

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Winchester

Course approval: BSc. (Hons) Social Work and
MSc. Social Work

Inspection dates: 28 February to 3 March 2023

Report date:	13 April 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	14 June 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	18 October 2023

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	9
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	11
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	14
Standard five: Supporting students	19
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	22
Proposed outcome.....	23
Conditions	23
Recommendations	23
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	24
Regulator decision	32
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	33
Findings	33
Regulator decision	34

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. Inspections typically last three to four days.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, approved without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval. Where the course has been previously approved we may also decide to withdraw approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final regulatory decision about the approval of the course.
13. The final decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. The University of Winchester's existing BSc. (Hons) and MSc. Social Work courses and proposed changes to the courses were inspected as part of the Social Work England reapproval cycle; whereby all course providers with qualifying social work courses will be inspected against the new Education and Training Standards 2021.

16. During the same week the PG Dip Social Work (Step Up) course was also inspected by a separate inspection team. Some meetings across the week were held jointly. Details of this inspection are covered in a separate report.

Inspection ID	UWIR1
Course provider	University of Winchester
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BSc. (Hons) Social Work and MSc. Social Work
Mode of study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	BSc. (Hons) Social Work – 40 per cohort MSc. Social Work – 20 per cohort
Date of inspection	28 February – 3 March 2023
Inspection team	Zoe Burke, Education Quality Assurance Operations Manager (covering officer role due to sickness absence) Monica Murphy (Lay Inspector) David Childs (Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	TO BE ADDED

Language

17. In this document we describe the University of Winchester as 'the education provider' or 'the university' and we describe the BSc. (Hons) Social Work and the MSc. Social Work as 'the course(s)'.

Inspection

18. A remote inspection took place from 28 February to 3 March 2023. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

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

Conflict of interest

20. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

21. The inspection team met with eight students from across both courses, representative of each level of study except for year 1 of the MSc. One person attending was a student representative. Discussions included whether they felt they had enough information to make an informed choice about the courses, the admissions process, their placement experience and support services.

Meetings with course staff

22. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff from the course teaching team, staff involved in admissions, staff involved in practice learning, staff involved in support services and members of the senior management team. The inspection team were also given demonstrations of online systems 'InPlace', the 'Academic Engagement Dashboard' and an 'E-Portfolio' during these meetings.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

23. The inspection team met with four people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in the courses for between one and ten years. Discussions included what areas of the courses they were involved in, how they were recruited, what support they received and what mechanisms were in place for them to feedback.

Meetings with external stakeholders

24. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Hampshire County Council, Southampton City Council, Isle of Wight Council, All Saints Junior School, Homegroup and practice educators.

Findings

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

Standard one: Admissions

Standard 1.1

26. Following a review of evidence submitted prior to the inspection and during meetings with staff involved in the admissions process and students, the inspection team were able to understand the holistic approach the course provider has for admissions. They were advised of recent changes to the admissions process, which includes three stages, a written exercise, a 2:1 interview and a group activity. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

27. The University of Winchester's website provides access to the 'Recognition of Prior Learning Policy' and how this is considered as part of the admissions process. Open day PowerPoint slides included in the documentary evidence advise candidates about prior learning and experience and how it is considered as part of the selection process. Students confirmed to the inspection team that they were asked about prior experience during the process. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

28. The inspection team heard how employers, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work were involved in selection processes. Documentary evidence included a timetable for admissions sessions and tasks, an email asking people with lived experience of social work for their views on the new admissions process and meeting minutes relating to people with lived experience of social work/practitioner being consulted on the design and development of components of the admissions tasks. During a meeting with staff involved in admissions, the inspection team were advised how people with lived experience of social work and employers were involved in each element of the admissions process. The meetings with people with lived experience of social work and employers confirmed this involvement. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.4

29. Documentary and narrative evidence from the admissions team confirm information is provided to candidates concerning the requirements for the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) at several points prior to application and throughout the admissions process. A

declaration of suitability precedes completion of the DBS to cover any time lag before the DBS process is completed. The inspection team met representatives from employer and placement organisations. They explained their involvement, when required, in student DBS checks where a concern is raised. Online information packs provided prior to the inspection as part of the documentary submission provide candidates with details of required evidence with respect to the required checks. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

30. To assess whether there were equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they were implemented and monitored, the inspection team considered documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection and met with the senior leadership team, admissions staff, people with lived experience of social work and students.

