

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of East London

Course approval: Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Step-Up to Social Work)

Inspection dates: 5th- 7th July 2022

Report date:	6 October 2022
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	13 February 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	TO BE ADDED

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
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	6
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	9
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	13
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	17
Standard five: Supporting students	23
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	26
Proposed outcome.....	27
Conditions	27
Recommendations	28
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	30
Regulator decision	36
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	37
Findings	37

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, 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 perception 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 two to three-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. As a result of the COVID 19 pandemic, inspections are currently being carried out via remote virtual arrangements, and typically last three to four days.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, approved without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval. Where the course has been previously approved we may also decide to withdraw 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 regulatory decision about the approval of the course.
13. The final 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. The University of East London's Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Step-Up to Social Work) was inspected as part of the Social Work England reapproval cycle; whereby all course providers with qualifying social work courses will be inspected against the new Education and Training Standards 2021.

16. During the inspection visit a second inspection team inspected the BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work courses, for which there are separate inspection reports compiled based on the findings of that team.

Inspection ID	UCLR2
Course provider	University of East London
Validating body (if different)	N/A
Course inspected	Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Step-Up to Social Work)
Mode of study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	12
Date of inspection	5 th – 7 th July 2022
Inspection team	Naomi Barrett - Education Quality Assurance Officer Dr Sally Gosling - (Lay Inspector) Mary Macdonald - (Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	TO BE ADDED

Language

17. In this document we describe the University of East London as 'the education provider' or 'the university' and we describe the Post Graduate Diploma in Social Work (Step-Up to Social Work) as 'the course'.

Inspection

18. An onsite inspection took place from 5 – 7 July 2022 at the Stratford campus in East London where social work education 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.

19. 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

20. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

21. The inspection team met with four students. Discussions included their experiences of practice placements, teaching and learning, curriculum content and support services available to them.

Meetings with course staff

22. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the teaching team, practice placement delivery, senior management, support services, the specialist library and IT services.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

23. The inspection team met with people with lived experience of social work from the Advisors in Mental Health Services (AIMHS) who have been involved in working with the university to support them in the delivery of the course. Discussions included the types of work they are involved in, the support they receive, how well they feel listened to and the training they are provided with.

Meetings with external stakeholders

24. The inspection team met with representatives from Step-Up partners including Redbridge, Waltham Forest and Newham local authorities as well as practice educators from Tower Hamlets, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham, Waltham Forest and Newham local authorities.

Findings

25. 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

26. Inspectors were provided with a narrative outlining the policies and processes and how they have been designed and followed during the admissions stages. Some documentary evidence was also supplied, such as the UEL Admissions General Regs document and documents relating to the assessment centre programme of events, questions, candidate briefings and scoring sheets. Prior to the pandemic, the assessment day was carried out in person, but the process currently remains online.

27. The inspectors reviewed the evidence and met with university staff involved in the admissions process along with Step-up employer partners and discussed the processes working in practice and who was responsible for what elements of the processes.

28. The inspection team were satisfied that the university was involved in all parts, apart from the initial shortlisting which is undertaken by the Department for Education and Step-up partners.

29. From these discussions and review of evidence, the inspection team was unable to see how the university was adequately able to assure itself that applicants met its requirements in terms of minimum academic entry qualifications (in line with its academic regulations for postgraduate awards) and English language requirements, where appropriate. In addition to this, a theme that will be discussed in more detail further into the report, is that some partners and practice educators reported concerns over students' readiness for the demands of an intense course that combines academic study and learning in practice. This included the level of their academic writing skills not always being where they should be at the point of enrolment. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met.

30. The inspection team is 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 1.2

31. The inspectors were able to review the information provided that outlines how prior relevant experience is assessed. Inspectors were also provided with the questions currently used during the assessment centre stage of the application process. These further illustrated how applicants' past experience is considered. As such, the inspectors were satisfied that the standard was met.

