

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Hull

Course approval: MA Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Exit Route)

Inspection dates: 09 May – 12 May 2023

Report date:	6 July 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	13 December 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	7 May 2024

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	10
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	15
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	20
Standard five: Supporting students	27
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	32
Proposed outcome.....	33
Conditions	33
Recommendations	33
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	34
Regulator decision	41
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	42
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, 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 three-to-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, 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 Hull's MA Social Work course and Post Graduate Diploma (PG Dip) Social Work (Exit Route) course 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. During the same week the BA (Hons) Social Work and BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship courses were also inspected by a separate inspection team. Some online meetings across the week were held jointly. Details of this inspection are covered in a separate report.

Inspection ID	UHULR2
Course provider	University of Hull
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	MA Social Work course and PG Dip Social Work (Exit Route) course
Mode of study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	50
Date of inspection	09 May – 12 May 2023
Inspection team	Sam Jameson Education Quality Assurance Officer Sarah McAnulty (Lay Inspector) Aidan Phillips (Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	Approved with conditions

Language

16. In this document we describe the University of Hull as 'the education provider' or 'the university' and we describe MA Social Work and PG Dip Social Work (Exit Route) as 'the course'.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 9 May – 12 May 2023. As part of this process the inspection team met with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers, and people with lived experience of social work. An onsite inspection was planned but due to travel constraints around a bank holiday this was not possible.

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 four students, one from year two and the others in year one of the course. Discussions included their experiences of the admissions process, placements and support during these, support services available to them, the teaching and learning on the course and the curriculum content.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course teaching team, the senior leadership team, staff involved with admissions and selection, staff involved in practice-based learning and placement, student support services, specialist library and IT services, with demonstrations of the university Virtual Learning Environment (VLE).

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 development of the course, referred to as 'Lived Experience Group' (LEG) in the documentary evidence submitted by the university. Discussions included what area(s) of the course they were involved with, how much input and feedback they had, and were able to provide to the university, the course and what training they received in this role.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including members of the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership (HSWTP), Vulcan, Northeast Lincolnshire, Focus, North Lincolnshire, Hull City Council, East Riding Council, Humber

Teaching NHS Foundation Trust, North Yorkshire, and MIND. This included two Principal Social Workers from both adults and children, young people, and families' teams. The inspection team also met with eleven Practice Educators (PE) during the inspection.

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 prior to the inspection included the university Admissions Pack 2023 and Admissions Review 2022 Summary and Action Points. The inspectors noted that the admissions process was holistic and multi-dimensional, with activities including a case study, group exercise, exam paper and interview questions from a panel, made up of an academic, practitioners and LEG member, on the timetable for selection day. The inspectors were able to review examples of what was given within the Admissions Pack 2023 to students, as well as the ICT self-declaration form that applicants must complete and check the Academic Entry Criteria on the university website. This information is also available within the Admissions Pack 2023.

26. During the meeting with staff involved in admissions and selection the inspectors were able to triangulate this information. The inspectors were able to identify that the admissions process in place supports the university's ability to test an applicant's command of English, that ICT skills are evidenced throughout their application and the applicant has demonstrated that they have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards and course academic requirements. During the inspection the inspectors learnt that the admissions process had been changed following feedback from a member of the LEG, that was provided within the courses annual review process regarding the focus of the case study in this process. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

27. As identified in Standard 1.1 the Admissions Pack 2023 provided documentary evidence regarding how applicants have opportunities to highlight their prior relevant experience, and how this is considered as part of the university admissions process. The inspectors were able to triangulate this when meeting with staff involved in admissions and selection, receiving narrative evidence that demonstrated that applicants are invited to comment on

their prior experience in a personal statement and there is an exam question and a value-based panel interview that all encourage and draw out an applicant's life experiences, knowledge and skills. This feeds into the course Interview Marking Sheet, that inspectors were able to review prior to the inspection, that clearly evidences the members of the interview panels recording and comments regarding how the applicants relevant prior experience has been considered during their decision making within the admission process. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

28. The inspection team were satisfied with the documentary evidence provided, this included the Admissions Pack 2023, LEG Meeting Minutes Nov 2022, Annual Review of Admissions 2021 and Admissions Review 2022 Summary and Action Points for the course. Within this the inspection team were able to learn that the interview panel will consist of an academic, practitioner, and person with lived experience of social work. The inspectors were able to triangulate this when meeting with the LEG members and social work practitioners within the employer partners and placement providers. Both of which confirmed their attendance in the admissions process and days, highlighting examples of their co-production in reviewing and developing the interview questions and exam focus through the courses formal admissions review and attending as members of the interview panel and group discussions.

29. Members of the LEG told the inspectors that they felt they had equity regarding their involvement and any feedback they gave throughout the review and admissions processes. A social work practitioner in the employer partners and placement providers meeting spoke of their active role in the interview questions, which they supported to develop with the course team to ensure the questions were relevant and current to social work best practice and reflect contemporary workforce themes. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.4

30. The inspection team were able to confirm that there is a clear process in place for ensuring the suitability of applicants. This was achieved through the submission of documentary evidence which included an Anonymised Suitability for Social Work Self-Declaration Form that applicants must complete, alongside evidence of the university Support and Suitability Panel (SSP) in Social Work that considers an applicant's declaration or a matter arising from their enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. The inspectors were told of the SSP role regarding the Student Welfare Team involvement in the panel who can offer appropriate support and guidance to applicants, including those with lived experience of social work and who may require additional support.

31. The inspection team learnt from documentary, narrative evidence and discussions with the course team and admissions staff that as part of the admissions process, applicants complete an Occupational Health (OH) Screening Questionnaire that is shared with the university OH Team. The inspectors were able to review the university website that clearly sets out the MA course entry requirements and the checks identified above. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

32. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university Diversity and Inclusion Policy (which the inspection team were informed is under review), Inclusive Education Framework, and the Equal Opportunities Code for Student Admissions, that highlighted to the inspection team the admissions procedure regarding applications declaring a disability and their support needs. The inspection team were satisfied that within these documents, and other documentary evidence submitted and already referenced in this report, it was clear to applicants that any declaration made regarding a disability or their health in the admissions process would not impact on decisions taken about whether they are offered a place on the course.

33. The inspection team learnt during the inspection from their discussions with staff involved in the admissions process that applicants are provided with a link to the MA Social Work Interview Guide, which offers support within the admissions process and how to request any reasonable adjustments. The admissions lead during the inspection, and documentary evidence submitted prior to the inspection, provided examples of some of the support and adjustments the university has provided to applicants. This includes, but is not limited to sign language interpreters, transcript of the video used in group discussion and assessment material in different formats including on coloured paper.

