, *Practice Learning 1* and highlighted feedback experts by experience minuted in the SWQMG.

99. Throughout the inspection the inspection team heard that the university were collaborative and worked alongside stakeholder partners. Experts by experience were employed as hourly paid staff and reported engagement in admissions, teaching, assessment (cf. para [84](#), [122](#) and [126](#)) and governance activities (c.f. para [70](#)). Employers reported having the opportunity to feedback on the course through the QSWMG and provided examples of where feedback on the course had been received and acted upon (c.f. para [86](#)), and the skills day schedule detailed the sessions delivered by the practitioners who teach. The inspection team heard examples of how feedback from students, experts by

experience and employers had instigated change and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.3

100. The course provider submitted 20 pieces of evidence in support of this standard which covered institutional policies, and initiatives, as well as module handbooks and information about the student support and guidance tutor (SSGT). Specific evidence highlighted by the inspectors included the student contract, the 'Belonging at Brighton programme', the APP plan, the institutional policy on inclusive learning and teaching practice and the cause for concern policy. The narrative within the mapping document also provided additional information on the cross-institutional forum for students from ethnic minority groups (c.f. para [94](#)) and student meetings to support mature students, those who identify as carers, estranged students and repeating students. Throughout the inspection the inspection team recognised a strong commitment to EDI and noted that the course content and environment met the standard.

Standard 4.4

101. Through review of the documentary evidence, the inspection team considered the currency of the programme modules submitted in support of this standard and noted that they appeared current, with appropriate reading lists and links to contemporary relevant organisations.

102. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard examples where research impacted on teaching and how academics stayed in touch with the profession, including an academics in practice programme.

103. The inspection team were keen to better understand the way creative assessment was used within the course. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that a poster presentation, aligned to theory and research evidence, was used to support students to think more broadly about the social work profession. They were asked to select an area of social work practice and present the policy, legal, service and organisational developments whilst providing context of the role of a social worker in that environment.

104. The inspection team noted that the institutional AQA process provided a quality assurance framework for internal programme review (c.f. paras [82](#) and [91](#)) and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

105. The inspection team reviewed the course handbook, module handbooks and the PSD.

106. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that they were involved in the co-delivery of PEPs training alongside their employer partners which included sessions on how to be theory informed as practice educators.

107. Practice educators reported integrating theory into practice through supervision, citing the tools and cards they used to achieve this, while discussing the students case work. They also expected that students would bring their university learning back into practice and share it with colleagues. Students were well informed and talked confidently about their favourite theories and how they had used them in practice. They spoke positively about supervision as a time to breakdown cases and think about theories, noting this process helped them to more naturally integrate theory and practice as they became more experienced on placement. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

108. The evidence submitted in support of this standard was directly related to the interprofessional activities reported on the mapping form, including 4 sessions delivered alongside students from other professions (including midwifery, occupational therapy, social work, physiotherapy early years) and 3 sessions delivered by other professionals (including a Family and Systemic Psychotherapist). The students met by the inspection team spoke positively about the interprofessional learning they had experienced, specifically citing sessions on dementia, child protection and shared delivery alongside medical students. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

109. The inspection team reviewed the module handbooks and MSDs and noted that a standard credits accumulation and transfer system (CATS) was in place allocating 1 credit to 10 hours of notional learning time. The 20% spend 'off the job' was clearly articulated within the training plan, including the stipulation that any maths and English training required would be undertaken during working hours, in addition to the 20% 'off the job'. The 20% off the job training was clearly detailed within the recruitment event presentation provided as evidence for [Standard 1.1](#). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

110. The course provider submitted 16 pieces of evidence in support of this standard which included the university's general Examination and Assessment Regulations (GEAR), examination board minutes, external examiner reports from the MSc Social Work, the PSD and PAP minutes. The inspection team noted a diverse range of assessments including role plays, research-based assignments and presentations and understood that an alternative assessment process was in place where, in some modules, students could choose the format

of their assessment, for example between a 4,000-word practice study or a 20-minute presentation with a follow up viva.