Standard 1.3

32. Inspectors reviewed evidence that illustrated the difficulties experienced by the team during the pandemic in relation to the technological constraints that precluded external stakeholders from being involved in the interview process when this process moved online. During the meeting with people with lived experience of social work, inspectors heard how some members of the group had been involved in interviews. As part of the evidence submission, inspectors were also provided with an invoice from the AIMHS group for work carried out in interviews in 2019. When asked about the training and support offered by the university, the inspection team were told that group members were not provided with any official training and that they had only undertaken unconscious bias training provided by other organisations and not anything provided by the university relating to being part of an interview panel.

33. Whilst the inspection team agreed that this standard was met, they agreed that more could be done to support external stakeholders such as people with lived experience of social work to be involved in the admissions process. It is therefore making a recommendation in relation to 1.3 about the training and support offered. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard 1.4

34. In relation to this standard, the inspectors were provided with the PgDip Course Handbook, SW DBS Checks FAQs documents and other related documents highlighting the process to assess applicants' suitability both by the Department for Education and the university.

35. Students met during the visit confirmed to the inspectors their knowledge and experience both of this process and the ongoing suitability check requirements. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

36. Prior to inspection, the inspection team were provided with evidence including an Equality Diversity and Inclusion policy, EDI Strategy and UEL Admissions General Regs document. When discussing these processes with the university, they were advised that, due to the initial application sift being completed by Department for Education in partnership with Step-up employer partners, the university's policies only really go live once an applicant has been put forward to the assessment day. The university currently has no involvement or influence over the initial sift and therefore has no information relating to those not put forward to the assessment days.

37. The inspection team agreed this standard was met as the university was able to demonstrate that there are policies and processes in place and that their use is monitored.

However, the inspection team are recommending that the university discusses with their partners how they can be more involved in the initial decisions regarding applicants to ensure the university's full involvement and oversight of the admissions processes to its course (and ultimately its academic award), including from an EDI perspective. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard 1.6

38. The inspection team were provided with evidence prior to the inspection, including links to the university webpage, a Step-up Welcome 2021 document, as well as the NEL Bid 2021 document. When reviewing the related documents, there were some discrepancies and gaps in the information presented which the inspection team raised with the course team and on which they sought clarity. The inspection team agreed that this information could also be improved to correct factual mistakes and to be more explicit about the stresses and demands of the course.

39. When speaking with the students, it was clear that they were aware that some elements, such as being allocated a university and information about that university, would not be available until they were already engaged in the application process due to the nature of the Step-up programme, but felt that by the time they took a place on the course they had had all the main information that they needed. Students did, however, state that they would have welcomed more information about the structure of the course, including in terms of the sequencing of assignments and the deadlines for submission, to be able to better plan and manage their workload.

40. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met. However, they are making a recommendation to review the information provided to applicants. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

41. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were able to review documentary evidence submitted which included the PgDip Course Handbook 2022/23, the PgDip Practice Learning Handbook 2022/23 and the PgDip Placement Portfolio Document. These documents outlined how students are provided with at least 200 days' learning in practice settings, completing 70 days of placement in year one and 100 days in their placement in year two.

42. Both placements are held within the local authority that the student is linked to and are arranged and coordinated collaboratively by workforce leads, an employer-based Programme Coordinator and the UEL based Course Leader. All parties are aware of arrangements for individual students and ensure that, whilst students' placements are

undertaken within the same local authority, they must provide them with a contrasting experience.

43. The inspection team were also able to identify where the 30 skills days are used and saw the range of people involved in the delivery of those, including people with lived experience of social work and practice educators. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.2

44. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors were able to review the documentary evidence submitted, which included the PgDip Practice Learning Handbook 2021/22. The documentary evidence reviewed by the inspection team did not adequately demonstrate how the university ensures the quality of placement opportunities or how they are satisfied that students will gain the necessary knowledge and skills.

45. When meeting with the course team, the inspection team were given conflicting information about how and when the university carries out audits of placements and only had brief sight of the audit form. The inspection team were told that there was a reliance on the university's partners letting them know if there were any issues with placements, with the university being able to rely on very good longstanding working relationships with partners for this to be done. The course team also stated that the QAPL was an additional level of placement checking. However, the QAPL is about an individual placement experience, rather than a means to ensure that all opportunities within a placement setting are suitable and are underpinned by the necessary policies and procedures to ensure the safety and support of both students and people who use the services provided in that setting. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this did not satisfy the requirements of the standard.