31. During these meetings with the inspection team there was an acknowledgement that some minority groups were underrepresented, and a 'Faculty Access and Participation Plan' was in place. They were also told about faculty initiatives around admissions and engaging with a university-wide student steering group for consultation on ways to increase candidates from ethnic minority backgrounds. This group feeds into the faculty management group and the University race group.

32. During the admissions meeting the inspection team asked about examples of reasonable adjustments with respect to the recruitment process. The inspection team were advised that there were very few requests for reasonable adjustments. Lots of consideration had been given to the process in advance e.g. rooms with accessible access and options for captions on videos. One example that was provided was the change of a written 45 minute exam to an essay that's topic was released 24 hours prior to submitting it, where candidates could choose from a range of topics. This aligned with the university's assessment strategy that doesn't include a written exam.

33. In meetings with admissions staff, people with lived experience of social work and employers, the inspection team asked about training regarding equality diversity and inclusion for those involved in the admissions process. Information was shared about briefing sessions that were held to prepare those involved, which was adapted dependent upon the audience, and all seemed confident that they had a point of contact for any further questions. However, there didn't appear to be a consistent approach to training regarding equality diversity and inclusion for those involved in the admissions process and it wasn't clear whether there was any refresher training available.

34. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a [recommendation](#) in relation to 4.6. We recommend that the education provider standardises training in relation

to EDI principles and bias for all people involved in admissions activities including introducing a system for recording this and periodic updates.

Standard 1.6

35. The inspection team saw comprehensive documentary evidence which outlined information given to candidates enabling an informed choice about all aspects of the courses. They were told about course champions, level four social work students who engage with candidates at open days and on admissions days. They were told about videos that had been created by undergraduate and postgraduate students highlighting the reality of social work. Students confirmed this during the meeting with them and said that they did have enough information to make an informed choice about the course. Students talked about information on the website and attending open days. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

36. The inspection team saw evidence that placements at the university consisted of a 70 day placement, a 100 day placement and 30 skills days. A student placement data management system 'InPlace' was demonstrated during the inspection. This system was used to support the management of placements and student allocation alongside an allocation spreadsheet. During a meeting with placement staff at the university the inspection team were told about annual placement audits, where details of what placements can offer are updated. This ensures that students can be matched with appropriate statutory and non-statutory placements in contrasting settings.

37. The inspection team met with a range of employer partners offering different placement experiences. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.2

38. The inspection team saw documentary evidence that students have practice learning opportunities that enable them to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and meet the professional standards. During a meeting with the placement team the inspection team heard that careful consideration is given to student's prior experience and their stage in the course when deciding on placements. The course aims to build resilience through managed exposure in practice and university simulated practice environments. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

39. The inspection team spoke to the placement team, students and practice educators about whether students have an appropriate induction, supervision, support, access to

resources and a realistic workload while on placement. They heard that the course team is actively involved with practice educators ensuring that students are supported to learn. Students told the inspection team about their preparation for practice module. They understand where to go for support and direction within the university.

40. The inspection team saw documentary evidence, including practice learning agreements, which provide contact details for key staff, timetables and learning objectives and details relevant policies and procedures that students need to be aware of while on placement. They were provided with an orientation to practice MS Teams recordings, which provided clear information about escalating concerns (this recording also supported standard 2.4 below). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

41. As outlined in Standard 2.2 above, during a meeting with the placement team the inspection team heard that careful consideration is given to student's prior experience and their stage in the course when deciding on placements. The course aims to build resilience through managed exposure in practice and university simulated practice environments.