111. The inspectors noted that the external examiner reports were overall positive about the application of grading criteria and the contemporary assessments in place. However, the external examiner highlighted a need to better understand the moderation system. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that a 20% sample, or 6 scripts, whichever was higher, were sent to the external examiner for moderation.

112. Students reported a good range of assessment methods, highlighting exams, case studies, poster presentations and essays. Students were aware of the alternative assessment options; however, reported that, although alternative assessment was offered, they did not always have enough detail on the non-written assessment alternative. Consequently, students defaulted to the written submissions and did not always uptake the opportunity to submit in an alternative format.

113. The email feedback from principal social workers submitted as evidence for [Standard 3.4](#) reported that graduates of the programmes were prepared for professional practice suggesting that the assessment strategy in place was suitable to ensure that students had developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.

114. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to review and ensure the information provided to students on alternative assessment is clear. Further details of the recommendation can be found in [recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard 4.9

115. The inspection team reviewed the PSD, the institutional assessment and feedback policy. Also supplied were the curriculum design framework, and the external examiner reports from the MSc Social Work. During the inspection the university provided the assessment schedule which set out assessments by module with specific submission dates. Students reported that assessments were generally well spaced. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

116. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included module handbooks, MSDs, the institutional personal academic tutoring policy, the school postgraduate taught courses assessment guide and the placement handbook.

117. Through discussions with stakeholders across the inspection, the inspection team identified that feedback was provided to students on both formative and summative assessment and from practice educators on placement. Placement portfolios were understood to be moderated by staff and experts by experience at the PAP, providing an

additional avenue for feedback. PATs provided an additional means by which feedback and academic support could be provided and apprentices also received feedback as part of the 12-weekly tripartite meetings.

118. Through discussion with the students, the inspection team heard that feedback was generally timely; however, it was reported that students did not always find the written feedback meaningful, and on occasion felt comments to be inappropriately severe. It was reported that it was not clear to students how the written feedback related to the grading criteria, or how it could be used to improve. Students provided examples where grades had been challenged, however, the outcome of those processes were reported to have been experienced as either negative, or passive, rather than as a positive, encouraging experience.

119. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team understood that the external examiner had raised issues of consistency in feedback and that the team had, in response, instigated a marking sample and calibration exercise and engaged in group internal moderation. It was also highlighted that, in previous academic years, hourly paid lecturers had provided support for marking and that this was not continuing into the current academic year.

120. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.10 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 4.11

121. The inspection team reviewed staff CVs, institutional policies on the recruitment of an external examiner, independent practice educator details including qualifications, slides from training for practice supervisors and the placement handbook.

122. Staff were considered to have appropriate expertise to undertake assessment. It was understood that experts by experience were involved in marking assessments. The experts by experience reported undertaking an in-person training session before an assessment event where the grading criteria and scoring sheets were discussed and described themselves as feeling well prepared.

123. At the time of the inspection the external examiner had not been appointed for the programme.

124. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.11 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 4.12

125. The course provider mapped to 14 pieces of evidence in support of this standard including QSWCEB minutes, PAP minutes, an expert by experience PAP portfolio review sheet template, an external examiner report from the MSc Social work, module handbooks and the PSD. Institutional policies on fitness to practice, GEAR and suitability and safeguarding were also provided.

