

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Bradford

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Inspection dates: 18 July - 21 July 2023

Report date:	15 September 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	7 November 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	Not met

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	11
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	15
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	19
Standard five: Supporting students	25
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	28
Proposed outcome.....	29
Conditions	29
Recommendations	31
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	33
Regulator decision	40
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	41
Findings	42

Introduction

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

What we do

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

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

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

Summary of Inspection

15. Course details: the University of Bradford wish to run a three-year Bachelor of Arts Degree Apprenticeship in Social Work.

Inspection ID	UBR
Course provider	University of Bradford
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of Study	Full Time Apprenticeship
Maximum student cohort	16
Proposed first intake	September 2022
Date of inspection	18 July – 21 July 2023
Inspection team	Nikki Steel-Bryan, Education Quality Assurance Officer Monica Murphy (Lay Inspector) David Childs (Registrant Inspector)

Language

16. In this document we describe the University of Bradford as ‘the education provider’, ‘the course provider’ or ‘the university’ and we describe the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship as ‘the course’.

Inspection

17. An onsite inspection took place from 18 July – 21 July 2023 across sites in the location where the education provider is based. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

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

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with eleven students, of which seven were Year 1 apprentices, three were BA (Hons) Social Work students and one was an MA Social Work student who had just completed the programme. One BA student was representing the social justice society. Discussions included placement, supervision, support and feedback.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the senior leadership team, the course team, staff involved in placements, staff involved in admissions and welfare and academic support staff.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in the delivery of the apprenticeship course. Discussions included their role in the interview processes, their contributions to curriculum development, course design and course delivery and the opportunities provided to feedback to the university.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners, Bradford City Council and Bradford Children's Trust.

Findings

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

Standard one: Admissions

Standard 1.1

25. Documentary evidence reviewed in support of this standard included the programme specification document (PSD), and an apprenticeship process map. As part of a secondary submission the university also supplied an applicant pack that included a training plan agreement form, an example of an initial skills assessment and an example apprentice agreement.

26. Through discussions with the employer partner, the inspection team heard that the selection process concluded with a three-day event and that university staff were only involved in the interview and written assessment component of that selection process. It appeared to inspectors that the selection process was owned and managed by the employer partner. Furthermore, the employer partner explained that applications to the apprenticeship were ringfenced to certain employees, and that they undertook the initial sift of candidates. It was unclear to the inspection team what the criteria for the initial sift was, how it was applied, or whether the university was involved.

27. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard that, in the most recent cycle, the programme leader sat on the formal interview panel to consider applicants to the children's apprenticeship. However, they had no knowledge of what had been undertaken in the panel for the adult services apprenticeships, suggesting that the university did not have a complete overview of the interview process.

28. The admissions assessment was made up of several components. Applicants undertook formal interviews, submitted a handwritten assessment based on a journal article, were required to engage with ICT as part of the overall admissions process and took part in a group interview led by people with lived experience of social work. However, the students met by the inspection team described two different approaches to the apprenticeship assessment day over two years suggesting that the applicant assessment process was inconsistent.

29. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the employer partner and the university resolved issues should their assessment of a candidate differ. Both the university

and the employer partner reported that they would be the party to make the final decision in this situation, and it was not clear to inspectors that there was a policy, or process, to guide panel members and ensure a consistent approach.

30. The inspection team did not have access to the predetermined interview questions, or the marking grids or matrices that applied to the interview questions and the written assessment. As a result they were unable to assess whether the approach could give applicants the opportunity to demonstrate that they had the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.

31. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team were unclear how the university had ownership of the admissions process and as a result are recommending that a condition is set against 1.1 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 1.2

32. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included the application form which incorporated a question on why the applicant wanted to be a social worker, where applicants were expected to reflect upon their prior experience. Furthermore, through discussion with the employer partner the inspection team heard that applicants were required to hold a relevant substantive role within the local authority and have the support of their head of service to apply. The apprentices met by the inspection team were all able to articulate their prior experience and how it supported them on the programme.

33. Although it appeared that candidate prior experience was considered upon application to the programme, the inspectors were not reassured that the university had ownership, or oversight, of this element of the course. It was not clear to the inspection team that university staff were involved in assessing prior experience in the stages prior to interview to ensure fairness or parity.

34. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 1.2 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 1.3

35. It was clear to the inspection team that employer partners, and practitioners from the local authority, were involved in the admissions process (c.f. para [26-27](#)) and the inspection team understood that people with lived experience of social work were involved in the assessment event including, as part of a group interview panel (c.f. para [28](#)). However, the inspection team were not reassured that this aspect of the admissions process was 'ensured' as required by the standard due to the lack of formal governance structures to record the activities and views of stakeholder groups (c.f. para [93-96](#)).

36. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against 1.3 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 1.4

37. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard was limited, however the inspection team noted that the mapping document reported that *'potential applicants are required to submit an enhanced disclosure and barring certificate (DBS) and complete a confidential declaration of health status and health episodes.'*

38. Both the employer partner and the course team reported that DBS checks were undertaken routinely within the local authority with the employer partner confirming this was undertaken annually for employees. The inspection team acknowledged that the standard did not require a separate DBS check to be completed for students. However, through discussion with the course team, they heard that the level 4 students enrolled at the time of the inspection had not completed a DBS or had their DBS status confirmed with the employer partner.

39. Further discussion with the course team highlighted that ongoing declarations of suitability were not in place for this course (c.f. para [127](#)).

40. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that three conditions (*one issued with immediate effect) are set against 1.4 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

* An immediate condition was agreed by the regulator to ensure that the students currently enrolled at level 4 of the programme had undergone appropriate DBS clearance.

Standard 1.5

41. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university's admissions policy, and the institutions access and participation plan: 2020-21 – 2024-25. The university was committed to equality and diversity (c.f. para [97](#)) and the inspection team did not identify any issues in relation to the support of applicants or the reasonable adjustments made to the admissions process where necessary.

42. However, there was a lack of clarity around the processes for admissions appeals as neither the admissions tutor, the programme leader or the professional support services admission officers were able to confirm how the university process applied to apprentices. The inspection team were not assured that the equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) processes could be considered 'ensured' as required by the standard when the appeals status of applicants was unclear.

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

Standard 1.6

44. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included a link to the course website. On initial review inspectors noted that the information provided on the site was limited. However, the website was updated several times following the evidence submission preventing inspectors from being able to make a judgement on the information available to applicants at their point of application.

45. Through discussion with employers the inspection team heard that informational emails, flyers, event information and a deadline for application date was sent to potential applicants. The inspection team noted that they did not have access to these materials to make an assessment.

46. The inspection team were keen to understand whether the current cohort were aware that the course was currently not approved by the regulator which could pose a risk to their future career. The students reported that they were made aware of the status of the programme and that the apprenticeship offered an opportunity they may have otherwise been unable to undertake, and that the employer partner had committed to their training regardless of the outcome of inspection.

47. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 1.6 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was

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

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

48. The programme specification document (PSD) detailed 30 skills days, one 70-day placement, and one 100-day placement. The placements were spread over years 2 and 3 of the course, with the intention that both placements would be undertaken within the statutory setting. From the documentary evidence the inspection team understood that apprentices were based in adult child services and that they would swap for the second placement to ensure that students experienced suitable contrasting practice-based experiences. However, through discussion with staff involved in placements, and with the employer partner, it appeared that due to placement capacity, unequal apprentice numbers between adult and children's services, and accommodating placement for social work students from other courses, the arrangement to swap placements for apprentices was in doubt.

49. The documentary evidence reported that students undertook 30 skills development days as part of the programme of study and that the level 4 module SOW4016-B, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* delivered 50 skills sessions. The inspection team were keen to better understand the skills day set up and heard from the course team that the programme of skills delivered changed each year to support individual cohorts and that they were shared with Bradford College as part of the teaching partnership. The inspection team queried whether there was any difference between a skills session and a skills day, and heard that the session, or taught element, may be delivered over a morning, and that delivery was linked to self-directed learning that students were expected to undertake for the remainder of the day.

50. The inspection team cross-checked the documentary evidence during the inspection and identified a maximum of 20 skills days from the mapping of skills sessions provided. The course team responded that the additional ten days could be located within the level 5 module SOW5022-D, *Apprentice Practice Learning I* and the level 6 module SOW6016-D, *Apprentice Practice Learning II*, which each contained ten recall days. However, the inspection team identified this as a further inconsistency between the submitted documentation and the evidence heard on inspection, as each of the module specification documents (MSDs) reported that the modules contained five recall days.

51. In addition to the query surrounding the number of skills days provided, the inspection team questioned the course team on the content of the skills sessions. The skills day mapping provided by the course team detailed academic writing as a component of the

skills sessions and the inspection team were keen to better understand the rationale for this decision as the course included a 20 -credit level 4 module that provided academic skills development, SOW4014-B, *Academic Skills Development for Social Work*. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that the students within the current cohort required some additional support with academic writing, which was considered a skill necessary for writing court reports.

52. The students met by the inspection team reported that the skills days delivered as part of SOW4016-B, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* were 'experiential' where they learned from the discussion, and the experience in the room. They then documented their attendance in a log on PebblePad, and had the opportunity to write a blog post that was reviewed by academic staff. The students further reported that they understood which parts of the timetable were skills days, however, it seemed through discussion that there appeared to be some confusion between skills days required for registration, and the student-led enrichment days organised by the social justice society.

53. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against 2.1 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 2.2

54. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included a course handbook, memorandum of understanding between Bradford City Council and the university and a training plan agreement. Through discussion with students the inspection team heard that students felt that the placements were useful and helped to prepare them to meet the professional standards and be fit for practice. One final year MA student reported having received four job offers at the end of the programme. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

55. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included a course handbook, induction materials, a training plan agreement and placement documentation. During the inspection the team heard from employer partners that a generic induction was provided to all students undertaking placement with them as a local authority and that this included apprentices. In addition, the team responsible for providing the apprenticeship placement was asked to provide a tailored induction to their environment and work.

56. The inspection team were keen to better understand whether students would be expected to continue undertaking any aspects of their substantive role whilst on placement

and were reassured that the employer partner reported that students would not remain within their substantive team for placements, and that managers were supported to understand the role of the apprentice and the boundaries relating to placements.

57. The local authority partner employed a number of registered social workers as full-time practice educators which were known as either Practice Educator Consultants (PECs) in adult services or Practice Educator Specialists (PESs) in children's services. Training and support were provided to professionals who wished to specialise in the education of Social Workers, and the local authority considered this a valuable and valid route through the profession.

58. Through discussions with the practice educators, some of whom were also apprentice line managers within the local authority, the inspection team heard that there was an understanding, from a management point of view, that apprentices were unable to take cases when involved in teaching and learning activities, including placements. The practice educators, PECs and PESs, met by the inspection team further noted that they expected managers to support the boundaries around placements, and that this was discussed during the PEC and PES led induction sessions, and reinforced during supervision.

59. Practice Educators reported feeling they were provided with sufficient information about students in advance of the placement and noted that they also undertook informal meetings with their supervisees where they asked about other commitments students may have outside the course, as well as whether any specific support was required.

60. Through discussions with students the inspection team heard that practice educators were supportive, and students were also able to highlight several other avenues of support available to them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

61. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included a tripartite meeting agreement and a course handbook. Throughout the inspection the inspection team heard from a range of stakeholders who confirmed that they understood that, although the apprentices had experience of the social work environment, they were students and were on placement to learn. The inspection team were keen to better understand the tripartite meeting and heard from practice educators that students were asked to prepare reflections for this meeting. These were discussed during the meeting and informed any actions for the placement going forward. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

62. The inspection team noted that SOW4016-B, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* included an assessed component that ensured that students were ready to carry out practice learning in a service delivery setting. Readiness for practice was shared across the

teaching partnership and as a result university and Bradford City College students experienced the same preparation for placements. Practice educators reported that students were well prepared for placement and that the shared approach to readiness for practice in the region was beneficial. The inspection team agreed that the viva assessment was appropriate and included people with lived experience.

63. However, as the standard referenced DBS checks at admissions, the inspection team is recommending that, following a review of the evidence, two conditions (*one with immediate effect) are set against 2.5 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

* An immediate condition was agreed by the regulator to ensure that the students currently enrolled at level 4 of the programme had undergone appropriate DBS clearance.

Standard 2.6

64. Following a review of the documentary evidence provided and their discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were unable to confirm that the university maintained a record of practice educators registration status, currency, and qualifications. Through discussion with staff involved in placement activity the inspection team heard that the university undertook checks on the practice educators who were not employed by the local authority, however, where the practice educator was part of a statutory partner organisation, this was maintained by the local authority.

65. Practice educators reported that they undertook CPD activities with the university which they reported to Social Work England on an annual basis, and practice educators employed by the local authority noted that there was a policy that required full attendance at either Practice Educator Professional Standard (PEPS) 1 or PEPS 2 training. Both the staff involved in practice learning and the practice educators cited the teaching partnership as receiving information about practice educators, however it was unclear to the inspection team what was received and monitored at these meetings.

66. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.6 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 2.7

67. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the university whistleblowing policy. The inspection team were keen to better understand how apprentices would know whether to follow the university or the employer whistleblowing policy. Through discussions with the course team, the inspection team heard that students could use all parties to blow the whistle if necessary and provided an example where a student had brought a workplace issue to the course team, which was followed up with the employer and recorded on e-vision in the secure student record. The course team confirmed that whistleblowing was an explicit requirement of placement induction. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met, with a [recommendation](#) that the course and governance documentation is reviewed to ensure that any references to the HCPC have been updated.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

68. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included a faculty governance and management structure, documentation on academic related career progression and monitoring, staff CVs and a memorandum of understanding with the teaching partnership. Throughout the inspection it was unclear to the inspection team how the course was supported by a management and governance plan that identified accountability, or how quality was overseen across the course.