42. When meeting with practice educators the inspection team were told that the legacy of necessary adjustments during the Covid pandemic has impacted on student engagement in practice. This continues to challenge some student expectations and their engagement. This has also impacted on support for students, face-to-face placement engagement and returning to direct working with service users. Some practice educators make informal arrangements with other service teams to expand the practice experiences of students. The inspection team were told about placement planning meetings, which identified any outstanding learning needs and opportunities that could be found to meet them at the appropriate time. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

43. The inspection team reviewed documentary and video evidence relating to preparation for direct practice which included a readiness to practice module. Processes are in place for managing Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks as a part of admissions processes. During meetings with students overall they said they felt prepared for practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

44. Documentary evidence provided details of the process for gathering data in relation to qualifications, training, experience, observations, Social Work England registration details and DBS for both on-site and off-site practice educators. An annual declaration form is used for practice educators to provide any changes to information. Information about practice educators is stored on the 'InPlace' system.

45. During the meeting with practice educators, the inspection team were told about events arranged by the university to upskill practice educators and masterclasses they were invited to. One practice educator was new to the role and said that she was asked for specific information in relation to qualifications, training, experience and registration and observations were set up. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.7

46. Documentary evidence confirmed that policies and procedures were in place. There is a university wide online system 'Report and Support' where students can raise concerns, which can be submitted anonymously if preferred. The online MS Teams platform provides an area for students to raise concerns if they have identified poor practice, how to manage difficult conversations and who to go to for support. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

47. Documentary evidence outlined programme governance arrangements for the courses. When the inspection team met with the senior leadership team, they were told about the governance structures for the social work programmes. Social Work became part of the Faculty of Health and Wellbeing in 2019. There are regular programme and department meetings that the head of the social work department attends. There is also a faculty management team meeting monthly with a formal agenda.

48. Evidence was provided with respect to the course leads and their registration status was confirmed.

49. Members of the course team often have multiple roles/responsibilities within the team which could lead to potential conflict of interest in some circumstances, this was evident during discussion with the course team when they were providing one example about how support was arranged when a student was failing and subject to a fitness to practise (FtP) investigation, where the person providing support was also responsible for the investigation.

50. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met, however, following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a [recommendation](#) in relation to 3.1, that consideration is given to strengthening process, roles and accountability for course governance in supporting students that reduces potential conflict of interest.

Standard 3.2

51. Documentary evidence reviewed by the inspection team included the partnership agreement, which outlines the arrangements between the university and the placement provider and what they each have responsibility for.

52. During the meetings with the course team and with staff involved in placements at the university the inspection team were told about procedures in place for supporting students during placement and how practice placement breakdowns are managed. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

53. As with standard 3.2, documentary evidence reviewed by the inspection team included the partnership agreement, which outlines the arrangements between the university and the placement provider and what they each have responsibility for. The inspection team also saw the health and safety agreement and the practice learning agreement which details induction requirements and information about the relevant policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk.

54. Support staff and placement staff explained what support was available to students if they wanted to raise any matters. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

55. Documentary evidence included information about employer involvement in the delivery of teaching on the course. There was also information about masterclasses at the university that were available for practice educators to attend.

56. During the inspection meetings it was evident that there were long-standing relationships between the university and employer stakeholders, but these arrangements appear to be informal. This was confirmed by the senior leadership team, who advised that there wasn't a formal schedule of meetings but that meetings happened regularly.

57. Documentary evidence included information about the intention to establish a Masters and BSc Social Work partnership group and include students, employers, practitioners, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work. A constitution for this group was included, though there is no detail about when this will be implemented.

58. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 3.4 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 3.5

59. During the meeting with students one person shared that they were the cohort representative and gave examples of changes made to the course as a result of collated feedback.

60. When the inspection team met with practice educators, they gave examples of varying ways in which they had been invited to give feedback about the courses including joining specific groups to give feedback, being invited to skills days to give feedback to students, sharing experiences about placements and picking up on any concerns.

61. The course team advised that they continue to respond to external examiner feedback on marking inconsistencies, improving the quality and timeliness of feedback for student academic work through staff facilitated workshops and discussing parity marking exercises.