34. The inspectors were provided with information within the university mapping document that outlined the relevant training that those members involved in the admissions process receive. During the inspection the inspectors were able to confirm this and were told by the admissions staff, employer partners, course team and LEG members that they must complete key mandatory training, which included Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI), to complete the module in one of three ways, face to face, online or on paper. There are systems in place for checking this has been completed through the Faculty Lead for Service Users and Carers members and university Human Resources for their staff, including Student Consumer Rights mandatory training. The inspection team were informed by the university Student Support Service, that one of its functions is that it can be used as an advice service for the admissions process. If an issue arises and reasonable adjustments are required, then they can liaise with the applicant and staff involved in admissions regarding these support needs. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 1.6

35. The inspectors were able to review documentary evidence prior to inspection. This included the MA Selection Day Presentation that applicants are shown on a selection day that links to the university and the course website and page. The inspectors confirmed that all appropriate and relevant information required for applicants was apparent in both sources of evidence and in relation to meeting this standard, for example the role and responsibilities of a social worker, costs associated with the course, course structure and content, the role of Social Work England, professional regulation, registration, and fee. The inspectors heard from the course team of the pre-induction day planned for this year, demonstrating a lot of front-loaded information available for potential applicants to help them make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the course.

36. The inspection spoke to some of the courses' students during the inspection who all confirmed that they felt able to make an informed decision during their admissions process. One student spoke of their experience of applying late in the process but due to the clear and supportive information they were provided, they were able to complete it in a timely manner and were successful in gaining a place on the course. The inspectors were provided with a demonstration of PebblePad during the inspection. They learnt when an applicant has been shortlisted for a selection day, they receive a link to this e-learning platform from university Central Admissions that provides the applicant with details and means of access of all the above support mechanisms and information for their admissions process. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

37. Prior to the inspection the inspectors were able to review documentary evidence submitted which outlined how students are provided with at least 200 days learning in practice settings. This included the MA Placement Handbook which outlines that students have 30 skills days in total, that are all mandatory (with a clear framework if any days are missed) and monitored for attendance as part of Readiness for Practice assessment. There are 4 skills days attached to the first and last placement to support students in progression from these, covering key themes such as evidencing professional capability, with 14 skills days in the readiness for practice module. These are all mapped to Social Work England standards and Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) for Social Work in England British Association of Social Workers (BASW, 2018), including practice simulation to connect modules to direct practice. Another 12 skills days are embedded in modules, with practitioners involved in delivering sessions. An example given during discussions with the course team included a local domestic abuse support service who co-teach on the module. The inspectors learnt from the handbook, and discussions with course team, that the first placement students complete is 70 days and last placement is 100 days.

38. The inspection team were able to learn of the key role that the Link Lecturer plays within the course, supporting to ensure that students have contrasting placements. An example of this was given by a second-year student that the inspection spoke to, who identified that they worked with their Link Lecturer to ensure that they had contrasting placements to support their learning and development. The inspectors had the opportunity to speak to two Link Lecturers during the inspection. They established that they work collaboratively with students, identifying their previous experience, placement needs, learning and development requirements and what their career progression may wish to focus on. Within the meeting with employer partners and placement providers it was apparent that the university has links to a wide range of statutory, private, voluntary, and independent (PVI) sector placement settings.

39. The university works as part of the HSWTP. The inspectors were provided with documentary evidence of Placement Application Form which was developed with the partnership and quality assured in this collaborative working space. The inspectors learnt that this form and placement application briefing that the university carry out feed into the mechanism and partnership working with HSWTP to ensure that students have access to contrasting placement experiences, learning and development. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.2

40. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included Statutory Placement Audit Form, Learning Agreement, Interim Review and Role Descriptor Link Lecturer (all redacted or anonymised where appropriate). From reviewing these and the university mapping document, the inspectors were able to learn of the university Placement Team, who together with the Link Lecturers to quality assure, audit, and monitor all practice placements. Their role includes checking placement capacity to ensure that students have appropriate learning and development opportunities for the level of the course the student is currently in and confirming the placement can provide learning in line with the requirements of the Professional Standards and PCF (BASW, 2018). The inspectors were able to review the Confirmation of Placement Form (which outlines the organisations details for the student) and the Learning Agreements. This is used for the student, PE, and Supervisor to outline placement expectations, health and safety, placement dates, and learning and working opportunities with other professionals, including practical experiences to apply theoretical knowledge and supervision arrangements.

41. During the inspection the inspection team was able to meet with the course team who gave a demonstration of PebblePad which highlighted the interim review document with the PE aspect of this. The employer partners and placement providers gave narrative evidence of mapping their workforce, looking forward regarding how many PEs were available and where gaps are for placements and students, then working with wider HSWTP to fill these and ensure standards of practice learning opportunities are upheld.

42. The inspection team learnt that the role of the Link Lecturer is key to supporting this standard. They are involved in the allocation of contrasting placements, learning about a student's individual learning and development needs, being part of and then checking the Learning Agreement and addressing any learning needs, as well sitting on the HSWTP Quality Assurance Panel. Students told the inspection team of the drop-in sessions that the Link Lecturers run on recall days to discuss and support with complexity of cases and workload whilst on placement. The inspection team was assured that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

43. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided prior to inspection, which included the Placement Handbook that clearly sets out the requirements for placement inductions. The placement induction slide pack that the inspectors reviewed was thorough and covers the use of the Learning Agreement, how practice is assessed and the role of the Link Lecturer who has a clearly defined role for students and in the Quality Assurance Process. As a result of reviewing the documentary evidence and discussions held within the inspection the inspectors were reassured that the student is supported by their Link Lecturer, PE and personal supervisor, and that placements are monitored, and quality assured via the Placement Audit Form. There are clear arrangements for student support during induction, supervision arrangements and support, with access to resources and a realistic and manageable workload, which students have covered in the Readiness for Practice Module.

