

Ruskin College Course Approval: BA Honours Social Work

Report date: 26 November 2020

Proposed outcome:

Withdrawal of approval

Regulatory decision:

Withdrawal of approval

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary	5
Language	5
Conflict of interest.....	5
Background.....	6
Inspection.....	8
Meetings with staff connected with the course	9
Meeting with students	10
Meetings with people with lived experience of social work	11
Meetings with stakeholders: Placement Provider	11
Findings	13
Standard one: Level of qualification for entry onto the register	13
Standard two: Admissions.....	14
Standard three: Course governance, management and leadership	18
Standard four: Course design and delivery	27
Standard five: Practice based learning.....	33
Standard six: Assessment	35
Conclusion.....	38
Proposed outcome.....	39
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	40
Regulator decision	46

Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses of initial education and training. Inspections form part of our quality assurance 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 supplied by the course provider 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 Social Work England about whether a course should be approved.
3. The process is governed by 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. A course may also be inspected under an extraordinary inspection process if it is required outside of a normal period of reapproval.
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 that 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 multi-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 with a regulator decision attached.
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

Inspection findings from Ruskin College course inspection

15. Ruskin College was inspected under the extraordinary inspection processes² following the assessment of potentially significant changes to the course following the redesign of many processes within Ruskin College and the departure of the social work course staff. Social Work England also considered complaints about the course received on behalf of students as part of the inspection.

Inspection ID	RC54
Course provider	Ruskin College
Validating body (if different)	Open University
Course inspected	BA Honours Social Work
Date of inspection	20-23 rd July 2020
Mode of study	Full time and part time
Inspection team	Hannah Brown, Head of Education Quality Assurance acting as Education Quality Assurance Officer Joshua Hemsworth, facilitating Education Quality Assurance Officer Joanne Benn, Lay Inspector Associate Professor David Childs, Registrant Inspector
Inspector recommendation	Withdrawal of approval
Approval outcome	Withdrawal of approval

Language

In this document, we describe Ruskin College as ‘the College’ and the social work course as ‘the course’. The Academic Lead for social work is hereafter referred to as the ‘Academic Lead’.

Conflict of interest

Prior to the inspection, it was disclosed that David Childs had completed a Degree course that had been taught by the Academic Lead in 2004 – 2007. This was acknowledged in the initial meeting with course staff at the beginning of the inspection and both parties agreed that this posed no conflict of interest to the processes.

No other parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

² The HCPC had previously conducted a direct visit and transferred responsibility for consideration of the matter as part of transition of regulatory responsibilities.

Background

16. Social Work England became the new specialist regulator for social work in England on 2 December 2019. Prior to this date, the previous regulator had considered a concern raised about the course provider following the departure of staff within the social work department at Ruskin College. The Health Care Professions Council (hereafter referred to as 'HCPC') had conducted a 'direct visit' that reviewed the matters of the concern following both restructures in the College and social work course provision and the resignation of course staff. Due to the timing of the visit being close to the transfer of regulatory responsibilities, the findings from the visit were unable to be formally considered by the HCPC's Education and Training Committee. The findings were passed to Social Work England as part of 'work in progress' transitional arrangements to transfer responsibility between the regulators.

17. Social Work England considered the matter under its respective legislation and reviewed the matter under the Education and Training Rules 2019. In early 2020, the Head of Quality Assurance met with staff members at Ruskin College and it was jointly agreed that the course should be given time to address the findings from the direct visit, and allow the appointment of a lead social work course staff member. It was agreed that the course should then be inspected against Social Work England's Education and Training Standards 2019, having had adequate time to prepare for an inspection. The College was provided with a deadline for the submission of documentary evidence to support the inspection and a further opportunity following the initial review by inspectors. The College was also able to reference documents and provide them during the inspection. The inspectors took the opportunity to consider documentary evidence from the Social Work Lead (such as a draft timetable) during the inspection.

18. The process by which this inspection is being undertaken is an Extraordinary Inspection under Rule 9, which in some circumstances is a focussed inspection over a shorter period of time. However given the likely impact of the changes to the course from course staff departure, interim staffing measures and management of subsequent student complaints, it was decided that the course would be inspected against all of the education and training standards. It was also agreed that the Head of Quality Assurance would be part of the inspection team, acting as an Education Quality Assurance Officer given the nature of the concerns and the availability of experienced education quality assurance officers within Social Work England.

19. All approved social work courses are subject to a reapproval cycle against Social Work England's education and training standards, and at the time of the discussion, revised standards were due to come into place in September 2020 ('the 2020 standards')³.

³ <https://www.socialworkengland.org.uk/standards/education-and-training-standards/>

Following the Covid-19 pandemic, the implementation of the education and training standards 2020 was postponed until September 2021 and plans for an on-site inspection were suspended until both the virtual inspection processes (hereafter referred to as 'remote inspection') within the Education Quality Assurance function were developed and tested, and Ruskin College staff were in a position to accommodate an inspection. It was confirmed with the College that the inspection would consider how the course demonstrated meeting the 2019 education and training standards. During the transition to the newer standards, the inspectors are also encouraged to consider the 2020 standards if there are areas that need to be improved to meet these new standards, however the course should be inspected with the 2019 standards as the primary standards.

20. For the Ruskin College inspection, it was also agreed with the College and inspectors that the inspection should focus on the proposals for the course following the recruitment and appointment of an Academic Lead for social work and wherever possible, consider the course as it would be delivered, rather than the inspection of the course revisiting the disruption following the departure of various course staff and restructures of departments within the College or the overall recommendation by HCPC based upon their review of the course at that time. The inspectors were instructed to consider the findings from HCPC but were to review matters afresh during the inspection against Social Work England's own education and training standards. The inspectors were clear that they should review the course currently being delivered at the College and the proposals for how the course would be delivered in the 2020/21 Academic year detailed by the Academic Lead. This consideration was proposed to Ruskin College in advance of the preparation for the inspection and it was confirmed by the College that this would be the preferable option for the inspection to consider the course as it would be delivered in the academic year 20/21. The Regulator acknowledges that Ruskin College disputes that the course was to be inspected with consideration of model of course not currently being delivered. The inspectors have provided their recommendation to the Regulator based upon the findings made in the inspection, and in consideration of the agreed proposal outlined and confirmed with the College at the time of inspection. The inspectors have also reviewed the comments made by the College following the inspection and have revised the report on this basis where appropriate.

21. The Academic Lead for social work commenced in position in May 2020 and an inspection was scheduled to take place on 20 July 2020. Documentary evidence was supplied by Ruskin College in advance of the inspection with an agenda agreed with the course provider ahead of the event.

Inspection

22. A remote inspection took place from 20 July 2020 to 23 July 2020. As part of this process the inspection team organised virtual Microsoft Teams meetings with key stakeholders including; the senior management and leadership team of the course; tutors and staff connected with teaching the course; student services staff; library and IT services; colleagues involved in placement provision at Oxford City Council and people with lived experience of social work involved with 'Voices of Experience'⁴. The External Examiner also made herself available at short notice during the latter part of the agenda. As part of the agenda, the inspection was also arranged to have students take part. To allow all students who wanted to take part in the inspection, two sessions were offered with students from Level 4, 5 and 6 represented in person or able to provide feedback on their experience to the inspectors..

23. These meetings formed the basis of the inspection agenda, which was agreed with Ruskin College ahead of inspection. The following section provides a summary of these sessions, who participated, and the topics that were discussed with the inspection team.

Introductory Meeting with staff teams

24. As part of the agenda, the College were asked to deliver a presentation on 'Reflections of the Approvals Process' as a mechanism for addressing the matters that had come before and prompted the inspection, and outlining what actions had been taken to develop the social work course. The jointly delivered presentation by the Principal of Ruskin College and Academic Lead provided a background to the issues and challenges the course had faced in the lead up to the inspection and provided details about transformational change at the middle level of staffing structures within the College. The presentation highlighted efforts made by the College to develop guidelines around recognised unions, re-establishment of relations with teaching unions and development of new recognition agreements. It also highlighted efforts and aims to increase regional partnership arrangements referencing the Oxford Participation Forum, Voices of Experience and the Four Counties Forum. The presentation explained arrangements that had been made during Covid-19 and the improvement of virtual learning opportunities over Google Classroom as opposed to Moodle⁵, re-writing much of the course material and realigning the course specifications.

25. A partnership with the University of West London was also highlighted with expressions of hope that this working arrangement might provide further opportunities to grow courses at the College, including development of a Masters course, or exploring apprenticeship routes for social work.

⁴ Voices of Experience is a service user involvement group that works alongside Action for Carers Oxfordshire, Carers Oxford, Rethink and Oxfordshire County Council

⁵ Moodle is an open-source learning platform used for online teaching and learning.

26. It was noted by the inspection team that the presentation had been open and honest about challenges at the College and there had been a positive improvement in the course staff members' willingness to engage with Social Work England during this process.