126. The inspection team noted that a diverse range of people were involved in assessment decisions (c.f. para [117](#)) and acknowledged that the QSWCEB was attended by external examiners and that the PAP included experts by experience. The narrative provided on the mapping document noted that practitioners contributed to all meetings of the PAP; however, the minutes submitted as evidence did not identify roles of attendees. Practice educators provided feedback via the midway and final placement reports, and through direct observation of practice. The 12-weekly tripartite meetings provided students with feedback from employers and tutors and PATS were available as an additional source of feedback. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

127. The inspection team reviewed the MSDs, module handbooks and the placement handbook. The inspection team acknowledged the identified links between theory and practice already reported (c.f. paras [105 - 107](#)). Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard examples of how evidence informed practice was embedded into the course, including the use of cases and case law and the use of research-based activities in assessment (c.f. para [103](#)). Practice educators spoke clearly about the links between research and practice including asking students to bring research articles to supervision for discussion, and through discussions with central support teams the inspection team heard that the library had just launched an extension of access to online resource to social work practitioners supporting students on placement. Apprentices undertook a 60-credit dissertation module which had clear links to the development of research skills. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

128. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, student support was articulated clearly within the documentary evidence submitted prior to inspection and through discussions with stakeholders.

129. Central services reported that counselling and careers support was available flexibly, on and off campus. Through discussions with central wellbeing staff the inspection team heard that the university provided student support and guidance tutors (SSGTs) who acted as a first point of contact for students, and who could provide some support, or referral to other services, including the cause for concern process. Occupational health was understood to be arranged by referral. Students spoke positively about the support they were offered. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

130. The inspection team met with representatives from academic support services and heard that students had access to library services, a comprehensive disability support service, the SSGT and within the department students were allocated PATs. More widely, the apprenticeship team also provided support to students and could make referrals to support services where required. During inspection a demonstration of the library webpages was provided and the inspection team noted that access to e-books, video tutorials and academic writing tools such as *Cite them Write* were easy to access. The disability team provided the necessary support for the development of institutional learning support plans (LSPs) and the library offered accessibility equipment for loan such as portable hearing loops. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

131. Prior to inspection the inspection team reviewed the course handbook, an initial suitability declaration completed on admission to the programme and a fitness for social work training statement completed each academic year. The handbook clearly laid out the requirement for students to disclose any changes to their DBS clearance and any other matters which may affect their suitability for social work study and their later application for registration with Social Work England. The fitness for social work training statement gave clear guidance on the expectations of the regulator in relation to suitability to study including links to the Social Work England professional standards and the Social Work England professional standard guidance. The form also cross-referenced the relevant course regulations. The inspection team heard no evidence to suggest that this process was not operationalised appropriately and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

132. The inspection team understood that support was available for students with disabilities through a learning support plan (LSPs). The course handbook, submitted in support of this standard, included information on support for students with disabilities noting that the course leader was responsible for ensuring that approved reasonable adjustments were met in relation to assessment within the university and on placement. The process to declare a disability, learning difficulty or health condition was laid out within the handbook and links to central service were embedded in the text.

133. The inspection team explored how reasonable adjustments were supported on placement with employer partners and heard that, as apprentices were employees, they were able access support, and funding for equipment or software through access to work and provided an example of an apprentice who required a desk and chair which was able to be provided. Practice educators met by the inspection team were aware of LSPs, and the inspection team heard that they felt that the plans often concentrated on academic study support. However, they were aware that students could ask central services to update the plan to include practice learning considerations. Students did not report any concerns regarding LSPs, or reasonable adjustments.

134. Through discussion with central support services, in addition to the provision of LSPs, the inspection team heard that the library offered bookable accessible decks, height adjustable desks, scanners and digital magnifiers. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

135. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course handbook, placement handbook and module handbooks. The course handbook included the course structure, information about placements, referenced policies that were relevant to social work students, contact details, information regarding Social Work England and the regulation of the profession, and an assessment schedule with space to include submission dates.

136. Students reported understanding that there was a requirement to register with the regulator, and that they could apply to register with Social Work England once the pass lists had been confirmed and that a session covering the transition to professional social workers was coming up but had not run at the time of the inspection.

137. The inspection team acknowledged that the handbooks were comprehensive in relation to assessment, however reflected that students had felt that they did not have enough information on alternative assessments (c.f. para [112](#)).

138. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team agreed that this standard is met with a recommendation to review and ensure the information provided to students on

alternative assessment is clear. Further details of the recommendation can be found in [recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard 5.6

139. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the PSD and course handbook and noted that all components of the course were mandatory.

140. The handbook provided information on attendance stating that the expectation was that students attended all timetabled sessions including lectures, workshops, skills development days, inter-professional learning and placement days as well as tutorials. Students were expected to notify the university if they were unable to attend for health reasons. Placement days were required to be made up if missed and if a skills day was missed, a make-up task was required.

141. The students met by the inspection team felt that they understood what was mandatory to attend and noted that registers were taken in class for university attendance, and practice educators verified their attendance for placement hours. Students also noted that the placement calendar was shared with their placement supervisor so there was no confusion over when a student was on placement and when they were in university. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

142. Following a review of the documentary evidence provided, and through discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team felt assured that feedback was provided from a variety of sources (c.f. standard [3.9](#), [4.8](#) and [4.10](#) for more information on student feedback) and that it was timely (c.f. para [118](#)). However, students reported that the meaningfulness of feedback was not always clear to them (c.f. para [118](#)).

143. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against 5.7 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 5.8

144. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the institutional GEAR regulations which included clear information on academic appeals, these regulations were cross-referenced in the handbook. Some students were aware of an academic appeals process and cited a click through link on the website however, a number of students did not respond positively when asked if they knew about academic appeals.

145. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team agreed that this standard is met with a recommendation to review the information provided to students on academic appeals. Further details of the recommendation can be found in [recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register

Standard 6.1

146. The inspection team reviewed the PSD and agreed that the MSc Social Work Degree Apprenticeship met the standard, noting that the exit awards were clearly differentiated in title from the registered award.

Proposed outcome

The inspection team recommend that the course be approved with conditions. These will be monitored for completion.

Conditions

Conditions for approval are set if there are areas of a course that do not currently meet our standards. Conditions are binding and must be met by the education provider within the agreed timescales.

Having considered whether approval with conditions or a refusal of approval was an appropriate course of action, we are proposing the following condition for this course at this time.

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	1.5	The university will provide evidence that they have: • Implemented EDI data collection for the admission process for the course. • Have a clear process of investigating data, reporting on trends and using the information to inform practice.	24 November 2024	Para 45
2	1.5	The university will provide evidence that experts by experience who are employed as hourly paid staff by the university have been included in the annual renewal of EDI training including, but not limited to, unconscious bias training.	24 November 2024	Para 46
3	2.3	The university will provide evidence of consistent and ongoing oversight of student placement induction arrangements.	24 November 2024	Para 60
4	4.10 5.7	The university will provide evidence that the marking, calibration and moderation processes have been reviewed and report on any steps taken to ensure that	24 November 2024	Paras 118 142

		feedback is consistent, helpful and linked to the grading criteria.		
5	4.10 5.7	The university will provide evidence of a clear, standardised process for students who request clarification of feedback including how students have been made aware of it.	24 November 2024	Paras 118 142
6	4.11	Once appointed the university will supply the CV, and Social Work England registration number, of the external examiner for review.	24 November 2024	Para 123

Recommendations

In addition to the conditions above, the inspectors identified the following recommendations for the education provider. These recommendations highlight areas that the education provider may wish to consider. The recommendations do not affect any decision relating to course approval.

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	1.3	The inspectors are recommending that the university work towards including an expert by experience on all interview panels. This should be raised with employer agencies as appropriate.	Para 35
2	4.8 5.5	The inspectors are recommending that the university review the information provided on all assessment options to ensure that the level of detail is consistent between written and non-written formats.	Paras 112 137
3.	5.8	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider the information provided to signpost students to the academic appeals process.	Para 144

It should be noted that all qualifying social work courses will be subject to re-approval under Social Work England's [2021 education and training standards](#).