44. Expectations and provisions are outlined in the MA Student Placement Induction Briefing and clear in the Placement Handbook, then reinforced and monitored via the Learning Agreement, including at the interim and end reviews whilst the student is on placement. During the inspection the inspectors were informed by Student Support services that all students in placement can still access all usual support services that are available to university students. One student spoke of their experience of this and the strong support they received from their Personal Supervisor, when they were experiencing a higher level of anxiety, and an agreement was made for some home working to be put in place so that their caring responsibilities were supported whilst on placement. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

45. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included MA Professional Requirements Talk, MA SW Overview Mandatory Skills Day and anonymised Interim Review and Placement Handbook. Following the review of this information the inspectors identified that progression points for students are clear for passing the placements and course. They were reassured from speaking to PE and course team that there is an alignment to the Professional Standards and PCFs (BASW, 2018), the Learning Agreement and use of joint supervision, PE observations, Interim Review at mid-point of placements, and the PCF

threshold statements used by the PE. This all enables the PE to evaluate and ensure that the students' responsibilities are appropriate for their stage of education and training.

46. One student gave the example to the inspection team that they felt they could take on more responsibility and workload during one of their placements. They then spoke to their PE and were supported by the Link Lecturer to do this, identifying that they felt supported throughout this process and ultimately ensure the placement was providing appropriate learning and development to their level of education and training. Inspectors noted that there is evidence of what is done to support those students who are facing difficulties and there is a clear framework in the Placement Handbook on what is done for those students in this situation. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

47. The inspection team reviewed the Readiness for Practice Module Handbook and Interview Documentation prior to the inspection, identifying that there is clear evidence of assessed preparation for placement practice. There is alignment of the learning outcomes with the Professional Standards and PCFs (BASW, 2018) and this ensures that students passing this module are assessed as ready for practice, with a robust panel process and skills days that are co-delivered by academics, LEG members and practitioners. The inspectors heard from the course team that in a student's first year the Readiness for Practice module focuses on dedicated time and learning to ensure students are fully aware of the expectations of them within an employment and service delivery setting.

48. The inspectors had the opportunity to hear from LEG members, practitioners, and employers, who co-delivered the Readiness for Practice module to ensure that students are ready and safe for practice because of this learning and development, with clear check points throughout the course. The inspection team learnt from members of the LEG group of a simulation exercise that was established from LEG group feedback, that only having questions did not go far enough to assess and test a student's readiness for practice in that module. The members of the LEG group explained to the inspectors that they use their own life experiences of social work to create a real life and emotive experience to help support and ensure that the students are ready to progress into practice in a service delivery setting.

49. The student group that the inspection team met with spoke about their learning experience of this being positive, helping to link theory to a practice situation. The inspection team were reassured from documentary evidence that any information and additional requirements identified within the DBS and OH Questionnaire, mentioned in Standard 1.4, are appropriately shared with placements so that students can safely undertake placement learning. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

50. The university was able to demonstrate that it clearly sets out the roles and responsibilities of the PE in the MA Placement Handbook and PE Handbook, evidencing quality assurance process for the checking of registration, training, and monitoring of Practice Educator Professional Standards for Social Work (PEPS 1 and 2). During discussion with PE the inspectors learnt of the role of HSWTP which has allocated funding provided for PE training, new PE have an assigned mentor and can be a Link Lecturer in some instances and sit on the relevant subgroup of HSWTP.

51. The inspection team were provided with narrative evidence from employer partners and placement providers that annual appraisals and data feed into HSWTP to identify learning needs and actions across the region, for regional forums and forecasting for the future, with a planned PE conference in 2023. The group spoke of PE opportunities being the same for PVI and smaller organizations, equity in training, value in their feedback and working with the university, linking in with the university Practice Education Training Team that delivers certified training programmes and PE refresher training opportunities. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 2.7

52. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included MA Placement Handbook, university Whistleblowing Procedures and PE Session 1 Introduction Session, which outlined to the inspection team the support mechanism for students on placement to raise any concerns with their PE, Link Lecturer, or academic Personal Supervisor.

53. The inspectors confirmed that evidence reviewed in the Placement Handbook sets out the whistle blowing process. This was able to be triangulated with discussions with the student group, who stated they had been asked to confirm they had read and understood this process and its meaning for them. The inspection team were able to check the information and further availability of this framework from the demonstration they received of PebblePad from the course team.

54. The inspection team were reassured that the Readiness for Practice model also focuses on this process and covered in a student's placement induction. The inspection team were provided with a narrative example within its meeting with the students, one who gave their experience of a placement provider which declined to support them with their caring responsibilities. The student raised this with the university course team, who supported them in this and advocated on the student's behalf and enabled change to another placement. This concern being raised also resulted in a change in the organisation's stance for future placements, the student spoke of being clear of how to raise their concerns and how well supported they had been throughout the process. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management, and quality

Standard 3.1

55. The inspectors were able to review documentary evidence submitted prior to the inspection which highlighted how the university faculty and wider level governance is set. At a university level, the inspectors were shown the Committee Structure 2022/2023- Senate which shows how all the committees feed into the university senate. At faculty level, the inspectors were able to review the Faculty Governance Chart and Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee which sets out the remit and reporting lines clearly. The inspectors identified that from review of the Education Committee ToR and Composition 2022-2023 it supported this standard to underline the quality assurance processes. From the review of the documentary evidence, they were able to understand matters at strategic and operational levels in relation to the delivery, resourcing, quality support and management across the university and course.

56. This documentary evidence was triangulated during the inspection in which the inspectors met with the course team and senior management team that clarified that the course is reviewed every year. The inspectors learnt that there were four-week meetings in place to cover a feedback loop for the quality assurance process, with clear and tangible links into the HSWTP that were apparent from the inspection meetings. The inspectors were given visual evidence of the QAPL process from student's placements and embedded in the courses monitoring process. The course team and employer partners and placement providers confirmed that they carry out a review with external stakeholders every trimester. The faculty meets four times a year with Student Experience Support, lines of accountability are clear and expressed clarity regarding process for minor and major modifications of the course, for example process and responsibilities for the changes or withdrawal of a module. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

57. The inspectors agreed that, based on the documentary evidence provided and from discussions with the course team, the unique role of the Link Lecturer is key to upholding the quality assurance of placement providers to ensure that they meet the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards.

58. The inspectors learnt this is achieved through the designated Link Lecturer (as outlined in documentary evidence of the Role Descriptor Link Lecturer), the Placement Coordinator at the agency, and the Placement Administrator at the university, with the emphasis being placed on the Learning Agreement. The MA Placement Handbook outlines contingencies for placement breakdown and how it is addressed, the stages of this and the processes regarding Placement Difficulties and Concerns Resolution.

59. From their discussion with the LEG group the inspectors were provided with narrative evidence of the approach to responding to problems on placement that had been adapted from their groups feedback, which now includes a proforma at Stage 2. Focusing on that, a PE must chronologically record actions taken to support the student before Stage 3.