Meetings with staff connected with the course

27. Meetings were held with various College staff members during the four-day inspection period, and the inspection team met some staff members multiple times, either within sessions specifically with staff involved with delivering the course, and with senior management. These included:

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- Academic Lead for social work
- Placement Co-ordinator
- Head of Student Services.
- Academic Registrar, Programme Manager – Higher Education
- Programme Manager – Higher Education Academic and Registrar
- Librarian and IT Support
- Academic Support staff
- Senior Leadership representative for Human Resources

28. The inspection team were keen to understand the structures in place at the course level, including how the course might be delivered by course staff and how the operational and administrative functions connected to the course would be arranged. The social work course is run by a small department within the College with an academic lead, placement co-ordinator and two additional staff members delivering teaching. The Academic Lead and Placement Coordinator also provide link tutor roles for students. It was explained to the inspection team that additional resources had, and could, be called upon to deliver teaching from other subjects within the College, including from other Higher Education courses delivered at Ruskin College (including Community Development and Youth Work), should it be required. At the time of the inspection, a vacancy was open for an additional teaching staff member for social work and an additional fractional time tutor had been appointed but had yet to begin in post.

29. Much of the inspection was spent meeting with the senior leadership team to understand the strategy and plan for the course, including any actions or business continuity plans that had been in place following reflection upon the past couple of years' disruption to

the course. In addition to this, the inspection team met regularly with the Academic Lead and Assistant Principal to seek clarification on points not covered within the pre-approval documentation, or where the inspectors needed to rely on a verbal explanation for matters still requiring development following the recent appointment of the Academic Lead.

30. The inspection team heard that the Student Services Team also supported the social work course, holding responsibility for students and staff support and welfare. This was detailed to be any issues around wellbeing and safeguarding, and included areas such as Disabled Students Allowances assessment. The Head of Student Services explained that they would conduct assessments for students who might need learning support put in place to access learning. The Student Services Team is also the frontline admissions team, and their role includes running interview open days and managing the administrative requirements of the course (for example the collection of much of the data relating to courses within the College).

31. The inspection team met with two staff members responsible for IT and library services and connected with support services for students. These staff members were able to explain improvements to resources within the course due to be in place shortly as well as clarification on points connected with accessing virtual learning resources, library resources and learning materials kept from past years of the course.

32. The inspection team observed that the staff and management team at the College were enthusiastic and committed to the ethos and mission of the organisation, highlighting the history of the College and its background as a widening participation institution. There was also a strong commitment to allowing course staff to complete continuing professional development and vocal support for the Academic Lead to continue with his research ambitions.

Meeting with students

33. The inspection team met with students from two levels of the social work course. Present during the meeting were student course representatives who provided an overview of matters from students who were unable or did not wish to attend. Representatives advised that Level 6 students were engaged at present and nearing the end of the course, but that they felt adequately represented by other student colleagues. Two meetings were held during the four-day inspection. The inspection team also received information by email following the meetings that was considered alongside the meeting.

34. Discussions included students' experience of the admissions process; teaching and learning; course management; preparation for placement; and the academic or pastoral support available. The inspection team also encouraged participants to reflect on the feedback they had given to the College and whether they felt it had been valued and acted upon.

35. Across the students present, there were examples given where feedback on the course had been sought, for example during session feedback forms or requested via link or session tutors. Students reported feeling undervalued and excluded from feedback mechanisms

within the College and raised significant concerns about their ability to raise areas for improvement.

36. Students expressed varied experiences throughout the session, with students at different stages of the course having different experiences to others. It was acknowledged by students that there had been significant disruption in the past two academic years following the departure of two sets of teaching staff, however most advised that they had a strong desire to stay on the course and had high hopes that the Academic Lead could rectify areas that they felt were not meeting desired standards.

Meetings with people with lived experience of social work

37. The inspection team met with the Voices of Experience group who provide representation of people with lived experience involved throughout the teaching of the course. The group is an organisation that provides lived experience support to two social work courses – at Ruskin College and Oxford Brookes - and inspectors met with three members with different experiences of social work services.

38. Discussion topics included an exploration of the range of involvement that people with lived experience have with the course. Inspectors asked questions surrounding how consent was obtained; how individuals accessed training and the ongoing support available from the College and how they might raise issues for feedback to the College directly.

39. Those present were keen to discuss their experiences and were honest and forthright with their views. The Voices of Experience members that the inspection team talked to spoke very highly about their involvement with social work courses both at Ruskin College and Oxford Brookes University, and it was clear that they had found it to be of genuine value to themselves, as well as the students.

40. Members of Voices of Experience were able to explain that they had previously been involved with areas such as role-playing; talking about their experience of social work; assessment and admissions. They expressed disappointment to have been used minimally last year, however they were able to confirm they had had a fruitful and useful introductory phone call with the Academic Lead upon his appointment to the College. It was clear that there was a willingness from the parties to engage with the course and to return to a structure that had been in place in previous years prior to the departure of staff members. The members we met were unclear on the role they could undertake with the College and were unsure on how they could support development of the programme. This discussion did highlight to the inspection team limited engagement throughout the programme and that, although there had been an introductory discussion, no further plans or commitments had been made.

Meetings with stakeholders: Placement Provider

41. The inspection team met with representatives from Oxford City Council as the local authority who has partnered with the College to offer placement opportunities to students.

It should be noted that the other main provider of placements for the College is TRAX⁶ and the inspectors were unable to meet with representatives from this organisation due to the Covid 19 pandemic. Present in the meeting were members from the social work department responsible for learning and development, management within the department, and practice educators.

42. Discussion topics included; the communication and collaboration with the College following the disruption to the course last year; additional support that Oxford City Council had provided Ruskin College during the past year; and arrangements made by the College for delivering placements during Covid-19. In addition to this, the inspectors asked questions to the practice educators around their role, training, and supervision.

43. As above, the council had been in contact with the Academic Lead upon his appointment and expressed openly that they would continue to offer placement opportunities to the College but were looking forward to a new relationship with the course team following perceived disintegration of formal processes. Members from Oxford City Council expressed positive feedback relating to the relationship that they had with the Placement Co-ordinator as the sole contact point with the College and the work that they had put into managing the process during a challenging year. It was acknowledged by all parties that the Council had stepped in to offer additional support to the Placement Co-ordinator in undertaking and developing within the role and also offering teaching during some parts of the course.

44. There was evidence of a two-way partnership with Oxford City Council and the College, made possible through the work that the Placement Co-ordinator had put in during the past months.

45. Oxford City Council requested to hold a meeting with Inspectors outside of the planned agenda and at which College staff were not present. During this additional meeting, the members of staff from the council expressed concerns about processes and management within the College which had adversely affected students before they arrived to join placements within the council. The Council also highlighted the importance to them of quality assurance mechanisms for placement evaluation and boundaries that must exist between course providers and placement providers, both of which they had identified as requiring improvement within the College.

⁶ TRAX is a project that provides qualifications for learners on the verge of exclusion from mainstream education provision.

Findings

In this section we set out the inspectors' findings in relation to whether the College 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.

Standard one: Level of qualification for entry onto the register

Standard 1.1

46. The Ruskin College courses are a degree level qualification delivered as a part time and full-time route. Throughout the documentation provided, the exit point within the course differed in explanation, however this was confirmed during the inspection as a BA exit route. The inspection team felt that this standard for the BA course had been met with documentary evidence and outstanding queries appropriately addressed during the inspection.

47. The proposed qualifying course is a BA in Social Work and would therefore mean upon successful completion of the course and award of an honours degree, students would be eligible to apply for entry on to the register. The inspectors were therefore able to satisfy themselves that this standard was met when specifically applied to the BA route as outlined in documentation.

48. During the inspection, the inspectors heard reference to funding previously provided for a small number of students that had been put onto the course by Oxford City Council in an earlier academic year. It is not referenced in any handbook or documentation and is not an approved course route either by HCPC or Social Work England for Ruskin College, and as such was not examined in any detail during this inspection. The inspectors, however, were concerned that there were students that were on a different unapproved course route, and that there would be differing governance requirements from those currently on the course if the student remained employed or financially supported to complete the course by the Local Authority. This course route would not meet the standard as it would not result in a bachelor's degree with honours.

Standard two: Admissions

49. Prior to inspection Ruskin College submitted documentary evidence relating to the selection and admissions process including; the Admissions Policy for Ruskin College and Social Work Admission Policy; Ruskin College Fitness to Study policy; Admissions presentation titled 'Studying Social Work at Ruskin College'; Interview Form; Written Test Form; Student recruitment Strategy, and Equality and Diversity Strategy. These were all reviewed by the inspection team.

Standard 2.1

50. Inspectors felt that there was limited institutional memory relating to previous admission processes for this course due to the Head of Student Services joining the College part way through the academic year. Whilst assessing the proposal and vision of the social work course, frequently the explanations of the course were too broad to be able to triangulate to current documentary evidence, due in part to the recent appointment of the Academic Lead and the aspiration they had to redesign portions of the course. Much of the documentation provided to the inspectors made reference to the previous regulator, and it was acknowledged by the College that significant rewriting of the course materials was required to be completed by the Academic Lead. At present, the design of the course that is proposed for delivery in the next academic year and future academic years does not align to the existing admissions documentation and so the inspectors were not satisfied that the admissions process will give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a course. The inspectors were of the opinion that there was a documented process in place which could be improved upon, but at present the documentation does not align with the intended plan for the social work course. Inspectors determined that despite there being a written policy, the staff members responsible for this area were unable to articulate how the policy is operated or implemented. This determination was also strengthened by examples provided by students heard by inspectors during the inspection where the policy was not followed. On this basis the standard is partly met.