69. Through discussion with the senior leadership team (SLT) the inspection team heard that the course was monitored via the usual quality structures within the university. When asked to articulate the governance structure that managed and monitored the programme, the course team reported a list of roles undertaken within the team (for example, the personal academic tutor (PAT), the academic team, practice tutors, head of department etc). However, the inspection team were unable to ascertain what system was in place that allowed for the reporting, consideration, discussion, and documented action on course related issues, whether that was via a series of committees, or via an alternative process, or where the lines of accountability were drawn. It was clear that there were relationship-based groups, for example the people's forum (c.f. para [82](#) and [94](#)), however these were for the most part not minuted and as a result, the inspection team were unable to triangulate any action.

70. The inspection team were keen to better understand the role of the teaching partnership within the governance system, as the documentary evidence suggested that the future of funding for the partnership was unclear. Through discussions with the course team the inspection team heard that the partnership would continue regardless of whether future funding was secured or not. However, as the minutes of the partnership meetings submitted to the inspection team were very heavily redacted it was not possible for the

inspection team to gain an understanding of the ways in which the teaching partnership supported the course.

71. Through discussions with the SLT the inspection team heard that there was a five-year plan to develop the apprenticeship provision within the university more widely and that social work was an integral part of that aspiration. The inspection team understood that the university had taken over the apprenticeship from another institution and that the desire to slowly increase student numbers was supported by the senior leaders who would review the staffing provision annually to ensure that responsible scalability.

72. The inspection team further noted that the programme leader for the course was new to both working in higher education, and the role of programme leader and that this could pose a risk to the quality of the course. The SLT noted that the programme leader was being supported via a programme of mentoring from more experienced staff and the central quality team as well as via the Bradford Academic (c.f. para [91](#)).

73. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.1 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [condition sections of this report](#).

Standard 3.2

74. The inspection team noted that the university had a memorandum of agreement with the teaching partnership for placements (c.f. para [85](#)). However, through discussion with employer partners and the staff involved in practice learning, the inspection team heard that the local authority employer was not the only provider who may be involved in the course, as both university staff and the employer partner commented in separate meetings that the use of PVI and other sector placements may be necessary. The inspection team were not provided with any agreements with PVI, or other sector placement providers.

75. Moreover, through discussion with the staff involved in practice learning, the inspection team heard that the university were running an additional funded masters cohort in the current academic year that had put some additional strain on the available placements. To try and better understand the placement arrangements the inspection team asked the SLT what agreements were in place for placements, and with which providers, and the team was unable to answer. It was not articulated to the inspection team that placements for the course were adequately planned for, or appropriately assured with the necessary agreements in place.

76. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 3.2 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was

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

Standard 3.3

77. Evidence reviewed in support of this standard included the placement agreement which required the placement agency to confirm a number of indemnity articles that protected students' health, wellbeing and risk. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

78. The inspection team were not assured that employers were involved in all elements of the course. It was clear to inspectors that employers were engaged in the admissions process (c.f. para [26-27](#)) however, the other aspects of course management and monitoring were less obvious. The inspection team received some terms of reference and minutes from the teaching partnership, however, the level of redaction meant that they were unable to ascertain who had attended, and what was discussed.

79. In addition, although the course was running at the point of inspection, it was in its first year of delivery and had not been subjected to the university's annual monitoring process. The inspection team acknowledged that the university supplied an example programme monitoring report for the BA (Hons) Social Work. However, the report was not a recent example, as it covered academic year 2018/19.

80. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 3.4 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [condition sections of this report](#).

Standard 3.5

81. The inspection team were not assured that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation, and improvement systems were in place.

82. Through discussion with the senior leadership team (SLT) the inspection team heard that some central quality processes had been updated, and across the inspection, the inspection team heard that several forums, meetings, and groups took place. However, it was not possible for inspectors to review this information due to the level of redaction on the submitted minutes, or because the forum in question was intentionally informal and no minutes were taken. As an example, people with lived experience were able to contribute

to the programme, and feedback their views, via the people's forum, however, this meeting was not minuted and was highlighted in other documentation to be regularly cancelled suggesting it was not properly embedded.

83. The inspection team were able to triangulate the use of module evaluation questionnaires (MEQs) however engagement from students was low. The SLT reported that the response rate was due to level 4 students misunderstanding the importance of module feedback, and that the apprentices struggled with the time they needed to complete the forms. A plan had been put in place for the next cycle to ensure that space was provided within the apprenticeship timetable to complete MEQs.

84. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 3.5 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 3.6

85. During the inspection, the team heard that student numbers were considered by the teaching partnership. As the teaching partnership consisted of the university, Bradford City Council, Bradford Children's Trust, and Bradford City College the inspection team were satisfied that placement capacity was considered alongside regional employers, and other providers.

86. Through discussions with the SLT the inspection team heard that, although there was the potential for strategic growth within the apprenticeship, they were keen to ensure that development in this area did not disadvantage the university's other social work programmes. They were cognisant that any growth had to be incremental and in line with placement availability. The university deployed a five-year planning cycle, which included student numbers. The SLT reported that there were clear opportunities for growth due to the workforce demands in the region, however, the university were keen to ensure that they responded to that demand in a sustainable way.

87. It was reported that the course was scrutinised for staff numbers and resourcing within the stage 1 and stage 2 university validation processes, and that some additional staffing had been secured as a result, including a joint post between Bradford City Council and the university. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

88. The evidence provided to support this standard included a CV for the lead social worker, which detailed relevant qualifications, experience, and registration number. The inspection

team cross-checked the Social Work England register during the inspection and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

89. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included staff CVs noting that the 14 full time equivalent (FTE) were all qualified and registered social workers. Through discussion with the SLT the inspection team heard that the department made use of associate teaching staff for subject specific delivery, and that an additional joint post between the university and the employer partner had been approved, but not recruited to. Throughout the inspection the inspection team met with a range of staff within the department, and from central services, and the inspection team agreed that the resourcing was adequate, and that this standard was met.

Standard 3.9

90. Through discussions with the senior leadership team, the inspection team heard that apprenticeship performance, progression and outcomes were stringently monitored in line with apprenticeship funding requirements and that a monthly learner tracking meeting was facilitated by quality assurance officers who were based centrally within the university alongside the programme leader. Apprentices' performance, progression and outcomes were also monitored via the tripartite meetings which took place every 12 weeks and, although the apprenticeship had not yet been through the process, the university annual monitoring process incorporated student progression and attainment. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

91. The inspection team reviewed the staff CVs submitted as evidence in support of this standard and were satisfied that they demonstrated professional development. Through discussions with the SLT the inspection heard that the university ran a staff development programme called *The Bradford Academic* to support new academic staff. The SLT further reported that the academic workload model ran at 90% (approx. 1580 hours across the year) to provide some flexibility for unforeseen activity or development. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

92. Documentary evidence submitted to support this standard included a course handbook, module specification documents (MSDs), programme monitoring report from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, marking criteria and example feedback provided to students following an assessed presentation on the module SOW4013-B, *Introduction to the Social Work Apprenticeship*. The university also supplied a document mapping the course to the

Social Work England Professional Standards which were also mapped at a module level within the MSDs. Through discussion with students the inspection team were assured that the regulatory frameworks were being disseminated, as the students discussed the professional standards and the apprenticeship knowledge skills, and behaviours which they described as being '*taught in every session*'. Furthermore the inspection team heard the students articulate the role of the social worker, and provide examples of how teaching on the programme had positively impacted their work within their substantive roles. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.2

93. The inspection team were unable to verify how, or when, employers, practitioners, and people with lived experience of social work were involved in the design and ongoing delivery of the course. Through discussions with students the inspection team heard that practitioners, both from social work, and from other professions, and people with lived experience, undertook sessions within the programme (c.f. para [102](#) and [110](#).) however, it was unclear how they engaged in collaboration to develop and review the curriculum.