60. The inspectors heard from the student meetings about an example of a placement breakdown whereby a student's communication needs were not being met by a PE. Steps were taken to resolve this with mediation initially but as it progressed a joint decision was formally made to change the student's placement to support their learning and development. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

61. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included the anonymised Health, Safety and Agency Checklist which provided an outline of all health and safety policies and procedures for placement providers. Within the meeting with the students and through demonstration from the course team, the inspectors were told and shown of how PebblePad is used for the students to check and sign off that they have read and understood these frameworks. As identified in Standard 3.2, the Link Lecturer is responsible for checking and ensuring these are in place for each student on placement that they are designated to. The inspectors were able to learn that where any personal or emotional circumstances might arise for the student, agency or PE, the Placement Difficulties and Concerns Resolutions in the MA Placement Handbook provides a further process for support and monitoring.

62. Within the meeting with the course team the inspectors were told of how the Learning Agreement is used as a live and fluid document that changes and used throughout placement. The course team provided an example of a student who was pregnant, with appropriate health, wellbeing and risk checks complete and carried out that reflected the above policies were put into practice and used in accordance with the Health, Safety and Agency Checklist. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

63. The inspection team were told of an example from an employer partner and placement provider that they were involved in the annual review of the MA course and review group activity as part of this. The employer partner told the inspectors that they worked with the MA course lead, following their experience of having students in their placement setting and identifying gaps in knowledge regarding current practice, then working that the course lead to shape the programme and address these gaps. The inspectors learnt from their review of the HSWTP Inter-Authority Agreement and the Memorandum Final documentary piece of evidence that the HSWTP seeks to embed and support the partnership to work collaboratively. Where learning needs are identified, social work practitioners can be

brought into modules so that their skills and knowledge can be utilised and taught within the curriculum. The course gave the example to the inspectors of the Specialisms in Practice module in which they visit a Hospice in the local area, that provided students with a hands-on learning experience of visiting a potential placement and meeting the palliative care social work and multidisciplinary team there.

64. The employer partners and placement providers provided the inspection team with narrative evidence that they were represented on subgroups within the teaching partnership. All were clear that they felt able to voice thoughts and feedback and saw actions from this. Examples included social work practitioners in the local area involved in the MA course, co-designing, teaching, and delivering a simulated assessment. Both the course team and employer partner and placement provider spoke to the inspection team of bringing social work practice to life for the students. An example of this that the inspection team was presented with was following consultation within the HSWTP and resulting in the implementation of Professional Learning Teams (PLTs). The inspection team was provided with documentary evidence that outlined that the PLTs are co-facilitated by personal supervisors and a social worker practitioner from the HSWTP for a method of group supervision to discuss practice, the students' experiences on placements and sharing best and current practice, including areas for development and learning. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

65. The inspection team were satisfied with the documentary evidence provided that included UCoP: Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) Programme Review Process, CMEE Programme Journal Guidance and minutes from Student-Staff Forums (SSF) review process. The inspection team learnt and were satisfied that the CMEE review process is informed by key student satisfaction and performance indicators and views of external stakeholders, including employer partners and placement providers and the HSWTP. The process for module review is also set out here. The minutes of SSF demonstrate that this forum is used to gather student feedback across five areas of development: teaching and learning opportunities, assessment and feedback, academic support and AST provision, organisation, and management, and learning resources. The inspection team learnt the timing of the teaching of modules was changed following feedback from students. Students explained to the inspectors that they had requested for these teaching sessions to be slightly later due to caring and family responsibilities.

66. The inspection team were provided with documentary and narrative evidence that members of the LEG are involved in the annual review process and module review boards of the course. One of the members spoke of their feedback to the course team regarding the Readiness for Practice module. The group said there has been an implementation of a face-to-face case study scenario with two members from the LEG, in which they provide a lived experience of their own for the basis of the case study and then act/practice out working

through this with the student. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

67. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to Standard 3.5. Throughout the inspection there was a commentary of where the course is aiming for next and planned changes, however there could have been more clarity about how decisions and plans to make changes were arrived at, with actions from meetings that are clearly assigned, given a RAG rating and timeframe. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations](#) section of this report.

Standard 3.6

68. The inspection team completed their review of documentary evidence prior to the inspection. This included the HSWTP Inter-Authority Agreement and the Memorandum Final, which outlines its priorities and key sub-groups including Quality Assurance (QA) and Recruitment and Retention, which focuses on workforce development. The inspectors were satisfied that these were dedicated to looking at student numbers in the various geographical locations, ensuring PE provision and workforce planning is carried out to inform student numbers admitted to the course and inform placement strategy. The inspection team learnt during the inspection that placements are sought via the HSWTP, but also through a working relationship with North Yorkshire Council for students based outside the Hull area and closer to Scarborough. A member of the course team provided narrative evidence and an example about a shift in students in geographical area and how this is managed through engaging and forming working partnerships with other organisations and local authorities to provide placement and learning opportunities. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

69. Documentary evidence included detailed information in the mapping document and the Professional Lead's CV, which confirmed their registration with Social Work England, appropriate qualifications, and experience. The inspection team agreed that based on the documentary evidence provided and from discussions with the course and senior management team that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

70. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors reviewed documentary evidence which outlined the qualifications, research topics, experience, areas of expertise and specialist subject knowledge held by the course team. Areas of specialisms including but not limited to trauma informed practice, suicide prevention, young people's mental health and dementia, all of which are evidenced in modules of being brought into teaching by the course team. Inspectors were able to review staff CVs and information on the university and course webpage and triangulated this information regarding the various specialisms during the

inspection meetings. The inspection team reviewed the submitted course design that highlighted relevant and current social work practice. The inspectors learnt that the university has three 'Academic Practitioners' working between academia and in direct practice, children and families, substance use and mental health settings. This, alongside guest speakers and LEG members supports students to learn about professional practice from those who have direct experience of delivering social work services.

71. The inspectors were assured that the course team represent an adequate number of staff to deliver an effective course, and discussions held with external stakeholders and students confirmed this. The inspectors heard from senior managers about the support provided to new staff to gain appropriate post-graduate teaching qualifications, with the course team all having required ICT facilities with access to reasonable adjustments for home working, linking into the Student Hub to support students, supported by the Placement Team, Admissions Team in the Faculty Hub, a Central Admissions Team, and Central Marketing Team. The inspectors were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.9

72. As identified in Standard 3.5 the inspectors were able to review documentary evidence regarding the MA CMEE Journal prior to the inspection. This enabled the inspectors to learn of the mechanism through which a range of module, programme and faculty level data is analysed and actions taken to change and improve the course, modules, and student performance. The inspectors were satisfied that there was clarity regarding how the module leader uses this data, as well as the marking template used by the course team ensures that feedback and feedforward occurs for students. With the move through to Rubrics by September 2023, students identified this is a positive as this system provides clear breakdown in relation to marking and grades.