46. When meeting with Step-up partners, the inspection team discussed quality assurance and were told that it is a standard agenda item for the steering group. However, the group is not a university-owned and -governed group. The partners confirmed that they were not regularly asked to take part in university-led quality assurance mechanisms relating to their placement provision. While initial quality assurance forms were completed and signed off within each local authority, this had happened some time ago. One local authority advised the inspection team that they had recently received an 'inadequate' rating from Ofsted and confirmed that the university had not asked them to undertake any additional quality assurance checks regarding the on-going suitability of the service as a placement site for students.

47. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.2 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 [proposed outcomes](#)

Standard 2.3

48. Inspectors were provided with documentary evidence outlining the processes to be followed to facilitate induction, supervision, support, access to resources and a realistic workload. The PGDip Practice Learning Handbook and the Practice Learning Agreement document these processes and the people involved. However, as with standard 2.2 above, the inspection team were not satisfied that quality assurance processes were either sufficiently regular or robust and therefore could not enable the university to be confident that processes were enacted and that this was checked.

49. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.3 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 2.4

50. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were able to review the documented mechanisms for aligning students' responsibilities with their stage of education and training. These were included in the Practice Learning Handbook and the Practice Learning Agreement. They also understood how Personal and Professional Development Plans are completed by students at three points during the course: to establish readiness for direct practice on placement, at the end of the first placement, and at the end of final placement.

51. The inspection team met with students, Step-up partners and practice educators to discuss how students' responsibilities and workloads are appropriately managed. They were reassured that everyone involved are referring to the correct processes.

52. The students were also able to provide examples of additional adjustments made to support their circumstances. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

53. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard was focussed on university processes, such as the UEL Fitness to Study, UEL Fitness to Practice and Non-academic Misconduct Policy documents. None of the documents submitted for this standard explained how and where the university ensures that students go through assessed preparation for direct practice as part of their studies.

54. The inspection team were able to determine that students' readiness for practice is assessed in the module assessment for The Introduction to Key Skills for Professional Practice module. Readiness for practice is also part of the skills days. However, partner and practice educators in discussions with the inspection team raised concerns about students' readiness for practice. In particular, practice educators referred to gaps in students' knowledge and understanding prior to placement that surprised them and that they had to mitigate, with this impacting on students' ability to engage with placement learning opportunities from the earliest point. This will be picked up again and discussed in standards below.

55. The inspection team agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is 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 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 2.6

56. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors were able to review the Practice Learning Agreement which requires the Social Work England registration number of the practice educator to be recorded. The inspectors requested additional evidence before the inspection to enable them to understand how the provider ensures oversight of the currency of practice educators' registration and their relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience. However, based on the discussions held in the meetings with staff involved in practice learning, the inspectors were unable to be assured that this oversight is being maintained for all practice educators, including those working independently.

57. 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 2.7

58. Prior to the inspection, inspectors were provided with the Practice Learning Handbook. The inspectors reviewed the section within the Handbook on how difficulties in placements are to be managed, the processes for reporting concerns and recommended sources of support. During meetings with students, there was some ambiguity over indications of where to find information on the university's formal whistleblowing procedures. However, all in attendance reported that they were happy that they knew how and where to do this in

relation to their employer partners. Whilst the inspection team agreed that this standard was met, they identified that the university could do more to ensure students know where to find the university policy and related processes. They are therefore making a recommendation here for the course team. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

59. Prior to the inspection, inspectors reviewed documentary evidence including the Strategic Route Map, the Course Handbook, and the terms of reference for the Academic Board and the Curriculum Committee. They were also provided with a detailed narrative which described some of the recent changes to the location of the social work department and the organisational structure. The inspectors were informed that previously social work had stood alone as a department but has now been amalgamated into the School of Education and Communities (EDUCOM). Since September 2021, there has been a new organisational structure for roles and responsibilities, with this intended to align the school more closely with the university's Strategic Vision 2028.