94. Through discussion with the employer partners, the inspection team heard that employer partners were not currently involved in curriculum design, however, they hoped to build on their current relationships with university staff so that in the future they could be more involved. The inspection team understood that people with lived experience were able to provide feedback via the people's forum, however, as this forum was informal and not minuted, it was not possible for the inspectors to be able to assess the level of collaboration that took place in relation to course design.

95. Throughout the inspection, the inspection team heard from all stakeholders that the university were supportive, the relationships were positive, and all parties felt valued. This positive culture emerged in the student body who described the peer relationships across the students on the three social work programmes as 'beautiful'. However, it was unclear to inspectors how the relationships were operationalised towards a robust system of quality assurance.

96. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against standard 4.2 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that these conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 4.3

97. Evidence reviewed in support of this standard included a university webpage on the institutions Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy and information about *The Bradford Curriculum* where ‘*all students are welcomed, valued and have potential to thrive and succeed at the University of Bradford*’. Through discussion with stakeholders over the course of the inspection, the inspection team heard that the university had a pro-vice chancellor for equality, diversity and inclusion and that the course team were engaged in a process of decolonisation of the curriculum and discussed broadening their teaching of ethics to include indigenous knowledge, highlighting that the team felt that decolonisation was not limited to source materials, but should also be evident within the teaching they presented. Through discussions with academic support services the inspection team heard that the subject librarian for social work was a member of the university’s working group to decolonise the curriculum and reported that there were several toolkits in development to support academic staff across the institution. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

98. Through review of the documentary evidence the inspection team considered the currency of the programme modules and the staff CVs submitted as evidence in support of this standard. It was noted that while the curriculum was considered appropriate at the point of inspection, and that staff CVs demonstrated the appropriate social work knowledge and skills to ensure its currency, it was unclear to inspectors how changes to legislation and government policy were planned for.

99. Through discussions with the academic skills staff the inspection team heard that the subject librarian for social work was involved in the course validation process and that support was provided to academic staff to update module resources on an annual basis. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a [recommendation](#) that the course team consider how developments in research, legislation and government policy are planned for, and articulated within the programme.

Standard 4.5

100. The inspection team reviewed the MSDs and the narrative included in the mapping document submitted as evidence in support of this standard and noted that theory was integrated and mapped across the course. Through discussions with students the inspection team heard that the apprentices found the theory delivered throughout the course had changed their understanding of practice within the workplace. They reported that they wrote *on the job, off the job* blogs where they could reflect on the integration of theory and practice to think about their knowledge which can be applied immediately within their substantive roles. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that academic staff review student blog posts, and while there is no minimum number, they aim to review all that are submitted. The inspection agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

101. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the module proforma for SOW4016-B, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* which the university noted supported the skills and knowledge development required for working across agencies. The inspection team were keen to better understand how this occurred within the course, as it was not sufficiently clear within the MSD.

102. Through discussions with the students the inspection team heard that level 4 apprentices had undertaken a case review half-day alongside students in cognate disciplines. In addition, the students discussed undertaking sessions within the *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* module that were led by professionals from other disciplines, citing nurses and physiotherapists as two examples. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

103. The inspection team reviewed the level 4 timetable submitted in support of this standard. The inspection team were assured that there was sufficient time allocated to on the job, and off the job, learning within the course, and that apprentice engagement was monitored through the monthly progress meetings held between the programme leader and central quality officers for Ofsted purposes and via the 12-weekly tripartite meetings. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

104. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the universal design for learning criteria submitted in support of this standard, the assessments as documented within the programme MSDs and the external examiner comments. The inspection team understood that the course team applied the principles of universal design for learning to the assessment strategy, and that the course made use of a range methods to develop creative assessments which ranged from the submission of art and theatre pieces to viva voces and essays.

105. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the course team ensured that creative assessments appropriately supported the evaluation of module and course learning outcomes. Through discussions with the course team the inspection team heard that all assessments were carefully aligned to learning outcomes, and that measures were taken to ensure that external examiners had access to samples of work (e.g. performance assessments were recorded, and students identified themselves at the start of the recording). External examiner feedback indicated that the examiner had access to work samples which were marked appropriately, and that detailed feedback was provided to students.

106. The inspection team further noted that, during the recent university validation process the assessment strategy had been considered by an external examiner with appropriate knowledge and skills to determine the quality of the approach. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

107. The inspection team reviewed samples of feedback supplied as evidence in support of this standard. The inspection team were keen to better understand where assessments were undertaken within the academic year as they had not been provided with a timetable of assessment. They heard, through discussion with the course team that SOW4017, *Values and Ethics for Social Work Apprentices*, had two assessments, and one was due in the middle of the module, and one took place at the end. This approach was considered satisfactory as an example. The students met by the inspection team did not raise any concerns around the timing of assessments and the inspection team noted that the assessment strategy was mapped to the curriculum. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

108. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included examples of student feedback. The inspection team noted that the narrative within the mapping document detailed a 20-working day turnaround time for student feedback. The inspection team heard from students that they were happy with the timeliness and quality of feedback noting that they felt confident raising queries if they were unhappy about their marks. They explained that they were able to access tutorials to discuss grading and they understood they could make an academic appeal if necessary. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

109. The inspection team reviewed staff and external examiner CVs and noted that staff had appropriate expertise to undertake assessment for social work. The external examiner was suitably qualified and on the register.

110. However, through discussions with the course team, the inspection team heard that people with lived experience of social work were considered equal partners in the assessment of the end-point assessment (EPA). It was not clear to the inspection team how the people with lived experience of social work were supported to undertake the assessment task. The members of this group met by the inspection team reported that they had not received any training for their roles with the university, and that their preference would be not to be trained, to maintain their authentic voice within the process.

111. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.11 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was

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

Standard 4.12

112. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university's marking criteria and the university *Regulation 7: Assessment Regulations*. In addition, the university also provided module handbooks and the programme handbook. The inspection team were keen to understand how direct observation of practice was undertaken and assured. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard that direct observations of practice were undertaken by practice educators or the work-based team manager, and that the expectation was that it must be carried out by a qualified and registered social worker with a minimum of three-years' experience. All observations were moderated via the monthly Practice Educator Panel (PEP). The panel received student observations for moderation including the report, the student reflection and, where consent was received, the feedback from the people with lived experience of social work involved in the observation in a sealed envelope which was opened at the PEP. Assessors on the panel were provided with a front sheet to complete, which included a checklist for consistency, and space for feedback to be provided to the practice educator. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

113. The inspection team reviewed the course specifications in advance of the inspection and were content that the programme appeared to be underpinned by research and evidence-based practice, noting that at level 4 the course included SOW4014, *Academic Skills Development for Social Work Apprentices*.