Standard 2.2

51. During the inspection, the senior leadership team and course staff team were asked for clarification on the entry requirements of the course, specifically with regards to Maths and English and prior attainment of recognised qualifications. Within documentary evidence, and referenced during the inspection, was the use of assessment by BKFB (a functional skills education technology provider of products which improve English and Maths skills). Both staff members and senior leadership were unclear during the inspection about what assessments or solutions were used and their rationale for requiring examination of these skills when recognised qualifications may have been present, or the equivalency of other qualifications. The inspectors asked staff teams about the College's processes for considering qualifications in English and Maths and how BKFB was utilised for these areas.

52. During the meeting with students, the inspectors heard from a student who said they had been advised they would need a Maths qualification and so delayed their application for a year whilst taking a recognised course. Another student advised that they did not have a qualification in Maths and had not taken the BFKB examination. In discussion with the senior leadership team it was unclear whether Maths was or was not a requirement for admission to the course.

53. The inspectors based the consideration of this standard upon evidence available and the clarification provided by the staff teams at the College during meetings and on this basis the inspectors felt that lack of clarity, assurance, knowledge or ability to articulate the correct entry requirements meant that this standard was only partly met.

Standard 2.3

54. For the reasons stated above, the inspectors were not confident that the admissions process would ensure that applicants have a good command of English as the senior leadership team and course staff team were not able to clarify the entry requirements or the use of equivalency examinations. The inspectors were of the opinion this standard was partly met.

Standard 2.4

55. The inspectors heard from course staff and particularly from Student Services that processes in place within the previous year had been improved upon to ensure that criminal records checks were now conducted at the point of admission via Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)..

56. Upon further questions from the inspectors, there was a lack of a coherent plan and process for collecting, storing and sharing DBS checks, and this was still evident when examining this further with Student Services. It was unclear how routine checks were completed and how these were shared with relevant stakeholders connected to the delivery of the course, or consideration of General Data Protection Regulations in this matter.

57. It was also unclear how staff course members might be able to access DBS information at any point within the course. An example was provided to inspectors that suggested that students had been asked to present their own DBS check to placement providers rather than the College being able to supply confirmation that all students had completed necessary checks during the admission process or at the point of beginning placement.

58. The inspectors felt that there was a lack of understanding of the key principles of this standard or an appropriate consideration or reflection of the risk factors at strategic level, and for this reason this standard is not met. This standard highlighted to the inspectors that support services connected to the social work course did not seem to understand the additional requirements that might be required from a professionally regulated course where students have placement activity directly involved with people receiving social work services, and the full assessment of risks relating to both these areas for a course that is the 'gateway' to applying to join a national register as a professionally registered social worker. The inspectors acknowledged that better systems were now in place, but concluded that these processes were still inadequate in ensuring a student remained suitable to undertake the social work course over its duration, and that the College had not adequately reflected on risks related to this area in the past year.

59. The inspectors were of the opinion that there was a lack of evidence provided of an admissions process that would assess the suitability of an applicant and therefore the inspectors were unable to conclude that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

60. In course documentation, there is reference that a GP letter may be required at admissions stage. It was unclear to the inspectors what the purpose of a letter might serve and when this might be requested from applicants prior to admission. This was confirmed by Student Services to not be a requirement for all students, but it remains unclear to the inspection team when this might be required or the rationale for requesting it. The admissions process did not demonstrate the meeting of this standard because it did not detail a coherent plan for collecting health information from applicants to the course and there was not a transparent process that could be easily understood by applicants wishing to join the course. Inspectors heard that reasonable adjustment requirements disclosed at admission stage could be made available to staff members and wider issues might be discussed within a team meeting situation. It was explained during the inspection that Welfare and Health requirement checks are completed. The inspection team considered that there was a lack of application of robust processes for determining health requirements that do not present barriers to applying for a social work course, for example considering what reasonable adjustments might need to be made following engagement with placement partners. Inspectors were of the opinion there was a lack of strategic understanding and oversight of risks that are particular to regulated social work courses resulting in a lack of clarity for applicants to the course about what health-related declarations and documentation were required within the course or how this might be verified to ensure there is compliance. On this basis the inspectors were of the opinion that no proportionate approach was given or rationale for why the College might make a request to a GP was provided during the inspection and this standard was not met.

Standard 2.6

61. Connected to the consideration of standards relating to admission by inspectors was the College's assertion that they were a college with an ethos of widening participation. The inspectors felt that the age and demographic of students, and foundation and reputation of Ruskin College has resulted in assumptions made about the course that were not supported by a strategic vision or plan designed to attract students that might benefit from a widening participation admissions process. Senior leadership were unable to articulate a clear vision for widening participation actions with statements made within College documentation and inspection that could not be backed up by metrics, strategic plans, or clear action plans for taking a widening participation direction. Students from both groups spoke about the attractiveness of the course to learners who might be less familiar with academic processes, either through experience in school or through taking time away from a learning environment. There was no evidence for inspectors, for example a mapping document, that

supported any consideration from Ruskin College at admissions stage of past experiential learning or relevant life experience that might support any student's application to study. As part of the pre-approval documentation there was reference to a policy connected to consideration of prior learning, but this was not provided after further request. It was unclear how an applicant might access this information, or how the policy might be enacted if it is used within the College.

62. The inspectors heard positive examples from students and course staff about a staff member who supported students accessing help with skills relating to academic English and signposting to other resources. Students were unclear how any of their prior experience was used to support admission to the course.

63. The standard requires that the process, and how it works must be demonstrated by the College as "appropriate and effective" in order to be sufficiently met. The inspectors concluded that this standard was not met as there was a lack of evidence of an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.

Standard 2.7

64. The College provided a copy of the Equality and Diversity policy as part of pre-approval documentation. However, the implementation and monitoring of equality and diversity at admission stage was not able to be articulated by many of the College parties spoken to as part of the inspection. Staff were unclear about demographics of the student group or applicants to the course, or how course staff might go about gathering this information as part of their evaluation and quality assessment of the admissions process. On this basis, the inspectors were not satisfied that this standard was met and concluded the course did not meet this standard.

65. The collection of data connected with course and student data, including equality and diversity, is covered within later standards, however the inspectors had specific concerns about the ability of the course staff to access suitable information to support the course, and overarching concerns about the College's lack of strategy for analysing data connected to equality and diversity.

66. The inspectors concluded that the presence of a policy was insufficient when staff members were not clear about the implementation and evaluation of the policy and there were insufficient monitoring processes in place within the College. On this basis, the inspectors determined that the standard was not met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and leadership

67. In relation to course governance, management and leadership, the inspection team reviewed documentary evidence including a Course Manual, Equality & Diversity Policy, Complaints Policy, Fitness to Practise Policy, and CVs and job descriptions for key staff.

Standard 3.1

68. In consideration of the standard surrounding the sustainability of the course, the inspectors analysed the commitment to providing the resourcing that might be required for the course that was proposed.

69. Inspectors met with the Academic Lead, who has overall professional responsibility for the course, placement co-ordinator and the Assistant Principal with line management responsibility for the Academic Lead and course oversight. Throughout the inspection, the inspectors felt that the emphasis for the delivery of all parts of the course would be placed with the Academic Lead. The Academic Lead would be supported in much of the delivery by the Placement Coordinator as an additional member of staff who has been at Ruskin College for the past year. Although the inspectors fully recognised that the member of staff had gone over and above in her dedication to the role and had the capacity and passion to develop within her role, by her own reflection and analysis, the placement co-ordinator was an inexperienced member of staff with limited prior experience in delivering many parts of an academic social work course. The inspectors considered that the College had failed to grasp the requirements of many parts of delivery within a professionally regulated social work course that require oversight, and as such the placement co-ordinator had been placed in a position that made her and the College exposed.

70. An additional staff member with strong academic credentials within a non-social work subject had been recruited to teach parts of the course. Upon reading the staff member's CV, it was noted they had been away from teaching for approximately five years. When asked if plans had been put in place to support this staff member to deliver current and contemporary social work theory and practise, the College were unable to articulate if any additional support may be required over and above induction and line management, and this would again fall within the responsibility of the Academic Lead. The inspectors considered that there did not seem to be consideration given to the amount of support the staff member might require in undertaking the role.