62. Documentary evidence was provided about the use of Quality Assurance in Practice Learning forms, used with both students and practice educators. As outlined in standard 3.4 detail was also provided about the intention to establish a Masters and BSc Social Work partnership group and include students, employers, practitioners, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work. A constitution for this group was included, though there is no detail about when this will be implemented.

63. During the meeting with people with lived experience of social work, the inspection team were advised that they do not participate in meetings or activity associated with course management or course evaluation and could not recall changes affected from their feedback. However, examples were given about co-development and delivery of teaching sessions. Whilst there is documentary evidence of notes indicating comments made by people with lived experience of social work on changes to the new course, nobody at the meeting had experience of engaging in anything specific related to the design of the new version of the BSc. and MSc. or the ongoing development of courses.

64. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 3.5 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 3.6

65. When meeting with the senior leadership team, the inspection team saw that there was recognition that placement availability and flux in workforce necessitates careful balancing of candidates admitted to the courses. There is flexibility within the typical three year cycle of a student cohort journey to accommodate placement learning and if necessary, candidate numbers to the courses can be closed early to ensure this.

66. Documentary evidence included minutes from SWEN SHIP meetings where local placement capacity is monitored and reviewed. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

67. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were provided with the CV for the lead social worker for both courses, which illustrated appropriate qualifications, experience and registration. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

68. Ahead of the inspection, the inspection team were provided with the CVs of the staff that teach across both courses. During meetings with the courses team, the inspection team were told about CPD and research activity that staff were involved in. This illustrated the range of experience, areas of expertise and relevant subject knowledge held by the team.

69. The senior management team confirmed that they were in the process of increasing the staffing for the social work team and advertising an additional role. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.9

70. Documentary evidence provided the inspection team with information about the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) which has recently replaced the university course analytics process (APE). The PIP gives the university more individualised data so that they can evaluate student's performance, providing timely assessment, intervention and support for students who may be struggling or disengaging from learning.

71. The inspection team were told that this has been instrumental in informing diversity and equality impact, which in turn has informed the revised admissions process of the university. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

72. Narrative evidence from the course team confirmed documentary evidence with personal examples of extensive professional interests and opportunities for further development. This was supported by a workload model and annual appraisal system. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

73. Prior to the inspection documentary evidence was reviewed by the inspection team

including the programme specification, module descriptors and mapping of the professional capabilities framework (PCF) and the professional standards.

74. During meetings with students and practice educators, whilst the professional standards were acknowledged, response to questions with respect to the course content and assessment focussed on the PCF.

75. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met, however, following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a [recommendation](#) in relation to 4.1. We recommend that the course makes explicit in all student-facing documentation and information the requirement to demonstrate the necessary knowledge and skills to meet professional standards.

Standard 4.2

76. When the inspection team met with them, the employer stakeholder representatives in attendance said that they had not been involved in consultations around the new courses or course monitoring activity. Documentary evidence included details of employer stakeholders who were involved in teaching on the course but didn't demonstrate their involvement in ongoing development and review of the curriculum.

77. As outlined in standard 3.5, during the meeting with people with lived experience of social work, nobody at the meeting had experience of engaging in anything specific relating to the design of the new version of the BSc. and MSc. or the ongoing development of courses. However, one member of the group told the inspection team about involvement in the development and delivery of a module. The group did tell the inspection team how they were involved in the development of the admissions process.

78. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.2 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 4.3

79. During meetings with support staff at the university the inspection team heard about the diverse range of support available to students, including academic skills training that can be provided within the context of specific modules at tutor request and pastoral services for health, well-being and mental well-being.

80. A recording was provided in evidence introducing students to the ways in which the portal interface could accommodate neurodiversity with changing fonts, colours and backgrounds to text.

81. Documentary evidence outlined research and practice that the academic lecturers were involved in to pursue human rights goals, including work with people with learning disabilities, decolonising the curriculum, working with gypsies and travellers and working with asylum seekers. This activity was confirmed during meetings with the course team. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

82. Documentary evidence was provided prior to inspection that outlined activities that lecturers are involved in to maintain knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice. One staff member has recently completed their doctorate and another staff member is in the process of completing theirs. The inspection team were also advised that new staff complete the PGCert in teaching in higher education.