60. The course is now situated in the Social and Community Work cluster, with general oversight provided by the Dean of EDUCOM. What was previously the role of the dedicated Head of Social Work is now divided between the Head of Education and Community Development, the Academic Cluster Lead for Social and Community Work and the Lead Social Worker. The inspectors were informed that while there are advantages to this structure, it is being kept under review because issues such as the mitigation of disruption through staff absences or vacancies have proved challenging to overcome.

61. During the inspection, the inspection team became aware of staff shortages and a high turnover of staff within the course team. The course has only recently appointed a new course lead who is currently on a phased return to work. The inspectors reviewed a range of evidence which illustrated the impact of this, including in areas such as the resourcing, delivery and quality management of the course.

62. The inspection team agreed that this standard was not met and is recommending that a condition is set against 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 3.2

63. For this standard, the inspection team were pointed towards sections of the PGDip Practice Learning Handbook that stipulate the roles and responsibilities of placement providers and the necessary commitment to ensure all students gain placement experiences that provide them with the education and training to meet the professional and education and training standards. The inspectors reviewed this and other documentary evidence which illustrated relationships with a number of local authorities as part of the Step-up partnership.

64. When meeting with both the partners and practice educators, the inspection team were assured that the processes were working in practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

65. Evidence reviewed by inspectors in relation to this standard included the Practice Learning Handbook and PgDip Placement Portfolio Documents 2020/21. During the meetings held with Step-up partners, the inspectors were assured that placement providers have the necessary policies in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk and the support systems in place to fulfil the remit of them. The inspectors agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

66. The inspection team, through the review of evidence alongside meetings held with Step-up partners, were assured of the positive working relationships between the university and partners. Partners are involved in the steering group and curriculum and course committees, as well as input to the university's concerns process. As this is a Step-up course, partners are involved in interviewing applicants. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

67. The inspection team reviewed the documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard and, as part of the inspection, met with partners, people with lived experience of social work and students to discuss their involvement in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement of the course. From these discussions, the inspection team concluded that currently there is a lack of formalised involvement of both people with lived experience and partners. The university recognised this when discussing this standard with the inspection team. The inspection team were told of plans in place for a new committee that would have a broader membership, including partners, student and people with lived experience of social work. Formation of this committee had been delayed and had not yet been set up at the time of the inspection.

68. The inspection team agreed that the standard was not met and 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 3.6

69. As detailed above in standards 3.2 and associated evidence, the university clearly demonstrated how they work with employer partners around placement provision with a defined strategy and agreements in place regarding cohort sizes. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

70. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were provided with evidence illustrating the role and position of the Lead Social Worker for the course. The Course Handbook detailed the named lead and assigned responsibilities. The inspection team were also provided with the relevant CV which outlined the postholder's appropriate qualifications, experience and registration. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

71. During the inspection, the inspection team were informed of challenges the course team have faced and continue to face in relation to adequate staffing resource within the social work team as a whole. Difficulties in securing and maintaining adequate staffing levels have been experienced for several months and the inspection team heard how staff had left due to a range of issues and in relatively quick succession, while the current course lead is newly appointed and on a phased return to work. The inspection team were informed that recruitment of 3 new full-time members of staff to the social work team was underway, and it was hoped that new staff would provide sufficient, timely capacity to support the development and delivery of the Step-up course in the new academic year. However, if it was not possible to recruit these new staff members or they were unable to take up the posts until after the start of the academic year, the proposed contingency plan would rely on carrying on managing with the existing staff numbers which does not provide sufficient capacity to appropriately deliver the programme.

72. During the inspection and various meetings held, the inspectors heard how the reduced staffing levels had impacted various aspects of the course. Students reported delays to receiving communications and timely assessment feedback from tutors and how gaps between staff being recruited to posts had meant that their requests for clarity or support had not been provided. Students were also unclear on who and where to go to find information about university policies and processes should they need to raise an issue or

find out information. They were much more confident about how to raise issues or obtain information through placement methods and processes.