71. A vacancy for a 0.4 full time equivalent (FTE) role was currently open for recruitment. The role was not advertised as a part time position and when inspectors asked to know, given there was a desire to recruit against a specific skillset to support the Academic Lead and provide a breadth of experience against children and adult social work, whether any strategy had been used to attract applicants to this role, senior management were unable to establish at the time of the inspection if any applications for the role had been received or

detail any specific actions that had been taken to seek out a suitable candidate. The College Principal advised this full-time post was a commitment by the College, the Vice Principal clarified it was not full time (although advertised as such) and that this was a 0.4 (FTE) role. The inspection team asked how many people had applied to the role but were informed this information was not available.

72. The Inspection team identified that the amount of work the Academic Lead would have to do to deliver this course against the vision that was being proposed would require the redesign and rewriting of much of the course material and strategies. This was in addition to having a high degree of hands-on management of placement co-ordination, development of all partnership working arrangements, regional partnership engagement, assessment and staff supervision on top of link tutor and teaching roles. It is important to note that the inspectors had every confidence in the skills and ability of the Academic Lead. It was specifically noted in the inspection that in the short period of time that the Academic Lead had been at the College, they had achieved a significant amount of work, developed trust with students, placement providers and people with lived experience. However, ultimately the inspectors felt that without the support structures in place elsewhere within the College and the understanding of what would be required for a professionally regulated social work course, both in management and executive support, as well as supporting services that would be able to manage the additional requirements for a regulated course, the Academic Lead would be responsible for all parts of the course with inadequate resources to deliver this course. The inspectors were of the opinion that this was not related to salary levels or recommending additional staff resource, but that the breadth of knowledge and experience within the course staff team and the support that other services provided with areas such as partnership arrangements and course governance within the College, was insufficient to deliver and meet the standards required of an approved social work course.

73. The inspectors were of the opinion that this standard was not met.

Standard 3.2.

74. It was acknowledged that partnership arrangements with key stakeholders connected with the course, (with the exception of the placement provider at Oxford City Council) had been minimally utilised in the past year. The inspectors were of the opinion that the resources and management required to resurrect many of these arrangements to the required standards would be a significant undertaking. Furthermore, the oversight of these arrangements to allow inexperienced course staff to manage the processes appropriately would ultimately fall within the responsibilities of the Academic Lead. For reasons stated above, the inspectors were not satisfied that the course staff and senior leadership fully understood what was required to manage the processes connected with partnership arrangements.

75. An example provided in further discussions on this area highlighted a concern that in consideration of risk factors in play during Covid-19, the placement co-ordinator had been asked to conduct risk assessments for students completing placements relating to their special category data (as defined in data protection legislation) and/or protected characteristics under equality law, and may have had to make a judgement call on whether a student was at increased risk which fell outside of their professional skills, knowledge or experience placing them into an inappropriate position in making the assessments.

76 The inspectors were not provided with sufficient evidence to establish clear management roles or responsibilities and overall course oversight within the College to demonstrate adequate business continuity plans or actions plans related to this course. It was not clearly articulated how accountabilities within the College ensured delivery within the course. For these reasons, the inspectors were of the opinion that this standard was not met.

Standard 3.3

77. During the inspection, the inspectors heard that the Academic Lead had submitted an application to register with Social Work England. This was assessed to have not met the standard required, pending a decision on the Academic Lead's application for registration with the regulator. At the time of this report, the application for registration is confirmed and this standard is met.

Standard 3.4

78. Throughout the inspection there was a lack of evidence available that could demonstrate how effective monitoring of the course was in place. For example, it appears that the information on equality and diversity is held centrally within the College, but as with previous standards, it is unclear how this is readily supplied and able to be interrogated by course staff for inclusion within planning, admissions and developing the programme. There was no information available or detailed about how this information is readily accessible to placement providers or any sharing of intelligence in this area.

79. Overall, the inspectors had concerns about the College demonstrating this standard and were not able to be satisfied from the evidence provided that this standard was met. Furthermore, the inspectors reflected that the Academic Lead would have lack the support of an experienced course team and were concerned that there was a lack of understanding of the requirements of a professionally regulated course at senior level

80. Similarly, senior leadership was not able to articulate how equality and diversity data or any other kind of monitoring or quality assurance is interrogated, monitored and evaluated at a strategic level other than through Annual Monitoring Review and standard data requirements, for example supplying Office for Students with data returns. The inspectors reviewed minutes from Programme and Academic Boards and were unable to determine from the minutes of the meetings, or actions, how the course is assessed, audited and

evaluated. The meetings with relevant staff from these areas did not provide the inspectors with the assurance that these processes would be able to interrogate the course in sufficient detail over and above receiving information from the Academic Lead, and therefore the appropriate assessment of risks relating to this course were not monitored or evaluated for quality assurance.

81. The inspectors were of the opinion that they were not provided with the rationale, policy or clear examples of how this course is appropriately evaluated at senior leadership level or audited to collect relevant data connected to monitoring, and therefore this standard was determined to be not met.

Standard 3.5

82. The inspectors heard from the placement provider that there was regular communication and collaboration with the placement coordinator. It was acknowledged by both the placement coordinator and Oxford City Council that the relationship needed to develop and that the placement coordinator was inexperienced in the role, but that they had both the capacity to develop within the role and had gone over and above what was required for someone with their experience during the time they had held the role. Oxford City Council advised during a meeting at which College staff were not present that there was a lack of transparency in resolving concerns with senior management and shared feedback that they had offered assistance with the placement coordination that they considered should have been delivered by the College. The placement partners were clear with inspectors that they had to provide more support than would usually be provided to sustain and support the College. The inspectors agreed that the College had failed to grasp the requirements of many parts of delivery within a professionally regulated social work course with placements that require oversight, and as such the placement co-ordinator had been placed in a position that exposed her and the College to risk.

83. The inspectors were of the opinion that this standard was partly met due to the presence of clear lines of communication with the placement provider, but that effective processes were not able to be evidenced to the standard that would be expected.

Standard 3.6

84. The inspectors agreed that the placement coordinator has worked hard to ensure the availability of practice-based learning placements for all students, however the inspectors felt that there was insufficient evidence available to determine that effective processes were in place for ensuring the availability and capacity of practise-based learning. For example, Oxford City Council informed inspectors that they had stepped in to help find placements because they knew the students needed them. Therefore, this standard was not met.

Standard 3.7

85. The inspectors met with members of Voices of Experience group responsible for providing the services of people with lived experience of social work. This is an experienced group within the area and there was clear understanding from members about what their purposes was within the Voices of Experience group in providing experiential learning from services users of social work. It was acknowledged that the group had been used minimally within the last year with two of the three members attending the session not having delivered any services within the College within the last year. The inspection team heard that there was an intention to utilise the group in the development of the course, however it was not evidenced or explained by the Academic Lead how they were going to take part in the course going forward over and above being involved on an ad hoc basis as and when required, as opposed to playing an integral role within the design and delivery of the course.

86. The coordination of this function was determined to also now fall within the job description of the placement co-ordinator. The inspectors reflected that this was another challenging role that required experience of dealing with this function and there did not seem to be the full appreciation by the management structures of the College of what this might entail in managing this partnership arrangement. The inspectors were not satisfied that there would be adequate support available for service users. The Voices of Experience members expressed a desire to return to historic processes that had been in place at the College previously and it appeared that significant work would be required with the group to meet current standards for full involvement with the course. An example by a member of the group that had been involved with assessment highlighted that they had alerted the course to a data breach within a student assignment, but the member did not think this was within their role to feed this back through formal channels nor did they expect to receive reciprocal feedback on actions taken. For this reason the inspectors were of the opinion that although people with lived experience of social work were available to contribute to the course, the inspectors could not say how they would be involved and engaged with the course in the future and could not demonstrate clear partnership with this organisation, and therefore the standard was not met.

Standard 3.8

87. The course has existing structures in place for student leads within the course and inspectors met with representatives of the course during meetings with students. Students were able to clearly articulate that if they had concerns with the course or wished to feedback that they could do so via their Link Tutor, and were able to recall specific feedback forms for courses in the past year. Social Work England had been provided with complaints by students to College leadership and was aware of ongoing and resolved concerns. The inspectors spent a significant amount of time considering the policy relating to complaint handling and were of the opinion that it was unclear how many of the reporting structures were used in practice. It appeared that the Principal of the College and PA to the Principal

played a large role in the assessment of complaints, but the policy lacked detail about how the complaints process would ensure there was a resolution. There was confusion about whether students were present at Programme Boards with students reporting that sometimes they are invited to committees but excluded from review meetings.

88. There was insufficient detail available to students about how they might access support when accessing the complaints process with students expressing dissatisfaction with the way they perceived their concerns had been addressed. The inspectors acknowledged that many of the concerns were still to be resolved but there were systems in place for involving students within the course and handling complaints. Students also reported that they had felt listened to more recently and that systems were being strengthened.

89. In the meetings, students reported disappointment that the College no longer had a Students' Union. During meetings with senior leadership, the inspectors heard that a Students' Union was planned to be supported in the next academic year. At the time of the inspection there was no action plan available, or details provided about how this would come about during the meeting to support this development and it was not clear what communication had been made with students on plans to reinstate the Students' Union. It is not a requirement under the Education and Training Standards to have a Students Union in operation as a course provider.