114. The inspection team heard from the academic skills services that the subject librarian was active in the development of programme resources noting that they consider resources suggested by social work students, as well as resources requested by academic staff. It was acknowledged that although e-books were the default resource for apprentices, the library service continued to purchase physical books for those students who preferred that format and that social work apprentices seemed to prefer face to face contact and had sought out the subject librarians when in need of support.

115. Through discussion with the students the inspection team were further reassured that the programme developed appropriate evidence-informed practice as the students spoke articulately about theory, and its application within the workplace. Moreover, the student social justice society led and ran a series of enrichment sessions to continue skills learning outside of timetabled sessions, and they made explicit reference to the skills, knowledge,

and behaviours required for the profession. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

116. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, student support was a key consideration for all stakeholders. The students met by the inspection team were able to articulate several avenues of support including academic tutorials, counselling service, university food bank, financial advice support, the online resource, myBradford and identified the subject librarian by name.

117. Central wellbeing services reported clearly on the forms of support on offer to students, which included counselling and careers support. Through discussion with the university wellbeing services the inspection team heard that the counselling and wellbeing team and the student life team offered weekend provision, and that appointments could be made face to face, on the phone, or via teams making the provision accessible to students who work, or who were on placement. Occupational Health was available via the apprentice employer.

118. The inspection team heard that the counselling service within the university ran a responsive triaging service, and that the wait time for a block of counselling appointments varied across the year, however, students received allocated sessions in blocks of 4. Following any block of 4 the student could go back on the waiting list for another block and there was no cap to the number of times a student could do this, and the service referred students into NHS services for Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) if this was the most appropriate approach.

119. The inspection team noted that it was clear that the services offered were responsive to student needs. The student life team reported providing cost of living support, including a food bank, to address the needs of students during the financial crisis and to help students living in poverty. Financial assistance was available to students through university hardship loans, interest free loans and the staff provided debt advice and signposted to external charities where appropriate.

120. All frontline staff within central wellbeing services were mental health first aiders, and the inspection team heard that the university had several student mental health ambassadors who were also mental health first aid trained.

121. The inspection team heard that the careers service provided several relevant services and functions to students within the university including a career booster programme which was a weeklong event and offered sessions to students such as negotiation skills or working with neurodivergent people. In addition, the careers service was embedded within the

course providing student social workers with interview training, including mock interviews, and bespoke preparation for the end point assessment.

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

Standard 5.2

124. In advance of the inspection the inspection team reviewed the information provided by the university in the mapping document noting that each student was allocated a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) and would have a minimum of three tutorials in each academic year. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard that all the apprentices would share the same PAT, who was also the programme leader, but was not a regular member of teaching staff on the course. The SLT reported that PATs received a weekly report on their tutees that communicated their attendance to enable them to make contact and offer support should a student's engagement drop. Through discussion with staff from the academic support services the inspection team heard that the university provided training centrally for PATs, which included information on how to refer students into the academic and wellbeing support services.

125. Through discussion with student and academic services the inspection team heard that the university provided academic, mathematics, statistics and academic writing support and that students could access disability services where screening for specific learning disabilities (SpLD) such as dyslexia, dyspraxia and dyscalculia could be identified, appointments with a disability advisor were available and learner support profiles (LSP) to communicate and monitor reasonable adjustments were managed.

126. In addition to supporting the course resources (c.f. para [99](#) and [114](#)) the university library also provided tutorials and training in referencing based skills such as bibliometrics, referencing and the use of bibliographic tools such as End Note. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

127. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the submitted fitness to practise policy (2010). During the inspection, the inspection team were provided with a link to the updated version of the policy, approved by university senate in February 2023. The inspection team noted that the policy was available and appropriate, and, through discussion with the course team, heard that, should an apprentice be subject to the policy, then the employer would be notified. However, the course team further reported that there was no ongoing declaration of suitability following the DBS at the start of the programme.

128. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 5.3 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was

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

Standard 5.4

129. The inspection team reviewed the university's apprenticeship services agreement template where clauses 18.1.1 and 18.1.2 required that all parties would perform any legal obligations under relevant equality and human rights laws. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that learning needs, preferences and any reasonable adjustments were documented within the Placement Application Form (PAF) and the practice educators met by the inspection team reported that the learning agreement included any specific circumstances that the placement provider may need to be aware of, like required reasonable adjustments, or caring responsibilities. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

130. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course handbook, an induction presentation from the regional engagement lead at Social Work England and a link to the website. As part of a secondary submission the university provided information of a social work careers event hosted by the teaching partnership, presentation slides from presentations entitled *The Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE) in Bradford Council* and *How to get your first job in adult social work*. Additionally email exchanges between the course team and the careers service to organise *your social work career starts now* as part of SOW4016-B, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* were also provided. The inspection team noted that the course handbook included relevant information on the course curriculum and assessments, and that the additional presentations covered the role of the regulator and information relevant to the transition to registered social worker.

131. Through discussion with academic support services staff the inspection team heard that the university careers service was embedded within the programme delivery (c.f. para [121](#)) and that students could access this service for five years after graduation. The students met by the inspection team understood the ASYE, registration and their CPD responsibilities and did not raise any concerns over curriculum information. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.6

132. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the course handbook submitted as evidence against this standard. The inspection team noted that the handbook did not include any specific reference to mandatory attendance. However, the students met by the inspection team understood that they had to attend all aspects of the programme, that they

had to register in class using the swipe system, if they had forgotten their card they had to inform the lecturer and if they were absent this had to be remediated through direct contact with the lecturer. They further reported that, if they knew they would be absent they were required to email the lecturer, and they understood that absence would be shared with the employer partner. When a student was absent this was discussed at the tripartite meeting, and the monthly monitoring of apprentices (c.f. para [90](#) and [103](#)) covered a number of student metrics including absences. The PAT tutors were also emailed each month with a list of students who had been absent from classes (c.f. para [124](#)).

133. However, through discussion with the course team it wasn't clear that there was a shared understanding of the university policy on absence as staff provided conflicting absence tolerances ranging from 50% - 100%. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a [recommendation](#) that the course team review the information provided on mandatory attendance and consider where this should be documented and shared with students, course staff and partners.

Standard 5.7

134. Following a review of the documentary evidence, and through discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were assured that students had access to satisfactory points of feedback. Feedback was provided formatively, as well as on summative assessments. Feedback was also provided by practice educators, and line managers within the workplace. Students reported that feedback was timely, consistent, and clear (c.f. standards [3.9](#), [4.8](#) and [4.10](#) for more information on student feedback) and the external examiner reported that feedback was appropriate (c.f. para [105](#)). The inspection team agree that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

135. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included university *Regulation 6: Academic Appeal Regulations*. The students met by the inspection team knew that they were able to appeal should it be required. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

136. The inspection team reviewed the programme specification for the course and agreed that the award for the BA (Hons) met the standard, noting that other exit awards were clearly distinguished from the registered award.