83. During the meeting with the course team they explained the various ways they maintain currency within the courses in relation to learning from national and local profile serious case reviews, recent case law and changes to professional regulations. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

84. In narrative provided as documentary evidence, the inspection team were advised that students have a practice educator when on placement, to enable them to link theory and practice and assess this ability. Their learning opportunities are set out in their practice learning agreement, a copy of the agreement form was included in evidence.

85. Programme specifications supplied outlined where students had the opportunity to apply research, theory, evidence and knowledge in applying social work theory and practice.

86. When it was discussed during the meeting with students, they appeared to understand the relevance of what they learn in the academic setting and that theoretical perspectives have relevance to what they do in placement. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

87. The inspection team were told that there is multi-disciplinary working in the placement area for students. They were told about multi-disciplinary activities for joint learning in the academic arena but said that opportunities were limited and optional. The experiences were particularly memorable and valued with some hoping it could occur more often.

88. Narrative and evidence provided prior to the inspection outlined a longer-term strategy to develop cross teaching.

89. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a [recommendation](#) in relation to 4.6. We recommend that further development of university-based collaborative learning and exposure to other students from allied professionals (police, nursing, teaching) on professional perspectives of multi-disciplinary working on a common situation is considered (e.g. adult/child safeguarding, mental health, domestic violence, developing neighbourhoods).

Standard 4.7

90. During the meeting with students the inspection team were advised that when students miss taught sessions, they usually catch up online. They explained that on some occasions very few students attended. They voiced that this has an impact on opportunities for those in attendance. They advised that students could sign in online when they aren't in attendance and that monitoring is inconsistent. They note the disparity between positive actions taken for pursuing remediation by a student when a placement/skills taught session is missed compared to missing an academic module session.

91. The inspection team were given a demonstration of the academic engagement dashboard which is a multifunctional database that includes recording student achievement, progress and attendance. Administrative staff managing dashboard can respond to what each course requires for access and monitoring in the context of student attendance.

92. During the meeting with the course team we were advised that student absence from skills days is followed up by course tutors and self-directed work allocated, which is not always directly supervised and monitored.

93. Attendance was said to be particularly problematic for year one students and the course team use attendance data to follow up on those with below 60 percent attendance.

94. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 4.7 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, 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 [proposed outcome](#) section. (This condition links to standard 5.6).

Standard 4.8

95. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection outlined a range of assessment methods including essays, reports, reflective pieces, conceptual map, posters and a group

presentation. Academic Quality and Development Assessment Regulations were also provided. Discussion during meetings triangulated the evidence seen. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

96. Documentary evidence included the mapping of modules to learning outcomes, the Professional Capabilities Framework and the Professional Standards and they show academic progression. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

97. During a meeting with students the inspection team were told by a number of participants that timely, and on the whole, useful feedback is provided.

98. Documentary evidence included a Placement Feedback Template and external examiner feedback. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

99. During the meeting with the course team, the inspection team were advised that there is an external examiner appointed for each course. Documentary evidence included prior to the inspection included a CV for one of the external examiners and academic staff involved in marking. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

100. Documentary evidence provided detailed how academic progression occurs through assignment marking and moderation as set out in Academic Assessment Regulations for Taught Programmes.

101. When the inspection team met with the course team, they were told that they continue to respond to external examiner feedback on marking inconsistencies, improving the quality and timeliness of feedback for student academic work through staff facilitated workshops and discussing parity marking exercises. Work is ongoing to identify early any student who is failing and support them to access appropriate support to remediate, either through tutorial support or referral services.

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

Standard 4.13

103. Documentary evidence included module specifications, in particular details of a module introduced at Level 4 'Research for Social Work Practice', and how students can apply that knowledge to an independent study module. Students talked about their experience of

independent research and relating theory to practice, they also talked about using library services to find papers.