90. It remained a significant concern to inspectors that students were directly feeding back that they felt the systems in place within the College were ineffective and therefore there was a perceived lack of genuine interest in the students' opinion of the course. The inspectors were of the opinion that the committees and mechanisms for meetings with students provided an inconsistent and variable experience for students, resulting in reports from students of feeling that they are not always consulted with or excluded from processes. This provided weight to the inspectors' conclusion that there were not effective processes in place to assure students that their involvement in the course is valued within the College.

91. On the overarching theme of course monitoring and evaluation, the inspectors were able to review independent external evaluations and met with the external examiner during the inspection. The External Examiner echoed the other stakeholders during this inspection, that she had had an introductory conversation with the Academic Lead and had been made fully aware of the challenges that the course had faced in the past few years in her evaluation of the course but had not had the opportunity to speak with students connected to the course before submitting her report. The inspectors reflected that the feedback loop in evaluating the course was therefore not complete to allow the appropriate evaluation of this course.

92. The inspectors concluded that there was a lack of clarity on processes for engaging with students which had resulted in discontentment of students. The inspectors therefore felt that this standard was partly met.

Standard 3.9

93. This standard is considered within the details of this report at standard 3.1 with inspectors concluding that this standard was not met.

Standard 3.10

94. As above, the resourcing of this team is covered at standard 3.1. The inspectors considered the skills and experience of the course team and concluded that there was an adequate mix of practice and academic skills. However, there were gaps in the spread of the overall course team relating to both adults and children and family social work that would need to be resourced with expertise from outside the College either by visiting tutors or recruited for in the vacancy. As a result, the inspectors concluded that the standard is partly met.

Standard 3.11

95. The inspectors heard a clear commitment from senior management that course staff were supported to continue with CPD and examples were provided from the placement coordinator that confirmed they had been able to pursue formal teaching certificates. The Academic Lead also provided assurance to inspectors of CPD activity and confirmation of commitment to interests in social work research. This is reflected in meetings with the Higher Education Programme Boards.

96. The inspectors reflected that the emphasis on CPD plans seemed to focus on the placement coordinator with little analysis on how the Academic Lead would ensure practice experience over and above research. The inspectors were not confident, with workload pressures on the Academic Lead (identified previously within this report) and capacity within the course team to deliver the course, how the Academic Lead would be supported to take time to complete CPD during the working week and therefore concluded that the standard is partly met.

Standard 3.12

97. Inspectors were keen to establish how students would access learning resources, and student support services. Students positively reported accessing additional help with academic writing and research skills when requested and examples were provided that showed signposting to services was offered by both the Placement Coordinator and the staff member contracted to provide academic support.

98. The students were keen to discuss accessing course library facilities that were away from site highlighting that they had visitor access to the Bodleian library in Oxford. Some students reported that this had proved difficult to access throughout the year with no ability to withdraw materials and had accessibility problems for students unable to attend for longer periods of time, for example due to limited childcare. Students reported that they perceived the library based on-site at Ruskin College had insufficient and outdated resources with social work materials listed in catalogues not always present in the library. The inspectors heard that online resources were available, but these were not the preferred resources of students. During the lockdown period of the pandemic, students were unable to access reading material at the Bodleian library or Ruskin library. The inspectors and students acknowledged that the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic was unforeseen and it had been useful for inspectors to hear what support students had received during this time. Inspectors confirmed with students and course staff that online resources and books were available to students throughout the course. The College have advised that there were no complaints about inadequate social work resources received in module evaluations, programme reviews or through the complaints process from students. The inspectors heard from Facilities staff that improvements had and were still being made with significant investment made to improve library resources and improvement in the online catalogue of reading materials suitable for a social work course.

99. For the reasons outlined, the inspectors concluded that this standard was partly met.

Standard 3.13

100. During the meeting with students, a student had provided an example where they had requested a formal assessment for dyslexia which had not been arranged at the time of the inspection. The student expressed concern that they had been waiting for some time. This area was also examined with College staff when examining the structures in place for supporting students within the course. A differing example provided by the Placement Coordinator and Student Services Manager detailed the situation of another student who had identified that they might have required additional support having previously been identified in school as possibly having dyslexia. The approach described was a useful example that demonstrated how person-centred care offered by the Placement Coordinator and Student Service Manager could be adapted to meet the needs of the student. Unfortunately, the example also highlighted that the student had accessed many support mechanisms but had not received a formal diagnostic assessment for dyslexia at any point. The inspectors found that this supported the inspection conclusion that there was a lack of clarity for both students and staff on how formal processes should be followed. The Student Support Manager was unable to articulate and evidence the support available and in different settings – although some examples were given for other areas that a student might need support, there was insufficient evidence of effective and accessible arrangements being in place. In discussion with the Student Support Service manager, it was

not clear how a student may go about accessing more formal support mechanisms such as financial assistance, help with benefits and bursaries or accessing pastoral care. It was also noted that the Student Service Manager was a relatively new member of Ruskin staff which also affected the institutional knowledge in this area, however inspectors also reflected that it is an overarching College responsibility to provide these facilities. Due to this some of the examples given were from previous places of work and not Ruskin College, although the manager had joined some seven months earlier.

101. Inspectors were told that Ruskin College are able to facilitate counselling services for students, with examples given of how this will be facilitated and delivered off-campus during Covid-19. It was clear from talking with students that there had been problems with accessing counselling support services in previous years, with an example provided that no services were made available following the death of a student. However most students now reported that they understood the problems in this area had been resolved and knew of fellow students who were accessing the services. Inspectors were satisfied that students had access to counselling services and knew how to access these via services within the College.

102. For the reasons outlined, the inspectors concluded that this standard was not met.

Standard 3.14

103. This standard is considered within the details of this report at standard 3.4 with inspectors concluding that this standard was not met.

Standard 3.15

104. Meetings with Level 4 and 5 students from the course highlighted that their feedback was sought by staff throughout the programme, through regular surveys and evaluations. Inspectors asked for examples of when participant feedback had resulted in a change to the programme and discussed how these changes had been implemented, for example, in relation to access to teaching and learning resources from the library. Students were able to describe how feedback forms were provided during teaching sessions and where they were able to feed back to student representatives. The inspectors were provided with documentary evidence in advance of the inspection that there had been complaints and that some remained ongoing and others had been resolved and concluded. The inspectors spent a significant amount of time talking with students about how feedback about the course was gathered and if any actions were taken. Students provided details to the inspection team of raising complaints about the course that had not been resolved and many felt formal processes were not followed to allow them to raise concerns. The inspectors also sought clarity on many parts of the complaints policy and grievance procedures, ultimately finding that course staff and senior management were confused about some of the structures in place. This standard is considered within the details of this report at standard 3.8 with inspectors concluding that this standard was partly met as they

were not satisfied that there is a thorough and effective process in place in relation to student complaints.

Standard 3.16

105. This standard is considered within the details of this report on standard 2 Admissions with inspectors concluding that this standard was partly met as they were not satisfied that there are thorough and effective processes in place.

Standard 3.17

106. Students were asked who they would speak to if they had any issues during their placement, for example a breakdown in a relationship or a concern about a service user. They described examples of the support provided by the Placement Coordinator and Practice Tutor, in addition to the benefit of peer support within the placements. There was some confusion by students indicated where some students had a supervisor and tutor whilst others only had one of these allocated to them. The inspectors have received confirmation that students do have an allocated tutor. During the inspection, the inspectors were also provided with the consent process, however the inspectors felt that there was a lack of clarity on the arrangements in place and how the student is reassured that support is offered consistently and transparently to all students. Inspectors concluded that this standard was partly met.

Standard 3.18

107. The inspection team considered that this standard was met.

Standard four: Course design and delivery

108. The inspectors spoke with the Academic Lead throughout the inspection to understand what was proposed as part of the course delivery design and to provide the Academic Lead with an opportunity to explain the intention where it might not have been possible to develop documentary evidence to support the standards at the time of the inspection.

Standard 4.1

109. The proposal for the course design and delivery did not seem to be mapped against the Professional Standards or with consideration of the Education and Training Standards 2019. The inspectors also asked students about professional identity and their understanding of the professional standards. Most students were unable to recall hearing about the professional standards during the course and were not able to reference the previous regulatory standards. The inspectors were provided with Module Specifications that referenced the 2016 HCPC specifications and it was acknowledged that they required updating. The inspectors noted the presence of the Professional Standards in the Student

Handbook. It was unclear from documentary evidence, or in the vision of the course articulated by the Academic Lead, how students are being prepared to meet professional standards are being currently, and there was no documentary evidence provided to the inspectors to support the learning outcomes of the course being mapped against Social Work England professional standards in the proposed design of the course.