Proposed outcome

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

Conditions

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

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 1.1 Standard 1.2 Standard 1.3 Standard 1.4 Standard 1.5 Standard 1.6 Standard 2.5	The education provider will develop a robust process for the assessment of applicants that ensures that the university has oversight of the whole admissions process. The process should clearly communicate the stages of recruitment document where ownership and responsibility lies for those elements of the process. The processes will include appropriate and robust practices for DBS and Occupational Health checks, admissions appeals, assessment of prior experience, the implementation and monitoring of equality, diversity and inclusion across the application process and for ensuring that information provided to prospective applicants is appropriate to support them to make an informed choice.	31st January 2024	Para 25-47 63
2	Standard 1.4 Standard 2.5	Immediate Condition: The education provider is required to provide evidence that the DBS status of each student currently enrolled on the BA	30 September 2023	Para 38 63

		(Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship has been verified through an appropriate oversight mechanism.		
3	Standard 2.1	The education provider will develop, and provide evidence of, a strategy for the provision of skills days that includes an operational plan for their delivery and evaluation.	31 January 2024	Para 48-52
4	Standard 2.1	The education provider will consider the programme documentation and ensure it aligns to the way in which the course is delivered.	31 January 2024	Para 50
5	Standard 2.6	The education provider is required to develop a process of oversight of practice educator currency, qualifications, and registration.	31 January 2024	Para 64-65
6	Standard 3.1	The education provider will provide a management and governance strategy, or plan, which sets out clear roles and responsibilities for both individuals and groups for the course.	31 January 2024	Para 68-72
7	Standard 3.2	The education provider is required to provide an updated, explicit plan which includes agreements with placement providers.	31 January 2024	Para 74-75
8	Standard 3.4 Standard 4.2	The education provider is required to review the opportunities for employer engagement and consider the ways in which this will be formalised. Evidence will be provided which demonstrates how action has been taken.	31 January 2024	Para 78 93-94
9	Standard 3.5	The education provider will consider the ways in which effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are planned and recorded and subsequently how actions are completed and tracked.	31 January 2024	Para 81-82
10	Standard 1.3 Standard 4.2	That the education provider will consider the mechanisms in place to enable the views of employers, practitioners, and	31 January 2024	Para 35 93-94

		people with lived experience to be incorporated into the admissions processes and the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.		
11	Standard 4.11	The education provider will ensure that any stakeholders taking part in assessment are appropriately trained to ensure consistency, fairness, and parity within the assessment process.	31 January 2024	Para 110
12	Standard 1.4 Standard 5.3	The education provider will develop and submit a process to assess students ongoing suitability in relation to conduct, character and health as detailed within the standard guidance.	31 January 2024	Para 39 127

Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	Standard 2.7	The inspectors are recommending that the university review the course and governance documentation to ensure that any reference to the HCPC has been updated.	Para 67
2	Standard 4.4	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider how developments in research, legislation and government policy are planned for, and articulated, within the programme.	Para 98
3.	Standard 5.6	The inspectors are recommending that the university review the information provided to apprentices, staff, practice educators and employer partners on mandatory attendance, and consider where this should be documented and shared with students, course staff and partners.	Para 132-133

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

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions.

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

1. If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure education providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the [education and training standards](#).
2. Inspectors will undertake the conditions review and make recommendations to Social Work England's decision maker.
3. This section of the report will be completed when the conditions review is completed.

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1	Standard 1.1 Standard 1.2 Standard 1.3 Standard 1.4 Standard 1.5 Standard 1.6 Standard 2.5	The education provider will develop a robust process for the assessment of applicants that ensures that the university has oversight of the whole admissions process. The process should clearly communicate the stages of recruitment document where ownership and responsibility lies for those elements of the process. The processes will include appropriate and robust practices for DBS and Occupational Health checks, admissions appeals, assessment of prior experience, the implementation and monitoring of equality, diversity and inclusion across the application process and for ensuring that information provided to prospective applicants is appropriate to support them to make an informed choice.	Condition not met
2	Standard 1.4 Standard 2.5	The education provider is required to provide evidence that the DBS status of each student currently enrolled on the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship has been verified through an appropriate oversight mechanism.	Condition met
3	Standard 2.1	The education provider will develop, and provide evidence of, a strategy for the provision of skills days that includes an operational plan for their delivery and evaluation.	Condition not met
4	Standard 2.1	The education provider will consider the programme documentation and ensure it aligns to the way in which the course is delivered.	Condition not met

5	Standard 2.6	The education provider is required to develop a process of oversight of practice educator currency, qualifications, and registration.	Condition not met
6	Standard 3.1	The education provider will provide a management and governance strategy, or plan, which sets out clear roles and responsibilities for both individuals and groups for the course	Condition not met
7	Standard 3.2	The education provider is required to provide an updated, explicit plan which includes agreements with placement providers.	Condition not met
8	Standard 3.4 Standard 4.2	The education provider is required to review the opportunities for employer engagement and consider the ways in which this will be formalised. Evidence will be provided which demonstrates how action has been taken.	Condition not met
9	Standard 3.5	The education provider will consider the ways in which effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are planned and recorded and subsequently how actions are completed and tracked.	Condition not met
10	Standard 1.3 Standard 4.2	That the education provider will consider the mechanisms in place to enable the views of employers, practitioners, and people with lived experience to be incorporated into the admissions processes and the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	Condition not met
11	Standard 4.11	The education provider will ensure that any stakeholders taking part in assessment are appropriately trained to ensure consistency, fairness, and parity within the assessment process.	Condition not met
12	Standard 1.4 Standard 5.3	The education provider will develop and submit a process to assess students ongoing suitability in relation to conduct, character and health as detailed within the standard guidance.	Condition not met

Findings

- The conditions review was undertaken as a result of the conditions set during the course approval process as outlined in the original inspection report above. The course provider submitted a conditions mapping document (hereafter referred to as the mapping document) and a selection of documentary evidence. The mapping document

provided narrative on the actions taken in response to the conditions, and cross-referenced the documentary evidence to be considered for each condition.

5. In response to condition 1, recorded against standards 1.1 – 1.6, and standard 2.5, the course provider submitted an admission process map, the covering email for an example employer pack and a link to the social work integrated degree apprenticeship webpage. The webpage detailed that a satisfactory enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) check and occupational health screening were included in the course entry requirements. The university further submitted an email template that demonstrated that potential employer partners wishing to offer an apprenticeship were directed to the university programme webpage to check the entry requirements with a statement that read ‘any applicants who are being recruited to an apprenticeship post must meet the eligibility requirements’.
6. Two additional pieces of web based evidence were unable to be accessed due to restrictions on SharePoint and were subsequently requested from the course provider in an alternative format. Screenshots of the university placement office webpages on DBS and occupational health were provided. The inspectors highlighted that the DBS webpage stated that *‘new starters on the majority of these courses will receive an email asking them to complete the online DBS form’* and that it was not clear if this applied to social work apprentices. The DBS arrangements were a cause for concern at the inspection and the inspection team did not feel that this evidence indicated a robust process for DBS checks had been developed. It was acknowledged that the occupational health webpage detailed the university process to undertake an occupational health check specifically noting a health questionnaire for social work courses. However, it was not clear to inspectors how the process was embedded at course level.
7. Further documentary evidence included the institutional admission policy where the arrangements for admissions appeals, and reasonable adjustments for candidates with disabilities was detailed, the applicant pack which included a cover email, application form and information on funding and the programme specification detailing entry requirements and included reference to the DBS check and occupational health checks. The university further supplied an anonymised applicant initial assessment of a candidates experience against the knowledge, skills and behaviours (KSBs) which was dated 2022. Also provided was an example of the interview assessment centre undertaken at the university however, this document appeared to relate to the BA (Hons) Social Work and not the BA (Hons) Integrated Degree Apprenticeship.
8. Having reviewed the evidence submitted against condition 1 the inspectors reported that, despite the range of materials submitted, they remained unclear how the processes were undertaken, and where responsibility lay. The inspectors noted that during inspection the heard evidence, from a variety of stakeholders, indicated that processes were either misunderstood, or were implemented variably and articulation of