73. The inspection team met with the Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Team Lead, who identified there was a new dashboard now in place to gather student data following change in governance structure. The inspection team learnt of data gathered that acknowledges recruitment in the local area may be impacted upon by the financial costs incurred with applying and attending a university course, what financial resources potential applicants may have to enable this or be able to access and exploring contextual admissions in support of bridging issues identified from the gathered data. The university and course team acknowledged that they do not have a diverse student population. The inspection team were provided with documentary evidence that outlined plans to address this in the Development Action Plan. This highlighted on-going work with HSWTP Recruitment and Retention sub-group to focus upon growing, retaining, and diversifying their student population.

74. One example that the inspectors were provided with was regarding data gathered that identified the impact that cost of living and travel was having upon the student group, the

reduction in student numbers and attainment. As a result of this data the university has sought to address these issues through reducing the amount of travel to reduce costs incurred, and condensing teaching sessions to fit in with students needs and family/caring responsibilities. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

75. Prior to the inspection the inspectors were able to review documentary evidence submitted by the university. This included course team CVs, university Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Social Work Practitioners Guide and the university Appraisal and Development Review (ADR) document. The inspection team were able to triangulate this within meeting with the course team in which they gave an example of their role as a PE, the training for this, mentoring other PEs and work as a Best Interest Assessor (BIA). The inspectors learnt the university Workforce Strategy and ADR sets out course team members objectives for development and learning, and maintaining their CPD. The course team confirmed they access a CPD budget to attend conferences and research topics through the university.

76. From the review of course team CVs the inspectors identified examples of academics in practice, including but not limited to a mental health setting in an NHS Foundation Trust, a local authority setting and another in the PVI sector. During discussions with the course team the inspectors were able to triangulate this with the MA Lead, who identified their work with a local police service and study in trauma informed practice, which is incorporated into the curriculum, including the research areas identified within Standard 3.8. The inspection team were told by the course team, meeting with LEG, and seen in documentary evidence Welcome and Training Event 2022 and Mandatory Training E-learning, of the mandatory training that members of the LEG must complete in their role on the course.

77. As identified in Standard 3.8, the university has three 'Academic Practitioners' working between academia and in direct practice (children and families, substance use and mental health settings). The inspection team learnt during inspection that the role of the Link Lecturers on the MA course includes working as a mentor for other PEs and on other courses. The course team provided the example of PLT (as identified in standard 3.4) which promotes the maintenance of currency regarding professional knowledge and understanding by the nature of the supervisions in which the student, academic and a social work practitioner share their experiences, awareness or learning needs in relation to current and best practice in a supportive setting. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

78. The inspection team were able to review the Professional Standards mapping form, Module Handbooks and Module Learning Outcomes which showed consideration of design and assessment against the Professional Standards and PCF. The inspection team agreed that there was clear documentary evidence of how the course content had been designed and structured to prepare students for professional practice as social workers, considering The Knowledge and Skills Statement for Child and Family Practitioners, Department for Education (DfE) 2018, and The Knowledge and Skills Statement for Social Workers in Adult Services DfE 2015 within documentary evidence.

79. Within the meeting with employer partners and placement providers the inspectors were provided with narrative evidence from the attendees that in their experiences, the students have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the Professional Standards. This was triangulated within the inspectors meeting and discussions with the PE who spoke of their work and documentation in routinely mapping to the Professional Standards and PCF, ensuring that they check these against the students learning and development. Students complete an online declaration that they understand these and are aware of their professional conduct, including what is appropriate and what is not, as a student and in future professional practice. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.2

80. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included Admissions Review 2022 Summary and Action Points, which identified the involvement and collaborative working with members of the LEG. The inspectors were able to triangulate this information in their meetings with the LEG, who provided examples of their feedback within the review setting and subsequent coproduction work that went in addressing their feedback. This they explained to the inspection team brought about the introduction of a real-life scenario case study for the students to work through with two members of the LEG, which the inspection team heard positive feedback and experiences from the student meeting regarding this change.

81. The inspection team were able to hear from the LEG members about the piece of documentary evidence, LEG 10 Top Tips, that the inspectors had reviewed before the inspection. The members identified they had developed this resource and is now implemented in the curriculum, the course team identified its value for students learning regarding their communication skills and professional behaviours.

82. The inspection team were provided with documentary evidence of the Readiness for Practice module, Panel Interview, and MA Skills Days, which clearly outlined the involvement of LEG members, HSWTP, and social work practitioners from the employer partners and placement providers in the module, who felt there was a collaborative feel to the course, practitioners teaching the 'day in the life of a social worker' was one example given. It was explained to the inspectors that practitioners are invited every year to go

through the admissions review process. The module review boards are being reinstated this year with the aim to refresh the course and identifying links to their area of work and the Specialisms in Practice module, one example given of students visiting a local hospice and taught by palliative care social work practitioners regarding loss and bereavement in this module.

83. The inspection team were able to review the QA of Practice Learning PE document which highlighted the feedback from PE after each placement and helping to support the development of each practice learning experience and discussions with PE, placement providers and HSWTP. From their review of the documentary evidence and discussions throughout the inspection the inspectors were assured that the university sought and effectively worked collaboratively with employers, practitioners and the LEG members into its design, development, and review of the curriculum. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.3

84. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided that included the Diversity and Inclusion Policy (noted university currently reviewing this document) which links to the protected characteristics identified within the Equality Act 2010. The inspectors were able to review the university Education Strategy 2020 – 2025, which sets out their aim for an inclusive approach that the Inclusive Education Framework sets out in practice, such as ensuring that learning environments are accessible.

85. The inspection team were able to meet with Student Support Services who confirmed their role in the course and offer drop-in sessions for the teaching team to ensure the course is accessible and meeting suitable requirements. From the inspection team's discussion with the Disability Inclusion Team, it was identified that they have visited placement providers to ensure that the providers can provide, or require, any reasonable adjustments that students need to be put in place. The same support services spoke of how students are encouraged to declare any additional needs or reasonable adjustments they require from their application process onwards. However, they acknowledged that these support needs do not always come to the forefront until later in the course, which they spoke of their experience and ability to support students through. Linking in with mental health support services and supporting with neurodiversity screening were given as some examples to the inspection team.