110. During the meeting with the placement provider, Oxford City Council, the practice educator was able to clearly articulate how the competency framework had been linked to the professional standards and provided examples of how the standards are referenced during placement learning. The inspectors considered that the standard was partly met due to the professional standards being referenced during placements and clearly linked to frameworks delivered whilst on placement. In many of the education and training standards assessed, inspectors felt that it was sufficient to hear about the proposal for the course, particularly at this time when the course was being developed by the Academic Lead. However, for this standard the inspectors felt there was a threshold that required the documentation to be up to date with the correct regulatory body and therefore at this stage, the standard could not be determined as completely met. The inspectors were additionally not satisfied that they had been provided with evidence from Ruskin College that the course material and learning outcomes for the currently approved course were mapped to the professional standards and therefore this standard could only be partly met.

Standard 4.2

111. The inspectors heard clear examples from the practice educator about how professional standards were used within the placement, however there was limited information provided to the inspectors to provide clarity on how standards are aligned or referenced within course material, and therefore how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. In meetings with students, there did not seem to be the understanding that this was a regulated profession with regulatory standards that applied to the role. The inspectors also asked students about professional identity and their understanding of the professional standards. Most students were unable to recall hearing about the professional standards during the course and were not able to reference the previous regulatory standards. It was also unclear from documentary evidence or in the vision of the course articulated by the Academic Lead, how professional standards are being met currently or mapped in the proposed design of the course.

112. The inspectors were also of the opinion that there needed to be a threshold of documentary evidence of the up to date course materials to say that the standard could be met in its entirety. For reasons stated above and in 4.1, the inspectors considered that this standard should be partly met due to the confidence that practice educators provided that this was covered whilst on placement, but that there was limited evidence from the inspection of how students could demonstrate how they understood the role of professional standards.

Standard 4.3

113. The inspectors reflected that the course material provided as evidence by the College referenced the previous regulator, however due to the timing of the inspection and the limited time for the Academic Lead in post, the course that was proposed to be delivered had not been written into a form that could be reviewed by the inspection team. The Academic Lead was able to verbally articulate a philosophy and aspiration of the course that was intended to be delivered, but inspectors reflected that this model had not been formed into anything that could be reviewed against this standard, or confirmed as the model that was to be delivered by the College. This also differed from the documents currently in existence for this course and all documentation relating to this standard would require to be redesigned and re-written by the Academic Lead.

114. The inspectors were satisfied with the explanation of the course by the Academic Lead but considered that evidence needed to be provided to provide assurance this standard was met. Therefore, the inspectors concluded that the standard was partly met.

Standard 4.4

115. During the meeting with Oxford City Council at which College staff were not present, the practice partners highlighted that course material seen for the course was not up to date with social work practice and that what they had been asked to deliver at Ruskin College was not what they had expected to see within current practice. The inspectors had concerns that key partners were not involved in developing course material to ensure currency and application of current models of social work within the Ruskin College course.

116. The Inspectors appreciated that the Academic Lead had a strong focus on research and intended to engage within regional partnerships in the area, but were not satisfied that the course, even in its intended vision, had made arrangements, or identified a need to bring in expertise and resources that could speak to current issues within social work over and above the teaching staff employed within the course.

117. The Placement Co-ordinator identified that they lacked experience within domestic abuse and had been able to call upon a previous colleague to deliver an extra curricula session in this area. She also provided an example where a visiting tutor had delivered a session on female genital mutilation to students, however this tutor had directly approached the College. Both examples highlighted to the inspection team that a coherent programme or plan to ensure that the curriculum was delivering against current practice was not in place within the College.

118. The Inspectors also considered that the College's Annual Monitoring Review was also too broad in overview to review the programme and appropriately identify where themes and areas needed further support in the next academic year to maintain current practice. The course delivered by Ruskin College has been validated by the Open University in 2018. Evidence of engagement with validation processes was not provided by the College as part of the inspection activity, however the inspectors were satisfied that the course is regularly

examined as part of the role of the validating body. There was no evidence provided to show how the course engages with partners and key stakeholders associated with the course to identify gaps in contemporary social work expertise. The inspectors felt that this spoke to the heart of what the standard expects to maintain and ensure currency by bringing in specialist knowledge and/or resources to support maintaining the currency of the course and therefore this standard could not be determined as met.

119. Inspectors also felt that the course may struggle to demonstrate the new standards coming within one academic year of delivery particularly surrounding the increased involvement of people with lived experience into the design and delivery of the course, inter-disciplinary working and involvement of students in the design and delivery of the course to meet expectations of current social work practice and therefore this raised concerns separately to their consideration of whether this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

120. During the meeting with Oxford City Council, the practice educators provided examples of how theory and practice is integrated within the practice placement. However, the inspectors were unable to be assured that the course material adequately reflected how this was demonstrated in the classroom setting, or a coherent plan for integrating this within learning and reflective sessions with students.

121. This standard requires that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course, and that there is demonstration of the standard across practice and classroom settings. The inspectors were of the opinion that although the course material has been validated by the Open University, there needed to be triangulation between documentary evidence and confidence that the integration of both theory and practise whilst on this course is present both on placement and within a teaching setting. This was clearly articulated or demonstrated during the inspection and on this basis, the standard was determined not to have been met.

Standard 4.6

122. The inspectors reflected that there was limited evidence available to them in assessing this standard. Partly due to the inexperience of the placement co-ordinator and short amount of time in post of the Academic Lead, the programme team for this course were not able to provide the assurance about how the teaching and learning methods or approaches used within the course were chosen, or assessed and quality assured as being the most appropriate mechanism to meet learning outcomes. What was provided in pre-approval documentation was limited in scope and did not provide the rationale or thinking behind how the methods were chosen.

123. Social Work England had received complaints from students that were also discussed during the meeting with students about the supervision of their dissertation by a non-social work academic. The Academic Lead was able to provide appropriate rationale for this decision, but it reiterated that assessment of approaches had still to be undertaken by the Academic Lead.

124. As with previous standards, the availability of evidence that could clearly demonstrate or explain how the course meets the standard was lacking and therefore was assessed as being a partly met standard due the lack of evidence to provide the inspectors with full assurance.

Standard 4.7

125. Documentary evidence supplied by the College as part of the pre-approval documentation provided assurance that reflective practice was used within classroom and practice settings, On this basis the standard was deemed to be partly met, however for reasons stated above, the inspectors were not satisfied that this standar could be fully met due to the lack of evidence connected to this standard.

Standard 4.8

126. The inspectors determined that much of standard 4.4 was relevant to the consideration of this standard and that ensuring currency of the course was intrinsic to ensuring practice and theory was evidence based. The Academic Lead talked to the inspection team briefly about a teaching and learning strategy, but the inspectors could not establish how evidence based practise would be integrated within this course based upon the model proposed for the next academic year or how the strategy for the previous academic years ensured this was delivered. Therefore, the inspectors concluded that this standard was only partly met.

Standard 4.9

127. During a number of inspection meetings with senior leaders and course staff, the inspectors asked a number of questions surrounding opportunities for learning from and with other course students and relevant professions. As mentioned before, there was support from within the College to utilise other departments such as Community Development teaching resources, but this did not really identify what the resources could bring to enable social work students to learn from and with other professions or the link with the social work profession. The inspectors felt this highlighted to them that the College did not fully understand the requirements within a social work course of this standard and had focused on what resources were available within the College, rather than identifying what a professionally regulated course might need.

128. Inspectors sought to clarify how the course ensures that participants are able to learn with, and from, professionals and students in other relevant professions. They were told that students have opportunities to work with interprofessional colleagues within the context of their practice-based learning or with students on other courses within Ruskin College or through informal extra curricula sessions arranged by the Placement co-ordinator. There was limited information available on how this might be developed in the design of the course in the future.

129. The inspectors saw no evidence to suggest that the College had addressed this standard or that the course addresses or promotes the benefits of collaboration between the social work sector and allied professions and therefore concluded that it did not meet the 2019 standards. Additionally, the inspectors noted that in the vision that the Academic

Lead outlined for the course intended to be delivered, learning with and from other professions also did not seem to be present and therefore would also not meet this standard should the course have been delivered against that design.

Standard 4.10

130. The inspectors met with people with lived experience via the Voices of Experience group and asked specific questions of the members about their understanding of consent processes within the course. A member of the group outlined views that by volunteering with the group they were providing consent, but were unable to explain whether they knew there was a consent process or consideration of informed consent in place at the College.

131. Students were able to explain to the inspectors that they knew they would need to provide consent to take part in aspects of the course. The inspection team were also provided with a copy of a consent form as part of pre-approval documentation.

132. During a meeting with course staff, the Placement Provider provided an example of a role-playing exercise that would allow a student to select a situation and that they could choose not to select one if for any reason it might have triggered trauma. The example showed another instance of person-centred care offered by the placement provider, but also emphasised that clear processes for ensuring informed consent for dealing with distressing matters and action processes where consent may be withdrawn were not in place within the course.

133. Through discussions with students and people with lived experience of social work, the inspectors were not satisfied that there are appropriate processes for obtaining consent before individuals engage in teaching and learning activity. Members from the Voices for Experience outlined that they had provided consent to take part by being part of the group but there seemed limited reflection from either party that participants and people with lived experience of social work felt confident in removing their consent or requesting additional support.