the processes differed from the documentation. The inspectors were not reassured that the evidence submitted sufficiently addressed these concerns, highlighting that some items presented were not relevant to the course being considered for approval. Specifically it was reported that the evidence did not appear to clarify the role of the employer partner within admissions or when, and how, employer partners and the university shared information regarding DBS or health disclosures. The inspectors concluded that this condition was not met.

9. Condition 2, recorded against standards 1.4 and 2.5 was issued immediately by the regulator following the inspection in response to the concern that, the university were unable to confirm the DBS status of the apprentices on the programme. The course team submitted the minutes from accreditation progress meetings dated 27 July 2023 and 01 September 2023 that provided updates on the actions taken in response to the condition and two emails that documented the number of DBS checks and the stage of completeness. The inspection team understood that, at the date of evidence submission, 12 students had completed their DBS checks successfully, and 2 were at the local police force stage. The inspectors reviewed the evidence provided at the point of submission and agreed that immediate action had been taken and that processes were clear for future intakes. The inspection team agreed that the condition was met.
10. However, following the submission of the wider conditions evidence the inspection team noted that the university had not provided any further updates on the 2 DBS checks pending with the local police force, and that the further evidence submitted as Appendix 13.04, *2022-23 Cohort Confirmation of New DBS*, included 15 students, where the previous evidence had reported for 14 students.
11. The course provider submitted four pieces of evidence against Condition 3, recorded against standard 2.1, including module outlines for SOW-4021-Z, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice*, SOW5022-D, *Apprentice Practice Learning 1* and SOW6016-D, *Apprentice Practice Learning 2*. The university also supplied an email sent to students that included a link to an evaluation questionnaire for students to complete. The inspectors reviewed the evidence submitted and reported that 20 skills days were explicitly labelled as such within the *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice* at level 4. The remaining 10 days were not clear to the inspectors. *Practice Learning 1 and 2* each included 5 'recall days' which the mapping document noted had been renamed 'skills days' but this change was not apparent within the evidence submitted.
12. The inspection team acknowledged that the mapping document submitted by the university referred to skills days in the context of interprofessional working days however, no evidence was submitted to support this. Furthermore, the wording within Appendix 14.01, the programme specification (PSD) stated

'in semester 2 apprentices will undertake a practice placement that is assessed at the End of First Placement level of the Professional Capabilities Framework. Of the 30 Mandatory skills days; 5 days will be hosted within the Practice Learning 1 during stage 2'

whereas the module outline for SOW5022-D noted that:

'whilst on placement the apprentice needs to meet both the BASW PCF standards at first placement level, and the Apprenticeship Standards of Knowledge, Skills, and Behaviours. To this end, in addition to the 70-days of placement, apprentices will have 5 recall days at the university where they will be supported through small group discussion workshops to critically reflect on their work-based practice learning and link this to social work theories and research, and to the Apprenticeship Standards (these session form part of the off-the-job learning with the University).'

And the module outline for SOW6016-D noted that:

'whilst on placement the apprentice needs to meet both the BASW PCF standards at final placement level, and the Apprenticeship Standards of Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours. To this end, in addition to the 100-days of placement, apprentices will have 5 recall days at the university where they will be supported through small group discussion workshops to critically reflect on their work-based practice learning and link this to social work theories and research, and to the Apprenticeship Standards (these sessions form part of the off-the-job learning with the University).'

13. The inspectors reported that considerable discussion regarding distinctiveness of skills days within the programme had taken place during the inspection as there had been an apparent error in the counting and mapping of them. The inspectors acknowledged that 20 skills days had now been explicitly addressed. However, the remaining 10 days continued to be unclear as they appeared to be referred to as skills days within one governance document and recall days in another governance document. The mapping document submitted acknowledged the past confusion regarding terminology however, it was noted by the inspection team, that the wording around skills days had not changed in either module outline for SOW5022-D or SOW6016-D from that which was originally submitted prior to the inspection. As a result the inspection team were not reassured that the original reported confusion had been resolved and concluded that the condition was not met.
14. In response to condition 4, recorded against standard 2.1, the course provider submitted the PSD, and the module outlines for SOW-4021-Z, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice*, SOW5022-D, *Apprentice Practice Learning 1* and SOW6016-D, *Apprentice*

Practice Learning 2, noting in the mapping document that these had been aligned to ensure clarity on the 30 skills days. As discrepancies had been identified within this documentation (c.f. para [10-12](#)) the inspection team agreed that this condition was not met.

15. In response to condition 5, recorded against standard 2.6, the course provider submitted 13 pieces of evidence, of which 11 were considered by inspectors to not be relevant to standard 2.6, or the condition under review. The remaining two pieces of evidence were a flow chart demonstrating the process for placement and practice educator identification and allocation, and a list of practice educators which showed the Social Work England registration number and the start and end date of their registration. The inspection team reported that although appendix 20 identified the process for the allocation of practice educators, it did not appear to clearly include distinctive steps for the checking of practice educator currency, qualifications and registration. Appendix 16 reported registration numbers and dates of registration validity, however it was not clear that a routine quality assurance process was in place that identified when this information would be audited. From the mapping document it appeared that the programme leader was responsible for checking the qualifications, currency and registration of the practice educators. However the mapping document stated that 'using the registration number, the Programme Leader will cross-check the currency of qualifications against the Social Work England (SWE) database' which suggested that there was a misunderstanding of the register and the information it held.
16. The inspection team were not reassured that a systematic and robust process was in place to ensure that practice educators were on the register and that they had the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Moreover, the inspectors raised a concern that the university had misunderstood what was required under the standard, the resulting condition and the use of the register. The inspection team concluded that this condition was not met.
17. In response to condition 6, recorded against standard 3.1, the university submitted role descriptors for the programme leader and module leader positions and terms of reference for the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee, the Faculty Accreditations Sub-Committee, the Faculty Management Committee alongside the terms of reference and composition of the university Senate. The course provider further reported within the conditions response mapping document that a deputy programme leader had been appointed in response to the concern that the programme leader may need support as they were new to academia (c.f. para [72](#)).
18. The inspection team considered the evidence provided however felt that the response did not provide a clear governance plan which identified accountability or oversight of quality. Forums for engagements with external stakeholders such as the teaching partnership, employers or people with lived experience was lacking. Furthermore, it

was not clear to inspectors which programme governance activities the deputy programme leader had assumed responsibility for as a job description had not been provided. The inspection team were unclear what progress had been made that would reassure the regulator that the course was supported by a management and governance plan that was effective with clear roles and responsibilities for both individuals and groups. The inspectors concluded that this condition was not met.