73. The inspection team agreed that the course team were unable to adequately demonstrate that they currently have sufficient staff capacity to sustain the course's effective delivery and ensure the appropriate input of specialist subject knowledge to students' learning and teaching, with the projected completion of the current round of recruitment being uncertain at the time of the visit. Therefore, they agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team are recommending that a condition is set against 3.8 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 3.9

74. Ahead of the inspection, the inspectors were provided with the Programme Analytics from the Social Work Academic Review 2021/2022 data sets. The inspection team could see that student performance, progression and outcomes are monitored by the use of the Power Bi application which also correlates data on equality and diversity amongst the student body. The inspection team heard how evaluation of this data impacts future targeting for admissions and the quality of academic support services. The data is also used to monitor disparities in attainment between groups with different protected characteristics. The inspectors were informed of the commitment and work underway by the course team to decolonise pedagogy, curriculum and assessment, the critical awareness they show when teaching and marking students' work and how they strive for academic rigour, fairness and consistency. The course team also analyse and critically address attainment gaps and apply consistent scrutiny and awareness to student assessments. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

75. Prior to the inspection, documentary evidence for this standard was reviewed by the inspection team. The evidence included examples of a range of activities that support educators to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice. Examples included staff involvement in running an event hosted by the North-East London Social Work Teaching Partnership on mental health. Staff are offered a yearly professional development review and encouraged to consider their own personal development, with several staff completing PhDs and undertaking research in practice settings, as well as providing internal training. Members of the course team are also able to teach in practice settings within the teaching partnership. Practice educators are offered refresher sessions at the university, although there was limited data on how well this is

attended. The inspection team heard that partner employers who employ practice educators directly state that they offer regular internal training and keep records of registration and regularity of taking students. The inspectors agreed this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

76. The Course Handbook was the only piece of documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard by the course team. The inspection reviewed this and concluded that modules are mapped to the Professional Standards. However, when looking at the module descriptors, there were inconsistencies in demonstrating how and where the relevant frameworks would be met.

77. Some of the modules, but not all, also mapped to the PCF and some still included terminology relating to the previous regulator (the HCPC) and its standards of proficiency. The inspection team also noted that some inconsistency in the number of learning outcomes for different modules, with some having more than others, without a clear indication of why this was or its implications for the relative learning demands of different modules. Discussions were also held about whether the learning outcomes, as they currently stand, fully reflect the demands of academic level 7 learning. This includes in terms of their focus on critical thinking, reflection, and engagement with the evidence base. Some of the learning outcomes therefore did not seem to reflect the level of the academic award.

78. When discussing these issues with the university, there was recognition that some work was needed to ensure consistency and that they had already identified the learning outcomes as an area requiring review. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that the university had not been able to adequately demonstrate how they meet this standard and therefore the standard was not met.

79. The inspection team are recommending that a condition is set against 4.1 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.2

80. As touched upon under the standard 3.5 above and the subsequent condition against that standard, there is currently a lack of formalised involvement of both people with lived experience, employers and practitioners in the design, ongoing development and review of the course curriculum. The university recognised this as an area that needs to be addressed.

81. The inspection team were informed of the plans to create a Curriculum Committee, enabling collaborative work between the team and external stakeholders to take place, including employer partners and people with lived experience of social work.

82. The inspection team agreed that as with standard 3.5, the university were not able to demonstrate how they meet this standard and agreed therefore that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 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 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.3

83. Ahead of the inspection, the inspection team reviewed evidence which illustrated how the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles. Inspectors reviewed the Equality and Diversity Policy and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy. The inspection team also heard how the course team maintain a critical awareness of unconscious bias and apply this to their teaching and marking, while they also design modules and assessments to be inclusive. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

84. Evidence submitted in support of this standard spoke of the mechanisms that the university are required to go through when reviewing their provision, such as the Periodic Academic Review, along with the processes to make changes such as the Module and Courses Modifications. This information is contained within the Quality Manual. What the inspection team were unable to see prior to the inspection was where there had been any changes in the curriculum as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice.

85. As discussed in standard 4.1 above, the university has identified some areas for review relating to the course content and module learning outcomes and the inspection team discussed some of these plans with the course team in various meetings and potential timescales for these to be progressed. There is also currently a gap in the formalised mechanisms for students, partners and people with lived experience to be involved in the ongoing review of the provision identified in relation to standards 3.5 and 4.2 above. This needs to be addressed to ensure that the provision is as current as it can be and remains responsive to developments and changing needs. The inspection team agreed that at the time of the inspection the university was unable to demonstrate that they meet this

standard as the planned activity around this has not yet been completed and therefore agreed the standard was not met.

86. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.4 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.5

87. During the meeting held with students, the inspection team heard examples of how they apply theory to practice and move their learning from university into their placements. Inspectors reviewed evidence that illustrated how academic staff support practitioners with their own teaching and learning skills to aid the integration of theory and practice. During meetings with the course team, the inspectors heard examples of the proximity of the realities of practice with the teaching at university, with contributions from staff who have specialist experience and a research focus on mental health, for example. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

88. Ahead of the inspection inspectors were informed of the course team's plans to develop shared learning forums with colleagues in EDUCOM within youth and community studies, law, early childhood studies and teaching education. This was highlighted as one of the university's strategic priorities and was being addressed as part of their portfolio review that is underway.

89. Previous professional guest lectures from other disciplines supported learning and included, as examples, input from specialist substance misuse workers and domestic abuse advocates. Operating effectively in multi-agency and interprofessional settings is addressed within the learning outcomes for practice placements. However, placements are currently the main opportunity for students to work with and learn from other professions. Whilst the team plans to work with other disciplines within their school, these are not yet implemented. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not currently met.

90. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.6 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.7

91. Evidence submitted to show the sufficiency of the number of hours students spend in academic learning included the Course Handbook, the academic calendar and module specifications. These were reviewed by the inspection team prior to the inspection.

92. During conversations with partners and practice educators, concerns were raised about students' readiness for learning in practice, already covered under standard 2.5 and the condition being recommended above. This, coupled with issues raised about staffing resources under standard 3.8 and the condition recommended for that standard, led to the inspection team to agree that this standard was not currently met.

93. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.7 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.8

94. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were made aware that the university's Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CELT) was in the process of approving a university-wide Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Strategy and Strategic Action Plan (2022-2025). This would include key performance indicators up to July 2023, with success measures defined for up to 2025. It had been scheduled to be reviewed and approved by the Academic Board on the 4th May 2022, which was after the evidence submission date to Social Work England had passed. Approval of the action plan would enable the course team to have the necessary key performance indicators and best practice guidelines in place to fully articulate the course's assessment strategy, in line with the relevant guidance on 'Producing Your Assessment Strategy'.

95. It was not clarified within the inspection itself that the action had been approved, and the plan was not provided as an additional piece of evidence during the visit. When discussing the strategy and assessments with the course team and picking up on conversations detailed under standard 4.1 and its subsequent condition, the inspection team remained unclear about how the assessments adequately demonstrate how and where the relevant frameworks would be met. Given the inspection team were also advised that the learning outcomes are due to be reviewed, it is not clear that the assessment

methods and new learning outcomes will correlate and ensure the coherence of the curriculum design.

96. The inspection team agreed that this standard was not met, with its reflecting an area currently under review by the university and the team not currently able to demonstrate how they meet this standard. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.8 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.9

97. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were able to review the module specification documents for the entire course. This illustrated how students are assessed at different points throughout the course. Assessments include a range of formative and summative assessments such as essays, reflective journals and case studies.

98. Feedback from practice educators suggested that there are some pinch points in the assessment schedule, such as students starting their first placement when they also have quite a bit of ongoing academic work to complete. Students spoke of this being challenging, but they did not raise any concerns about workload issues. The inspection team were assured that module leaders collaborate to ensure assessments do not occur at the same time, so that the burden of assessment deadlines is spread more evenly throughout the timetable where possible.

99. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met but would suggest that the course team liaise with practice educators to review the pinch points highlighted by them and ensure that these are addressed appropriately. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.10

100. During the review of documentary evidence and through meetings held with staff responsible for delivering academic support services, the inspection team were able to gain insight into how students should be provided with feedback to support their ongoing development. The university provides a programme of academic writing support which students can access online or in person through the MyFeedback platform. This enables them to gain feedback on their academic writing skills, including grammar and referencing. Students can also access drop-in sessions with an academic tutor and gain support with skills such as reading strategies and criticality, as well as access a wide range of support for

study skills online. Students receive feedback through formative, summative and placement assessment activities, including marking for development.