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
Admissions			
1.1 Confirm on entry to the course, via a holistic/multi-dimensional assessment process, that applicants: i. have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards ii. can demonstrate that they have a good command of English iii. have the capability to meet academic standards; and iv. have the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.	☒	☐	☐
1.2 Ensure that applicants' prior relevant experience is considered as part of the admissions processes.	☒	☐	☐
1.3 Ensure that employers, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work are involved in admissions processes.	☒	☐	☒
1.4 Ensure that the admissions processes assess the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes criminal conviction checks.	☒	☐	☐
1.5 Ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.	☐	☒	☐
1.6 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a course. This will include	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
information about the professional standards, research interests and placement opportunities.			
Learning environment			
2.1 Ensure that students spend at least 200 days (including up to 30 skills days) gaining different experiences and learning in practice settings. Each student will have: i) placements in at least two practice settings providing contrasting experiences; and ii) a minimum of one placement taking place within a statutory setting, providing experience of sufficient numbers of statutory social work tasks involving high risk decision making and legal interventions.	☒	☐	☐
2.2 Provide practice learning opportunities that enable students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
2.3 Ensure that while on placements, students have appropriate induction, supervision, support, access to resources and a realistic workload.	☐	☒	☐
2.4 Ensure that on placements, students' responsibilities are appropriate for their stage of education and training.	☒	☐	☐
2.5 Ensure that students undergo assessed preparation for direct practice to make sure they are safe to carry out practice learning in a service delivery setting.	☒	☐	☐
2.6 Ensure that practice educators are on the register and that they have the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.	☒	☐	☐
Course governance, management and quality			
3.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.	☒	☐	☐
3.2 Ensure that they have agreements with placement providers to provide education and training that meets the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards. This should include necessary consents and ensure placement providers have contingencies in place to deal with practice placement breakdown.	☒	☐	☐
3.3 Ensure that placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 Ensure that employers are involved in elements of the course, including but not limited to the management and monitoring of courses and the allocation of practice education.	☒	☐	☐
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.			
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity.	☒	☐	☐
3.7 Ensure that a lead social worker is in place to hold overall professional responsibility for the course. This person must be appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
3.8 Ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, to deliver an effective course.	☒	☐	☐
3.9 Evaluate information about students' performance, progression and outcomes, such as the results of exams and assessments, by collecting, analysing and using student data, including data on equality and diversity.	☒	☐	☐
3.10 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice.	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum and assessment			
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design,	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
ongoing development and review of the curriculum.			
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.	☒	☐	☐
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.5 Ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.6 Ensure that students are given the opportunity to work with, and learn from, other professions in order to support multidisciplinary working, including in integrated settings.	☒	☐	☐
4.7 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	☒	☐	☐
4.8 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☒
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students' progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☐	☒	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the register.	☐	☒	☐
4.12 Ensure that there are systems to manage students' progression, with input from a range of people, to inform decisions about their progression including via direct observation of practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.13 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation.	☒	☐	☐
Supporting students			
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: i. confidential counselling services; ii. careers advice and support; and iii. occupational health services	☒	☐	☐
5.2 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their academic development including, for example, personal tutors.	☒	☐	☐
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☒	☐	☐
5.5 Provide information to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.	☒	☐	☒
5.6 Provide information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory.	☒	☐	☐
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	☐	☒	☐
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	☒	☐	☒
Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register			
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor's degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions.

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

1.If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure education providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the [education and training standards](#).

2. Inspectors will undertake the conditions review and make recommendations to Social Work England's decision maker.

3. This section of the report will be completed when the conditions review is completed.

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1	1.5	The university will provide evidence that they have: • Implemented EDI data collection for the admission process for the course. • Have a clear process of investigating data, reporting on trends and using the information to inform practice.	Met
2	1.5	The university will provide evidence that experts by experience who are employed as hourly paid staff by the university have been included in the annual renewal of EDI training including, but not limited to, unconscious bias training.	Met
3	2.3	The university will provide evidence of consistent and ongoing oversight of student placement induction arrangements.	Met
4	4.10 5.7	The university will provide evidence that the marking, calibration and moderation processes have been reviewed and report on any steps taken to ensure that feedback is consistent, helpful and linked to the grading criteria.	Met
5	4.10 5.7	The university will provide evidence of a clear, standardised process for	Met

		students who request clarification of feedback including how students have been made aware of it.	
6	4.11	Once appointed the university will supply the CV, and Social Work England registration number, of the external examiner for review.	Met

Findings

4. The conditions review was undertaken as a result of the conditions set during the course approval as outlined in the original inspection report above.