134. The inspection was an opportunity for the course to demonstrate how an effective process was in place for obtaining informed consent but the College was unable to produce evidence that provided the inspectors with the confidence that this was fully understood by all parties connected with the course and effective. The inspectors concluded that there was not a shared understanding of what consent processes are within this course and therefore the course could not demonstrate that there was an effective process in place. Therefore, it was determined that the standard was not met.

Standard 4.11

135. The inspectors were provided with details about induction sessions with students that outlined mandatory attendance requirements and the Placement Coordinator explained the taking of registers during teaching sessions.

136 The Placement Coordinator also provided examples of how time could be made up should students miss any time during the course. However, there was a lack of evidence of the systems in place to monitor attendance and take appropriate action.

137. The inspectors considered that this standard requires a documentary requirement rather than reliance on a verbal account of how this standard might be met with the onus on the College to supply evidence at the time of the inspection that supports this standard. This standard was assessed as partly met due to the processes for evaluation and assessment of data from the course not being to the standard required.

Standard five: Practice based learning

138. Inspectors met with the Social Work Practice Development Lead, Curriculum Lead for the Consultant Social Worker Programme, Consultant Social Workers and representatives from local authorities. This was to further their understanding of the structure, duration, delivery and ongoing monitoring of practice-based learning. The inspectors noted that during the inspection, placement provision was considered as arrangements with the local authority at Oxford City Council due to the large proportion of placements that are provided by Oxford City Council. The inspection team did not meet anyone or interrogate arrangements relating to other placements being provided for students at Ruskin College, however it was noted that one-off placement provision was being provided in Birmingham and in Gibraltar.

Standard 5.1

139. The course was assessed to have met the standard required.

Standard 5.2

140. The course was assessed to have met the standard required.

Standard 5.3

141. Following conversations with the Placement Coordinator, Consultant Social Workers, Practice Tutors, representatives from local authorities, students and consideration of the documentary evidence submitted, inspectors were satisfied that the standards relating to practice-based learning were being reached because of well-developed processes within Oxford City Council. The inspectors felt that the formal management, quality assessment and co-ordination of this on by Ruskin College was not present or remained undeveloped, and therefore could not be evidenced to a satisfactory standard.

142. There was clear evidence to confirm that informal processes were in place with the Placement Provider and the Placement Coordinator for reviewing concerns and acting on feedback. However, these processes needed to be formalised to ensure that clear accountability is in place and therefore this standard was assessed to have been partly met.

Standard 5.4

143. The inspectors met with representatives from local authority and practice educators. Discussion topics included training and support, the learning environment, recruitment, and the information provided in relation to placements. Inspectors were told by representatives from Oxford City Council that the process for partnering with Ruskin College had been built upon through many years of working with the College but had suffered during the disruption of the past few years. They spoke positively about the regular contact with the Placement Coordinator but were less positive about mechanisms for raising concerns or improvements via leadership with the College and ultimately identified that there was a lot of improvement required to meet Oxford City Council's expectations for quality assured standards in their assessment.

144. Following conversations with Placement Coordinator, Consultant Social Workers, Practice Tutors, representatives from the local authority, students and the documentary evidence submitted, inspectors were satisfied that the standards relating to practice-based learning were being reached because of well-developed processes within Oxford City Council. The inspectors felt that the management, quality assessment and co-ordination of this on behalf of Ruskin College was not present or remained undeveloped, and therefore could not be evidenced to a satisfactory standard and therefore this standard was assessed to have been partly met.

Standard 5.5

145. For reasons stated above, the inspectors felt that the standard was partly met. The inspectors were satisfied that all parties that were spoken to were appropriately trained and qualified in their roles, and that there was evidence of clear relationship with the parties and the College. The inspectors felt comfortable that there was adequate support in place within the Local Authority, in the main because of appropriate oversight by Oxford City Council, however the inspectors were not confident in making the same assessment of other placement provision as the arrangements for reviewing this information and managing the process was not based within the College. The inspectors determined that this was a requirement of the College to manage this standard, as opposed to the placement provider and therefore this standard was assessed to have been partly met.

Standard 5.6

149. The Inspectors met with the Placement Coordinator to understand the processes and oversight of the management of placements. The Placement Coordinator was able to articulate to the inspectors that meetings were held with Oxford City Council on a regular basis. The College did not provide evidence in documentary form of any formal management processes, for example explanation that a register of practice educators or qualified staff was held, or confirmation if a database of suitability was maintained at the College for any of the placements arranged for the College. The inspectors made the

determination that all Practice Educators were registered social workers with appropriate skills and qualifications to complete the role, however this was not confirmed during the inspection by the Practise Coordinator during the inspection. There was also no partnership working, for example with Student Services department, that would ensure that this standard could be adequately evidenced.

150. 160. As mentioned in the assessment of these standards above, arrangements in place within Oxford City Council appeared to have been managed adequately due to steer and direction by the Local Authority, however evidence of formal processes in place within the College or historical working arrangements that might detail meetings or actions was not provided to the inspectors. On this basis, the inspectors were only able to determine this standard to be partly met.

Standard 5.7

161. The inspectors heard during the meeting with Placement Providers about how a Practice Educator was completing CPD, however there was no information provided during the inspection about how regular training and development by the course team would be arranged for Practice Educators, or how this was managed by the course team. It was also unclear what preparation the College required from Practice Educators to ensure that student needs, specifically for Ruskin College students, were met. The inspectors were unable to determine how any quality assurance mechanisms or governance systems were in place within the College to ensure that practice education was tailored to meet the needs of the students or the College.

162. For reasons stated above and in relation to the previous standard, the inspectors determined that this standard was partly met.

Standard 5.8

163. This was assessed to have met the standard required.

Standard six: Assessment

Standard 6.1

Documentary evidence submitted on assessment included the Course Handbook, External Examiner Reports, Programme Board minutes and reports, and Module Descriptors. This was reviewed prior to inspection by the inspection team. Inspectors met with the Academic Lead and Assistant Principal to discuss proposals for this area as many of the proposals were still under development.

Following adequate time to interrogate the plans and timetable for the assessment processes within the course with the Academic Lead, the inspectors felt that there was

limited evidence available to them to fully quality assure against the standards and that course staff were unable to clearly articulate the plan for assessment within the course. The inspectors also felt that there was a lack of a clear strategy in place that would map against the Professional Standards for the course overall. Weighting and volume of assessments and intrinsic links with partners connected to the course were not present in the proposals articulated to inspectors. This was also mirrored with a lack of students' involvement in the design of the course or the intention to rectify this within the proposals. Overarching themes connected to Ruskin College being unable to evidence how courses are monitored or evaluated via the collection of useful and necessary data to assess quality measures were also of concern in relation to the College meeting this standard.

It was accepted that much of the documentation connected to this standard was still to be developed by the Academic Lead, however at the time of the inspection, inspectors were unable to assure themselves that many of the assessments could be demonstrated with a coherent plan. The inspectors were also concerned about the College having effective mechanisms that would support a coherent assessment strategy, critical analysis and evaluation within the course. In accepting that there was limited information available for this area, the inspectors still felt that the Academic Lead was unable to articulate a clear plan for the assessment strategy of the course and therefore, the inspectors concluded that this standard was not met .

Standard 6.2

The inspectors noted that in meetings with students, language about professionally regulated activity seemed unfamiliar to them outside of a placement and practice-based setting. The standard requires the understanding of the requirements for professional behaviour throughout the course and the inspectors felt that this is a fundamental requirement of the course in preparing students for professional regulation both from within teaching and classroom based activities, and within a practice setting.

For the reasons stated above, the inspectors concluded that this standard was not met.

Standard 6.3

The External Examiner was able to explain that there had been a discussion with the Academic Lead about changes to the assessment processes following the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. The inspectors noted that there did not seem to be any discussion with the External Examiner about the proposed assessment strategy for the forthcoming academic year.

The inspectors were unable to establish from the College what analysis of results was done by senior leadership or at course level. The inspectors asked a number of questions throughout the inspection to various staffing groups surrounding the collection of data regarding equality and diversity. Aside from required data collection returns, there did not

appear to be any action in place to collect data that would allow for the analysis of 'objective, fair and reliable measure of students progression and achievement'. Within the College there is a Programme Board and Academic Board, but the inspectors were not provided with evidence that would demonstrate how those processes were effective mechanisms for measuring and analysing this information.

The inspectors determined therefore that this standard was not met.

Standard 6.4

The inspectors heard from students that they understood how they were able to progress within the course. The inspectors considered that the threshold for demonstrating this standard is to include this within the student handbook to ensure that there is transparency for all students involved with the course. The College has highlighted that there is Teaching and Learning Assessment strategy, but this was not provided to inspectors for consideration during the inspection. For reasons stated above relating to a cohesive, documented plan for assessment, the inspectors concluded that this standard was partly met.

Standard 6.5

The inspectors noted that they had not seen evidence in relation to the measuring of learning outcomes. For the reasons stated above relating to availability of evidence and lack of a clearly articulated and documented plan, the inspectors concluded that this standard was not met.

Standard 6.6

This was assessed to have met the standard required.