86. From meeting with the student group during the inspection the inspectors were able to hear first-hand of this support happening for them. One student told of having specific times needed to be away in their working day from placement for caring responsibilities and another example of course assessments that allow adjustments to be made for students to factor in additional time or breaks when appropriate. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

87. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included Academic Workload Planning, Publication and Research Outline and Module Handbook Specialisms in Practice. From their review of these documents the inspectors were able to consider whether the course is continually updated because of developments in legislation, best practice, and government policy, and from this documentary evidence and through speaking to the course team, students, employer partners and placement providers concluded that the course is. The inspection team were provided with a demonstration of Canvas, the university VLE which students can access all required, current and any developing research, legislation, policy, or best practice material.

88. The inspection team learnt that members of the teaching team remain in direct practice which maintains current social work currency and the incorporation of any developments into the course on a regular basis. As identified in Standard 3.10, the course team CVs provided clarity of the areas of research and specialisms that are brought into the curriculum and links to other professions and organisations that allow any advances in policy and legislation to also be part of this continuous development of the course.

89. The inspection team were able to review documentary evidence regarding one of the course teams research projects regarding 'evaluating the training of social work students.' From speaking to the course team, employer partners and placement providers the inspectors were able to triangulate this information, focusing on the Signs of Safety approach and its aims for best practice. The inspection team were told of how this is introduced to students as the preferred practice model adopted by the workforce regionally, with a local authority providing training for students in relation to Signs of Safety in preparation for their placements.

90. As identified previously within this report the university seeks active involvement and feedback from students and its employer partners and placement providers through several methods. PLT, QAPL and annual review of admissions and the module review boards, being reinstated this year, were some examples given. The inspectors identified these were all approaches that allow and encourage the information exchange for any changes in workforce development, professional and regulatory practice, and employability. The inspection team were provided with narrative information during the inspection from key stakeholders which identified a recent careers fair in which year one MA students were gaining employment in social care settings alongside their study, as well as graduates having social work employment upon their completion of the course. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

91. Prior to the inspection, inspectors reviewed documentary evidence which included, but not limited to PMSOCW XF MA Social Work, MA Social Work with Adults Module Handbook, and the Readiness for Practice Module Handbook 2022-2023, which supported how theoretical frameworks and practice are integrated into students' learning on the course. Inspectors reviewed module descriptors, how the thirty Practice Skills Days (PSD) are frontloaded to rehearse skills and instil theory in a classroom setting and through simulation exercises before then direct social work practice in placements. The inspectors learnt that the PSD involve social work practitioners and LEG members who bring real-life case scenarios for students to work with to reinforce learnt theory into direct practice.

92. During the meeting held with students, inspectors heard how they are encouraged on placement to reflect on their practice, make use of their reflective journal to draw upon and link practice-based learning into the placement settings. The PE group, which the inspectors were able to meet with identified the supervision framework for PE and students, bringing theory into practice. The PE explained this can be applied differently, but the framework in PebblePad supports the ability to do so in practice placements with recall days every four to five weeks to again address theory and application in practice to then take into placements settings. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

93. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence which demonstrated opportunities for multi-disciplinary learning in course modules and placement settings. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included Inter-Professional Learning Workshop Guidance, Practice Simulation and Schwartz Round Report 2023, which demonstrated the multidisciplinary learning and working within the Inter-Disciplinary Forum. The inspection team learnt this brought together students from social work, clinical psychology, mental health, and learning disability nursing, with further plans for this learning within the Allam Medical Building and its simulation suite within the Readiness for Practice module for the student group.

94. The inspectors were able to triangulate the documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection within their meeting with students. The student group spoke of their skills day with midwifery cohort at the university, ran by both course teams teaching staff. The inspection team were able to learn of the practice simulation activity using a DASH risk assessment which students learn and develop their skills with specialist input from domestic violence practitioners. The students told the inspection team of their visits to the criminal courts, learning they took from this into the Children and Families module. This is as well as visits and learning opportunities at a local hospice, to work and learn alongside the palliative care social work team and the other multidisciplinary professionals based there. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

95. The university Academic Framework and the Modular Structure provided the inspectors with the outline for the programme and structure of the course. The inspectors were provided with module descriptors exemplifying how the hours were arranged, and they were assured this time was sufficient for students in structured academic learning. The inspection team were provided with narrative evidence during the inspection of how consideration is being given to a blended approach to the mental health module in the coming years. The course team identified this would be with the aim that a more digital base for this module may assist with attendance and travel issues for students and support them with balancing the structured learning and their personal and work commitments.

96. Following their review of documentary evidence and discussions with key stakeholders the inspection team were reassured that students have a mixture of structured academic learning, group-based learning, and guided independent study, which reflect the requirements of each stage of study enabling students to meet the required learning outcomes and professional standards at the point of completion of the course. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

97. The inspectors were able to review the MA Assessment Strategy which they identified clearly demonstrated adherence to university regulations and guidance in relation to assessment, marking, moderation, and quality assurance processes. The inspection team were satisfied that the assessment strategy and design was robust, reliable, and valid, assured from their discussions with employer partners and placement providers that students were developing the knowledge and skills required to meet the Professional Standards. The inspection team were able to identify clear links from the module descriptors to learning outcomes and assessment methods to the Professional Standards and PCF.

98. The inspection team learnt from speaking to the course team and reviewing documentary evidence in the Student Handbook, that there were clear procedures and transfer to an exit route if required. The inspection team were able to review the External Examiner Reports prior to the inspection and there were no concerns identified regarding the course's assessment strategy and design. The inspection team concluded that the information contained within the course mapping document clearly linked to documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection, and discussions with the course team during the inspection was able to demonstrate that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

99. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included UCoP on Assessment Procedures, MA Social Work programme specification and the MA Assessment Strategy. This included an Assessment Map for the MA Social Work programme that the

inspection team could clearly identify the ordering and sequencing of assessments across the programme. From their discussions with the course team and students the inspection team were satisfied that assessments were carried out at appropriate stages of the course to match students expected progression. From their review of documentary evidence, the inspection team identified that formative and summative assessments were appropriately sequenced to students' progression through the course, weighting of assessments and mapping to programme specification were clearly set out on Canvas for students to refer to. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