19. No evidence was submitted in response to condition 7, recorded against standard 3.2. The inspection team acknowledged that the mapping document cross referenced the evidence submitted for condition 5 as being relevant however, the inspectors were unclear how those 13 appendices addressed the condition. The condition required an explicit plan for placement delivery and appropriate agreements with employers, however, the cross referenced evidence was concerned with practice educator lists and qualifications, the placement process, practice evaluation panel (PEP) and team meeting minutes and terms of reference for university based committees. The inspection team reported that this condition was not met.
20. In response to condition 8, recorded against standards 3.4 and 4.2, the course provider provided some narrative within the mapping document explaining that the programme leader and deputy programme leader were responsible for outreach and engagement to promote the benefits of the apprenticeship scheme. In addition the university submitted 8 pieces of evidence to address the condition, of which 1 was considered not to be relevant to standard 3.4 or 4.2 by the inspection team. The remaining items included terms of reference, a draft agenda, and proposed dates for an employer forum alongside a series of scheduling emails. The email trails provided did not demonstrate that the proposed dates for the employer forum detailed in the mapping document had been finalised with one email evidencing cancellation of the January 2024 date. The inspection team reported that terms of reference and proposed standing items for a forum moving forward demonstrated some intention of engaging with employer partners. However, inspectors did not feel reassured that a robust governance process had been developed to ensure the involvement of employer partners as required by standards 3.1 and 4.2. The inspection team agreed that this condition was not met.
21. The course provider submitted 12 items of evidence in response to condition 9, recorded against standard 3.5. These included:
 - an email regarding a student survey;
 - an infographic entitled '*How it works: Programme Monitoring*' illustrating the university processes for programme monitoring;
 - a screenshot from the university SharePoint of the programme monitoring timeline;

- the university process to make module changes;
- the external examiner report for the apprenticeship dated 27 November 2023;
- the external examiner report for the BA (Hons) Social Work programme dated 13 October 2023;
- the template of tripartite progress review;
- minutes from the student staff liaison committee dated 10 November 2023;
- an employer induction session;
- two examples of minutes from the Practice Evaluation Panel PEP, one dated 13 September 2023 and one dated 11 October 2023;
- minutes from the Social Sciences Advisory Board;

22. The inspectors considered the evidence submitted and reported that they were overall unclear how the evidence addressed the condition. They acknowledged the university processes, however noted that it was not clear how these were embedded into practice on the apprenticeship course. Some governance documentation provided raised further quality assurance concerns as the external examiner for the apprenticeship appeared to report that they did not examine any presentations, that they were provided with no evidence for a module assessed only by a viva voce and that marking systems were not consistently used and learning outcomes were not always referenced in the feedback. The minutes from the staff student liaison committee highlighted that apprenticeship students had raised issues of topic duplication, lack of notification of changes and alleged unprofessional comments from the programme leader. The inspection team acknowledged that challenges can arise as a part of course delivery, however, they were unclear what steps had been taken to address these concerns. The inspection team concluded that this condition was not met.

23. In response to condition 10, recorded against standard 1.3 and 4.2, the course provider submitted evidence that included staff student liaison committee minutes, minutes from the Social Sciences Advisory Board, minutes from the PEP and a series of emails and social media communications between the university and an external provider that produces and sells materials to support people with disabilities to communicate the accessibility they needed. The inspectors considered the evidence and concluded that, whilst the evidence submitted was broad, it was unclear what progress had been made since the inspection as the Social Sciences Advisory Board minutes submitted took place before the inspection and people with lived experience were not represented in the PEP.

24. The inspection team acknowledged that the course provider also submitted the module outline for SOW4021-Z, *Readiness for Direct Social Work Practice (Apprenticeship)* and

noted that the learning, teaching and assessment strategy included the statement that ‘all the sessions are co-delivered by a combination of academic, practitioner / employer and by people who use those services’. The mapping document also noted that the Social Work People’s Forum was working towards merging with the university led people with lived experience group. However, the evidence surrounding this was minimal and it was not clear what steps had been made towards achieving this goal bar an introductory meeting (c.f. para [25](#)). During the inspection it was reported by inspectors that they were unable to assess the level of collaboration undertaken with people with lived experience as the people’s forum was not minuted (c.f. para [94](#)). As minutes, or notes, from the forum were not provided as part of the conditions evidence, they continued to be unable to assess the success of this forum in ensuring that people with lived experience were included in design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.

25. The inspection team further reflected that there had been some activity related to engaging an external provider to deliver sessions on hidden disabilities to students. However, the inspection team reported that the evidence demonstrated only that a meeting had taken place and not that any change had occurred. They also noted that the social media messages provided did not demonstrate a consistent or robust approach to the involvement of people with lived experience within the programme, as it resulted from an opportunity following a staff member purchasing supplies, rather than a considered approach to the development of the curriculum. The inspection team agreed that this condition was not met.

26. In response to condition 11, recorded against standard 4.11, the course provider supplied:

- Minutes from a meeting between an external provider and the university to discuss a collaborative session on hidden disabilities;
- A screenshot of the university requirements for the appointment of external examiners;
- The institutional guide for external examiners;
- Internal email correspondence detailing contact between the university’s lived experience department and the social work team to discuss involvement of people with lived experience in a practice learning module;
- Minutes from a meeting (date unknown) between the university’s lived experience group and the social work team that discussed the university group, and the potential merging of the social work people’s forum into the wider university group;

- Email exchange between a social work lecturer and the Commonwealth Disabled People's Forum discussing the possibility of an additional lecture for students.

27. The inspection team noted that the linked paragraph of the inspection report (c.f. para [110](#)) was explicit that, at inspection, the team were concerned that people with lived experience were involved in assessing the end point assessment (EPA) without any training. The inspection team felt that the evidence submitted did not address that concern and concluded that the condition was not met.

28. A re-enrolment: Yearly Character and Fitness to Practice Declaration map was submitted in response to condition 12, recorded against standards 1.4 and 5.3. The process map demonstrated the university steps taken at re-enrolment which included a student declaration. However, the inspectors reported that the process did not include the employer partner, and did not appear to have any escalation steps where employer partners would be notified of changes by the university and as a result the inspection team could not be assured of effective communication pathways or communications in the event of health and suitability anomalies. The inspection team agreed that this condition was not met.

29. Following consideration of the conditions evidence the inspection team reviewed the process described in our legislation, the Social Work England ([Education and Training Rules 2019](#)), with specific focus on rule 11 (1-4) and rule 13 (1-3) and concluded that the conditions had not been met and that the recommendation of the inspection team is that approval is withdrawn for the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship at the University of Bradford.

Regulator decision

Withdrawal of approval.

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. The inspection team have concluded that 11 of the 12 conditions were not met. Consideration has also been given to the observation submission from the provider by the regulator, however there are a significant number of areas where the inspectors were not satisfied that the provider had demonstrated that it meets the 2021 standards for education and training. The regulator is satisfied that the course does not meet the criteria for approval and that it is appropriate to withdraw approval.