101. However, during the meeting with students, the inspection team heard a range of examples of concerns about the feedback that individual students had received. Some of the issues described included students receiving delayed feedback, preventing them from using it to inform their next piece of work before submission and not finding the feedback useful in supporting their ongoing development.

102. On reviewing the external examiner reports, the inspection team noted that inconsistencies in marking and feedback had also been raised, suggesting that more needs to be done to ensure standardisation in the assessment process and support to students for their ongoing development. These points, along with concerns picked up under standard 3.8 regarding adequate staff resourcing, led the inspection team to agree that this standard was not met.

103. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.10 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 4.11

104. The inspection team were provided with evidence including the terms of reference for the Academic Board, Academic Regulations and CVs for members of the course team and external examiners. The latter illustrated that individuals held appropriate expertise. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

105. The inspection team reviewed evidence which indicated the range of different people involved with input to and oversight of students' progression through the course. These included people with lived experience of social work from the AIMHS group, practice educators, external examiners and the Academic Board. The Practice Learning Handbook and the Placement Portfolio documents illustrate how the different assessments by a range of people contribute to students' understanding of their own progression and expectations in relation to the direct observation of practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

106. The inspection team were directed to the Course Handbook and the learning outcomes contained within to support this standard. As detailed in standards above but particularly in standard 2.5 and 4.1, the inspection team have set conditions pertaining to the learning outcomes and assessments. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that the university is not adequately able to demonstrate they currently meet this standard.

107. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.13 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

108. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence prior to the inspection and met with staff responsible for the development and delivery of support services for students as part of the inspection. At the point of enrolment, students have access to Track My Future, an online platform that provides access to a range of services, including those provided by the university Student Support and Wellbeing team. This team offers a range of support services, including counselling and financial advice. The main website provides information and access to a variety of services, including occupational health, while the Course Handbook outlines all support services available to students.

109. When meeting with the students, they confirmed that they were aware of support services even if they had not yet had cause to use them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

110. Ahead of the inspection, the inspection team were able to review information about the range of academic support services available to students and during the inspection held a meeting with staff involved in the delivery of these services. Inspectors gained insight into the types of assistance students can access for their academic work, which cover maths, statistics and writing skills. A specialist social work academic tutor devises bespoke support for students, informed by information on the core modules that students are studying. Inspectors were able to view the range of study skills offered through the virtual learning environment, Moodle, and agreed that the offer was comprehensive and detailed.

111. During the meeting held with practice educators, it was noted that communication with tutors is sometimes delayed, with this relating to the difficulties being faced by the team that are attributable to staff shortages. During the meeting held with students,

inspectors heard a range of examples of student concerns about personal tutors' availability and timely communication and response to queries. This impacted on students' ability to access support when they required it, including to address concerns about their placement. This again links to issues raised under standard 3.8 and adequate resourcing.

112. The inspection team agreed that the central support services offered are of a good quality, but that the standard cannot be wholly met due to the personal tutor concerns. Therefore, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 5.2 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 5.3

113. The inspection team were able to gain insight into the processes followed by the university to ensure the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health. The Course Handbook outlines the suitability concerns process and the Practice Learning Handbook details the university's suitability procedures. The Placement Portfolio Documents require the verification of students' status before each placement and this is covered in both the Practice Learning Agreement meeting and the Midway Review.

114. When meeting with the students, the inspection team raised students' understanding of the ongoing suitability checks. They confirmed that they knew and understood of the requirements and associated processes. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

115. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence ahead of the inspection describing the processes in place to support students who need reasonable adjustments. The Disability and Dyslexia teamwork with students to develop a Teaching and Learning Support Record which enables their support to be coordinated. During meetings with staff involved in the support services, the inspection team heard examples of appropriate funding and resourcing to meet students' individual needs and were satisfied that the university demonstrated sufficient capacity to make adjustments where needed. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

116. The inspection team were able to find a wide range of key information provided to students about their course within the Course and Practice Learning Handbooks and the Placement Portfolio Documents. Inspectors were able to view the Moodle pages that

included a range of information for students such as module outlines, assessment methods and reading lists.