100. From their review of documentary evidence and course mapping document the inspection team were able to learn that assessment and feedback is governed by the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy and the university Assessment Procedures. Documentary evidence outlined that these are made available to students via the online Quality and Standards Handbook and within the MA Assessment Strategy. Within the meeting with students, it was expressed that comments and feedback could be more robust. As identified earlier in this report there is a planned move to Rubrics by September 2023. Students identified this as a positive regarding the meaningful feedback, within a set timeframe, they receive in relation to their performance and progression in their assessments. The inspectors identified from the documentary evidence that student's feedback is aligned with the course's module competencies and outcomes, with the nature of the assessment underpinned by university Level 7 Grading Criteria. The inspection team heard of the varying methods of feedback that students have access to on the course to support them in their learning and development, which included but not limited to via Canvas, linking in with their Personal Supervisor and PebblePad with PEs during supervisions. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

101. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included university Code of Practice for External Examiner, Staff CVs, and External Examiner Reports. Inspectors were able to review the CVs of the course team and staff involved in assessment, which satisfied them that appropriate expertise, qualifications, and experience were held, including registration of the external examiner with Social Work England. The inspection team learnt that marking moderation is carried out, as evidenced in Assessment Procedures, with new members of the course team being provided with appropriate training and allocated a mentor to support them in their development. The inspection team concluded that the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection was able to demonstrate that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

102. Prior to the inspection the inspection team was able to review information about systems that the university and course team used to manage students' progression, including the Quality and Standards Handbook and the MA Assessment Strategy. From their review of the Anon Direct Observation within documentary evidence submitted, the inspection team were provided with a detailed account of a student's professional development. Inspectors reviewed evidence which indicated the range of different people involved in managing students' progression throughout their course. These included members from the LEG, PE, Link Lecturers, External Examiners, and the Programme Board, all of which contributed to the inspectors' findings that the students have a holistic approach to their progression through the course and support in place to address any issues during their study. This was evidenced through one example given to the inspectors in which they learnt of a student who was having some difficulty during their time studying and it was arranged, through the support mechanisms in place and input from those identified above, that the student would have a set number of days away from the course. This resulted in them being able to address what they required to outside of academic study and then return to be able to progress and graduate from the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

103. The inspection team were satisfied that from their review of course modules, including Human Development Across the Lifespan and Social Work Research and Dissertation, and learning outcomes that the course was designed to enable students to develop an evidenced approach to social work practice. Students provided narrative evidence of this in practice for them, highlighting to the inspection team of their own student focus groups, Canvas topic discussion areas where they can share their learning, own research, and findings with the student group. One student gave their example of the accessibility of research resources they had access to within the VLE and study skills from academic support services, which alongside their academic learning enabled them to develop their analytical skills and were key to their development and progression through the course. Members of the LEG confirmed they give their own feedback which they present to students from sessions and learning they are involved in, as well as the course teams own research areas and specialist areas being brought into the curriculum to encourage and instil an evidenced informed approach to social work practice in the students learning and development. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

104. The inspectors agreed that based on the documentary evidence provided, including links to university student support services webpages, including but not limited to the Mental Health and Wellbeing Team, careers service Student Futures and OH, and from

discussions with the university student support services that students had access to resources to support their health and wellbeing. Within their meeting with the student support services the inspection team were able to triangulate this evidence and learn of the central support services, the varied support available and in different formats, such as live chat, face to face, email, over the phone, which was accessible for students on campus, placement, applicants, and graduates. The inspection team were given narrative evidence from meetings with students of the inhouse support they have accessed through the course, with a social worker and mental health nurse available through these support services. As well as assistance with benefit checks, financial guidance, and reasonable adjustments to support a student who required adjustments within their placement for a shorter working week to allow them to meet their academic requirements but also uphold their health and wellbeing. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

105. The inspectors heard from the student support and academic and library support services that students have access to resources to support their academic development and learning on the course. Meeting with the student group during the inspection enabled to the inspectors to hear of their own examples, one student explained they were returning to studying after working and family commitments and required greater support regarding their academic study skills. The student identified that they accessed guidance in the My Journey Portal and supported by their Personal Supervisor, documentary evidence under Personal Supervision Policy, to access the library academic support services which they spoke positively of and enabled them to progress through the course.

106. During the inspection the inspectors were able to meet with representatives from a range of the university support services, highlighting the support for students with possible neurodiversity support needs for screening and further assistance available, physical disabilities and guidance regarding financial concerns. The student support services provided the inspection team with a variety of examples including ensuring students in financial difficulty were given financial support vouchers where appropriate, access to an educational psychology assessment for those screened positively for neurodiversity, and members of their support team going out on placement to assess suitability for students with reasonable adjustments. The inspection team were provided with visual evidence during the inspection of an anonymized student support plan and heard from the course lead of how data from Canvas can aid in identifying a potential lack of engagement from a student and how the course team can seek to engage with the student and offer support as soon as possible.

107. The inspectors learnt from documentary evidence and in meeting with student support services of the family rooms available on campus, which students can access to enable them to support their family and raise their ability to engage with academic work and requirements of the course. The inspection team advised this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

108. As identified in Standard 1.4 the inspection team were able to confirm that there is a process in place for ensuring the suitability of applicants. This is achieved through the submission of documentary evidence, which included an Anonymised Suitability for Social Work Self-Declaration Form that applicants must complete, alongside evidence of the university Support and Suitability Panel (SSP) in Social Work that considers an applicant's declaration or a matter arising from their enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check.

109. The inspectors agreed that, based on the course mapping document information, documentary evidence provided, including but not limited to MA Placement Handbook and Fitness to Practise Regulations, and from discussions with the course team that it is evident that once a student is on the course it is their responsibility to update the university of any change in their circumstances regarding their conduct, health, or character. There is no further formal check or declaration sought from the course team or university regarding a student's suitability. The inspectors were reassured of the process and stages in place regarding fitness to practice, documented in the MA Student Handbook and students confirmed they were aware of this during discussion with the inspectors, as well as the PE and employer partners and placement providers being aware of this process and how to report and support any stages in this procedure.

110. Regarding this standard, ensuring that there is a thorough and effective process in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of a students' conduct, character, and health and following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 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, 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.

Standard 5.4

111. As identified earlier in this report the inspectors were able to review documentary evidence and speak to the student support services regarding the OH Questionnaire that helps to identify any reasonable adjustments students may require. This level of support encompasses whilst students are on placement which the student support services referenced during their meeting with the inspection team. It was highlighted that this involvement assisted the student being matched to an appropriate placement setting, enabling them in progressing through the course and meeting the professional standards. The inspectors were provided with documentary evidence of an anonymised student support plan that highlighted the support and guidance put in place for a student within the

course. The student support services advised the inspectors of regular briefing sessions that they run that members of the teaching team can access for guidance and signposting to the most appropriate services to ensure the student is getting the support they require in a timely manner.