Conclusion

The inspection of both full and part time social work courses at Ruskin College resulted in the determination by inspectors that the course had failed to demonstrate meeting (or only partly meeting) a significant number of the Education and Training Standards 2019. Whilst considering what recommendation the inspectors should propose to the regulator, the inspectors noted that the course did not meet all of the required standards across five of the six areas covered by the Standards. The inspectors noted that this was frequently for one of the following reasons

1. Evidence was insufficient, not provided or not clearly articulated by the institution.
2. The evidence was not aligned with Social Work England's Education and Training Standards 2019 and the Professional Standards.
3. The evidence indicated that senior leadership and management structures and partnership working within and beyond Ruskin College would not sufficiently support the proposed course design to be delivered.

Separately from its consideration of the recommendation, the inspectors also looked at whether the course could meet the new Education and Training Standards 2020 within a short period of time, and formed the view that the proposed course is likely to struggle to demonstrate meeting the increased requirements of the new standards. This view was not taken into account in determining the overall recommendation to the regulator which was assessed against the Education and Training Standards 2019 alone.

It is important to reflect in this report that the inspectors felt the Academic Lead had been able to very quickly make a positive impression within the College, both to students and key stakeholders connected to the social work course, and had been able to participate fully with the inspection process despite being a very new member of staff. The inspectors through discussion confirmed that the Academic Lead had all the skills, experience and values required for this role and welcomed his honesty and time taken to explain the vision for the course he wished to deliver. Due to the short period of time that the Academic Lead had been in place within Ruskin College, and indeed the institutional knowledge across many of the supporting services with relatively new members of staff, the evidence connected to the proposed design of the course for Academic years 2020/21 and onwards was not always available or known about at the time of the inspection. Nevertheless, the inspectors felt that Ruskin College had been aware of the likelihood of inspection for many months, and had been given sufficient opportunity to develop or produce documentary evidence throughout the inspection, particularly around structures, implementation of policy and action or business continuity plans for this area.

In making an overall conclusion following the inspection, the inspectors reviewed all evidence relating to the pre-approval documentation and assessed each standard following meetings with relevant staff groups, including considering information shared within meetings at which College staff were not present and information contained within students' complaints submitted to Social Work England under its concerns process. The inspectors then considered whether the standards, which as a result of the inspection were deemed to be 'partly met' or 'not met', with further recommendations or conditions, could have the potential to be met upon further inspection or documentary review at a later date.

The inspectors concluded that the College failed to demonstrate a fundamental understanding of the expectations that were required for a professionally regulated social work course. They were not confident that the course staff could be supported by leadership and structures such as student services within the College that would allow them to meet the standards required.. Furthermore, the inspectors were not confident that the Academic Lead could be supported to deliver the full extent of the course design, teaching, staff development and management, partnership and stakeholder engagement and course oversight that had been made his responsibility, and without an appropriately and experienced resourced team to assist him with this, the burden would continue to be placed upon the Academic Lead. Finally, the inspectors concluded that Ruskin College had not demonstrated during the process of approval and inspection the overarching quality assurance and governance mechanisms in place at senior management level that could appropriately monitor, evaluate and take action to develop this course to meet the standards. The senior management were unable to articulate the processes of quality assurance, governance and required mechanisms for delivery inherent within their roles as senior leaders. The overall assessment of the course concluded that the standards, particularly relating to standard 4, as a currently fit for purpose and sustainable course, are not met, and as such students could not be adequately prepared to join the professional register. Therefore, the inspectors concluded that the course approval should be withdrawn from Ruskin College.

Proposed outcome

The inspectors determined that the purpose of the inspection was to safeguard protection of the public by ensuring high standards of quality within social work. The College was unable to demonstrate that the full time and part time routes of its social work course met most of the standards required to be approved as a social work course in England and the inspectors were of the view that imposing conditions in relation to the standards which were partly met or not met would not be sufficient to ensure the safety and quality of the course in preparing students to meet the professional standards. The inspection team concluded that it would not be appropriate to impose conditions as the conditions would have to be so extensive as to be impractical; and not reasonably achievable given many of the concerns listed within this report. The inspection team recommend to the regulator that the approval to deliver social work courses should be withdrawn.

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Table breakdown of standards met during preapproval and inspection.

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
Level of qualification for entry to the register			
1.1 The threshold entry route to the register will be a bachelor's degree with honours.	☒	☐	☐
Admissions			
2.1 The admissions process will give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a course.	☐	☒	☐
2.2 The selection and entry criteria will include appropriate academic and professional entry standards.	☐	☒	☐
2.3 The admissions process will ensure that applicants have a good command of English.	☐	☒	☐
2.4 The admissions process will assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.	☐	☐	☒
2.5 The admissions process will ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.	☐	☐	☒
2.6 There will be an appropriate and effective process for assessing applicants' prior learning and experience.	☐	☐	☒
2.7 The education provider will ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.	☐	☐	☒
Course governance, management and leadership			

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
3.1 The course will be sustainable and fit for purpose.	☐	☐	☒
3.2 The course will be effectively managed.	☐	☐	☒
3.3 The education provider will ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the course is appropriately qualified and experienced and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 The course will have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.	☐	☐	☒
3.5 There will be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and placement providers.	☐	☒	☐
3.6 There will be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice based learning for all students.	☐	☐	☒
3.7 People with lived experience of social work will be involved in the course.	☐	☐	☒
3.8 Students will be involved in the course.	☐	☒	☐
3.9 There will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective course.	☐	☐	☒
3.10 Subject areas will be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.	☐	☒	☐
3.11 An effective course will be in place to ensure the continuing professional and academic development of educators, appropriate to their role in the course.	☐	☒	☐
3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings will be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the course and will be accessible to all students and educators.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
3.13 There will be effective and accessible arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of students in all settings.	☐	☐	☒
3.14 The course will implement and monitor equality and diversity policies in relation to students.	☐	☐	☒
3.15 There will be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to student complaints.	☐	☒	☐
3.16 There will be thorough and effective processes in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☐	☒	☐
3.17 There will be an effective process in place to support and enable students to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of people with lived experience of social work.	☐	☒	☐
3.18 The education provider will ensure students, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved course leads to eligibility for admission to the register.	☒	☐	☐
Course design and delivery			
4.1 The learning outcomes will ensure that students meet Social Work England's professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.2 The learning outcomes will ensure that students understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour.	☐	☒	☐
4.3 The course will reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
4.4 The curriculum will remain relevant to current practice.	☐	☐	☒
4.5 Integration of theory and practice will be central to the course.	☐	☐	☒
4.6 The learning and teaching methods used will be appropriate to the effective delivery of the learning outcomes.	☐	☒	☐
4.7 The delivery of the course will support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.	☐	☒	☐
4.8 The delivery of the course will support and develop evidence-based practice.	☐	☒	☐
4.9 The course will ensure that students are able to learn with, and from, professionals and students in other relevant professions.	☐	☐	☒
4.10 The course will include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from people with lived experience of social work and students.	☐	☐	☒
4.11 The education provider will identify and communicate to students the parts of the course where attendance is mandatory and will have associated monitoring processes in place.	☐	☒	☐
Practice based learning			
5.1 Practice based learning will be integral to the course.	☒	☐	☐
5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice based learning will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
5.3 The education provider will maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice based learning.	☐	☒	☐
5.4 Practice based learning will take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for students and people with lived experience of social work.	☐	☒	☐
5.5 There will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice based learning.	☐	☒	☐
5.6 Practice educators will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, will be on the register.	☐	☒	☐
5.7 Practice educators will undertake regular training, which is appropriate to their role, students' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the course.	☐	☒	☐
5.8 Students and practice educators will have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice based learning.	☒	☐	☐
Assessment			
6.1 The assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who successfully complete the course meet Social Work England's professional standards.	☐	☐	☒
6.2 Assessment throughout the course will ensure that students demonstrate that they are able to meet the expectations of professional	☐	☐	☒

Standard	Met	Partly Met	Not Met
behaviour.			
6.3 Assessments will provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of students' progression and achievement.	☐	☐	☒
6.4 Assessment policies will clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the course.	☐	☒	☐
6.5 The assessment methods used will be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.	☐	☐	☒
6.6 The education provider will ensure that at least one external examiner for the course is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the register.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

The content of this report has been carefully considered, as have the conclusions that the inspectors have drawn, and the recommendation that they have made. Consideration has also been given to the submissions made by the provider in relation to this report and the inspectors' recommendation. The conclusion of the report sets out that there are a number of significant areas where the inspectors were not satisfied that the provider had demonstrated that it meets the 2019 standards for education and training, and the provider had further not demonstrated that the course would ensure that students who successfully complete it are able to meet the professional standards. It is noted that the inspection team considered whether conditions could be applied in those areas where standards were not fully met, and that they have concluded that the number and nature of such conditions would be impractical and not reasonably achievable. On the basis of this report, and the conclusions that the inspectors have reached, the regulator is satisfied that the course does not meet the criteria for approval and that it is appropriate to withdraw approval.