5. In addition to documentary evidence the course provider also submitted a conditions evidence mapping form (hereafter ‘the mapping form’) which included narrative evidence against each condition.

6. In response to condition 1 the course provider submitted 15 pieces of evidence. The mapping form explained that the university and employer partners took the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) seriously and reported that the following actions had been taken since the inspection:

- Employers would request EDI data from applicants who submitted an expression of interest to join the programme. Applicants were able to choose whether to submit their data and the purpose was explained. The data was planned to be used by Brighton and Hove City Council who intended to track their applicants throughout the admissions processes to monitor recruitment outcomes.
- Data was planned to be reviewed by the Teaching Partnership Steering Group to identify any themes, or patterns, in the demographics of successful, and unsuccessful applicants.

7. Once applicants were registered with the University, the University collected, and reported on, equalities data. The inspection team agreed that this condition was met.

8. In response to condition 2 the mapping form reported that all experts by experience involved in recruitment and admissions activities would be required to undertake mandatory EDI training. The training took the form of three modules and included a module on unconscious bias. The University provided:

- screenshots from the e-training delivery system that detailed the relevant modules

- an excerpt from the institutional mandatory training completion report that demonstrated how compliance with the training requirement was monitored
- minutes from the Expert by Experience meeting where EDI training was discussed.

9. The inspection team agreed that this condition was met.

10. The University submitted 14 documents in support of condition 3. Inspectors noted an agreement between the university and employer partners detailing a clear requirement for protected time for induction at the beginning of any placement for all apprentices. An induction checklist within the practice learning agreement (PLA) that was signed by the apprentice, practice educator, practice supervisor, and by the personal academic tutor (PAT) on behalf of the university was also provided. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

11. In response to condition 4 the University provided 11 items of documentary evidence. The narrative supplied on the mapping form explained that marking was usually done in small teams within Social Work and that, the Institutional Double Marking and Moderation of Summative Assessment Policy, suggested that where team marking occurred a calibration exercise should take place in advance of the marking period. The University reported that a calibration event was conducted on social work modules where multiple markers were working together to mark work, followed by a moderation event to further ensure consistency. As a result of the team reviews, the social work team reported that they developed the marking criteria and a framework for categorising the marking criteria that was intended to support apprentices to understand what was required within each assessment.

12. Additionally, a proportion of work was moderated by the external examiner who was asked to comment on clarity of marking criteria, consistency of grades, and consistency of feedback. Inspectors noted that clear timelines were provided. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

12. The University supplied the MSc Social Worker Degree Apprenticeship Course Handbook in response to condition 5. The handbook included information on the support available to an apprentice, the tutorial support available to an apprentice via their PAT, information on marking criteria, assignment workshops and drafts on assessed work, including the opportunity to request feedback on assignment plans. The handbook stated, *'markers are always happy to discuss feedback comments if you would like clarification (their name will be added to your assignment) and you should also seek to discuss your assignment feedback with your PAT'*. The inspection team agreed that this condition was met.

13. The University supplied the nomination form, and Social Work England Registration number, for the external examiner in response to condition 6. The register was cross

checked, and the inspectors considered the credentials of the external examiner. The inspection team agreed that this condition was met.

14. Following the review of the documentary evidence submitted, the inspection team are satisfied that the conditions set against the approval of the MSc Social Work Degree Apprenticeship are met.

Regulator decision

Conditions Met.