112. Documentary evidence identified a range of support services to students including the Mental Health and Wellbeing service, Disability Inclusion Team, Learning Support Team, and the Autism Support Team. The inspection team spoke to Link Lecturers who gave their examples of working with the Disability Inclusion Team, PE, student, and placement setting to ensure that a placement was suitable and accessible for the student, which enabled the student to progress through the course, successfully graduate from the course and find employment in that placement setting. The course team provided the example of a student who had a hearing impairment and supported with reasonable adjustments in the classroom, whilst teaching, so that the student could lip read and therefore progress through the course. The inspectors concluded that the university was likely well equipped to meet the diverse needs of students who may require reasonable adjustments due to health conditions or impairments, therefore this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

113. Prior to the inspection the inspectors were able to review Canvas which contained the MA Programme Handbook, Assessment, Teaching and Learning Strategy and the Assessment Map highlighting a range of information for students about their assessments and curriculum. The virtual learning platform provides information to students about each of their modules and includes detail of reading lists, reasonable adjustments, academic appeals, complaints, assessment timings and the academic learning to be covered, with an online declaration for students to sign during their induction to confirm they have read and understood the information within. The inspection team learnt from their review of documentary evidence, MA Placement Induction Briefing, that information about assessments and placements is conveyed to students through their induction from their Link Lecturer, reinforced through students' access and use of the MA Placement Handbook and Practice Learning Agreement.

114. From their review of documentary evidence and meeting with some of the Link Lecturers the inspectors were informed that they provide sessions regarding Assessed and Supported Year Employment (ASYE). These involve previous MA students who have become newly qualified social workers talking about their own career journey through their ASYE, the inspectors were able to view an extract from this session as part of documentary evidence review. The WG Report Jan to March 2023 highlighted to the inspectors of the robust role which the HSWTP plays within CPD, and the CPD sub-groups running of CPD events and masterclasses to further support students in their learning and development regarding transitioning to a registered social worker into ASYE.

115. The inspectors were reassured that the Professional Standards and CPD requirements are available and referenced to students on recall days, in the Programme Handbook, on Canvas and within the course curriculum. As identified within Standard 5.1 the careers service Student Futures links into the course and provides interview and application support. In their meeting with students the inspectors heard of the careers fair they had attended earlier in the year and how they felt their learning around CPD and ASYE had started from an early point in the course. They spoke positively of this and understood the process and expectations of registering as a social worker, professional standards, and what ASYE involves. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.6

116. The inspection team reviewed the MA Programme Handbook and MA Induction Week PowerPoint 2022 prior to inspection, which clearly outlines to students where attendance is mandatory in the course. This was triangulated within meetings with the course team and student group, with an 80% expected attendance rate and 60% minimum attendance rate across the programme, students explained to the inspection team that they must electronically tap into lectures using SEAtS system and if seven days are missed continuously then this is flagged to their tutor. As identified in Standard 5.2, data from Canvas can aid in identifying a potential lack of engagement from a student and how the course team can seek to engage with the student and offer support as soon as possible. The inspection team were satisfied that there was clear information available to students from their induction, to being referenced throughout the course and available on Canvas that detailed the outcomes of low attendance or missing placement and/or skills days. This included how to access support, work with their Link Lecturer or Personal Supervisor to action required academic learning and work to ensure they gain the required knowledge and skills to progress. The inspection team concluded this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

117. The inspectors were able to gain insight from their review of the MA Assessment Strategy, Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy and Social Work Feedback Template into ensuring that students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their learning and development. The inspectors agreed that the documentary evidence provided clarity regarding the courses approach to feedback, providing structure for the feedback within a set timeframe including a sequenced approach for both formative and summative assessments. From their discussions with the course team and students the inspection team heard how the Personal Supervisor role is integral to this, through their actions in providing feedback and guidance to the students regarding their academic work, progression, and marks throughout the course.

118. Students spoke positively to the inspection team regarding the various forms of feedback they had received including on placement from interim and end stage reviews, as

well as supervisions with PE to identify learning and development opportunities during placements, including PLT and sharing their findings and reflections in a safe and supportive setting. From the inspection teams PebblePad demonstration during the inspection they were able to have sight of a student's reflective journal, which they work on throughout the course and have lifetime access to take into ASYE and support their ongoing CPD. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

119. Prior to the inspection the inspectors were able to review the university Code of Practice Academic Appeals, MA Programme Handbook, MA Assessment Strategy and MA Placement Handbook that provided confirmation that there was a robust system in place for students to make an academic appeal on the course. This information was triangulated within discussions with the student group who were aware of this process and where to access this information. The inspectors concluded that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

120. As the qualifying courses are MA Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma Social Work (Exit Route), the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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 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, 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	Standard 5.3	That the education provider will establish a proactive and formal process to continually reassess student suitability for the programme of study.	13 March 2024.	Paragraph 110

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 3.5	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider more formal mechanisms of gathering information and data. This will enable clearer lines of accountability and evidence how and why changes occur.	Paragraph 67

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

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](#).

A review of the conditions evidence will be undertaken and recommendations will be made 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	Recommendation
1.	5.3: Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character, and health.	That the education provider will establish a proactive and formal process to continually reassess student suitability for the programme of study.	Condition now met.

Findings

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

3. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this condition highlighted that a new checking process to reassess student suitability was introduced following the inspection. The inspection team were able to review documentary evidence provided by the course provider that identified a declaration of good character and good health online form must now be completed by all students at key points throughout their programme. The forms will also be completed following every period of suspension of study and any other absence from the programme.

4. The completed forms will be checked by the MA programme director and discussed with and forwarded to the professional lead if a positive declaration is made with reference to the fitness to practice process and/or occupational health assessment.

5. Following their review of the documentary evidence, the inspectors identified that the new process is robust and is clearly set out in the documentation submitted by the university, including the programme handbook for students, MA induction professional requirements talk/powerpoint and declaration of GHGC standard operating procedure.

6. The course provider submitted documentary evidence that assured the inspectors that there is a proactive and formal process to the process for checking the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character, and health.

7. Following the review of the documentary evidence submitted, the inspection team are satisfied that the condition set against the approval of the MA Social Work course and PG Dip Social Work (Exit Route) is met.

Regulator decision

Conditions met.