117. However, the Course Specification available for students on the website is not the current version and does not reflect the updated details about the course and the regulatory environment. The version provided as evidence as part of the documentary evidence requires some modification to reflect the change in regulator and other concerns detailed under standard 4.1 and the subsequent condition.

118. The inspection team agreed that this standard was not met and is recommending that a condition is set against 5.5 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 5.6

119. The Course Handbook specifies the parts of the course for which attendance is mandatory. During the meeting with students their understanding of this requirement was clear and evident. My Engagement Dashboard is an online tool which monitors students' attendance and engagement in university taught sessions. The Practice Learning Handbook outlines the requirement for students to maintain their attendance record using their placement calendar in their portfolio, which practice educators are required to verify and sign. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

120. As detailed under standards 3.8, 4.10 and 5.2 above, the inspection team have set conditions relating to adequate resourcing of the course and feedback issues raised by students and external examiners. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met as it directly relates to the other standards identified here as not met.

121. The inspection team agreed that this standard was not met and is recommending that a condition is set against 5.7 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that 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 [proposed outcomes](#).

Standard 5.8

122. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence which outlined how students can make an academic appeal, with this clearly referenced in the Course Handbook and

accessible on-line. The Students Union offers support for students using this process. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

123. As the qualifying course is a PgDip Step-Up Social Work course, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Proposed outcome

124. The inspection team recommend that the course be approved with conditions. These will be monitored for completion and an additional inspection visit will be arranged as part of this process.

Conditions

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

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	1.1	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates how and where they gain assurance that applicants meet its minimum qualifications and English language requirements in line with its admissions regulations.	Six months	Paragraph 30
2	2.2, 2.3, 2.6	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates its robust quality assurance processes and the enactment of these in relation to practice placement suitability and its ongoing monitoring of individual placement suitability.	Six months	Paragraph 47, 49 and 57
3	2.5, 3.1, 3.8, 4.1, 4.7, 4.10, 4.13, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that it has sufficient staff resource within its social work team to deliver the course (alongside its other social work education provision), support students to engage with all	Six months	Paragraph 55, 62, 73, 93, 103, 107, 112, 118 and 121

		demands of the level 7 course, prepare students for practice and provide students with both up to-date, accurate documentation and accessible, timely support for their learning in all environments.		
4	3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.8	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates its formalised processes and opportunities for partners, people with lived experience of social work and students to be involved in providing feedback on the course, including supportive induction and training; its arrangements for the ongoing review and updating of the curriculum; and its learning, teaching and assessment strategy.	Six months	Paragraph 68, 79, 82, 86, 96
5	4.6	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates where students will be given the opportunity to work with and learn from other professions outside of a reliance on placement activity to ensure a consistent approach and student experience.	Six months	Paragraph 90

Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	1.3, 1.5	The inspection team is recommending that the university consider ways to be involved from the initial applicant sift to ensure greater involvement in the decision- making process and to ensure that	Paragraph 33 and paragraph 37

		people with lived experience are appropriately supported in their involvement in the admissions process.	
2	1.6	The inspection team is recommending that the university considers ensuring promotional/introductory material on the programme is accurate, consistent and reflects Social Work England standards and eligibility for Social Work England registration on successful completion of the programme (as well as Social Work England registration being a requirement of employment as a social worker). The university might also want to consider providing information around assignment deadlines to allow students to make preparations for the year ahead.	Paragraph 40
3	2.7	The inspection team is recommending that the university considers highlighting how and where to find the whistleblowing policy as currently not all students are aware.	Paragraph 58
4	4.9	The inspection team is recommending that the university considers work with practice educators to review the timetable and workloads to review the pinch points identified to ensure best possible timetables for students' workload.	Paragraph 99

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Table breakdown of standards met during preapproval and inspection.

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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.	☐	☒	☐
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to	☒	☐	☒

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	☐	☒	☐
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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.	☒	☐	☒
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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Met with conditions	Recommendations
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

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](#).

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1			
2			
3			

Findings