104. Members of the course team told the inspection team about research projects they were currently involved in. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

105. When they met with students, the inspection team confirmed that they knew of arrangements for making reasonable adjustments in the university and placement areas. They understood how to access disability services and the various routes for help available in relation to academic skills, health and wellbeing, mental wellbeing and financial support. Some students said they had a Smart Buddy to help orientate to student life.

106. Representatives from student support services told the inspection team about the extensive and varied opportunities to access help for academic and pastoral reasons. Services are signposted to students in multiple ways including social media and mass email.

107. The inspection team were told about pastoral services for health, wellbeing and mental wellbeing. This included counselling with appointments available every day, resilience building workshops and ongoing referral to other services if required. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

108. When speaking to the inspection team, representatives from student support services explained that academic skills training can be provided within the context of specific modules at tutor request, on a 1:1 basis, drop-in clinics or through group workshops. Skills on research, digital skills, referencing and academic writing are available. Students can be referred by a member of academic staff or self-refer. Access is through multiple options including an online booking system. Short and long term laptop loans can be arranged.

109. The inspection team were also told about a designated advisor for students with challenged backgrounds to enable accessing university, and proactive support for those students with additional responsibilities, such as carers, including sourcing placements nearer home. The service has a specific money team that manages financial hardship funds and travel costs where students are not in receipt of a NHS bursary. They will assist students who may be eligible for benefits.

110. The inspection team were told how the academic engagement dashboard can facilitate early detection of disengaging students, which can prompt course staff and trigger contact emails and supportive mechanisms. They were also told about the student support success service that offers extensive employment and career development advice. This includes life-long support after leaving higher education. They cited examples of former students accessing their service years after graduation. The inspection team agreed that this

standard was met.

Standard 5.3

111. Documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection included a copy of the university's FtP policy and evidence of how a FtP case was managed and resolved.

112. The preparation for practice video provided as evidence outlined to students that there may be occasion where another DBS check is required in addition to that gained at the admission stage, prior to a placement.

113. During a meeting with the course team they explained the process for investigating and addressing issues related student FtP with an example that involved representation from stakeholder employers. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

114. During a meeting with student support staff the inspection team were advised that a student need disclosure initiates occupational health access if needed and can trigger joint consideration for support from the disability services team. This includes negotiation with the course team and may involve assisting with a disability student allowance application. Placement support is led by the faculty in conjunction with the placement area.

115. As outlined in standard 5.1 students were clear about knowing how to make requests for reasonable adjustments. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

116. Documentary evidence included a copy of an email sent to students which provided a link to Social Work England's website and details for registration. Skills day booklets provided include information about continued professional development and lifelong learning. The orientation to practice MS Teams recording includes information about placements and processes.

117. During the inspection the inspection team were shown a demonstration of the 'InPlace' system which provides information to students on their placements and assessments. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.6

118. Documentary evidence reviewed by the inspection team indicated that every module is a core module, and 100% attendance is required.

119. During meetings with the course team and support staff, the inspection team heard about the Academic Engagement Dashboard which is a multifunctional database that includes recording student achievement, progress and attendance. We were told that

students do not always log in to taught sessions and that information contained in the database may not be representative of what students are doing. Administrative staff managing Dashboard can respond to what each course requires for access and monitoring in the context of student attendance.

120. The course team believe a number of issues impact on students, affecting their attendance in University. These include post-Covid readjustments, cost-of-living crisis, carer responsibilities and financial issues necessitating student choice to work during the programme. Confidence is lacking in the university attendance recording systems and there was some reluctance to rely on it by the team. Attendance was said to be particularly problematic for year one students and the course team use attendance data to follow up on those with below 60 percent attendance.

121. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 5.6 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, 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 [proposed outcome](#) section. (This condition links to standard 4.7).

Standard 5.7

122. When the inspection team met with students, they said they receive timely and developmental feedback from tutors on their academic work with some ability to follow up for further clarification if necessary. Library and academic skills support is available through a booking system on an individual basis and skills acquisition is a component of some modules in workshop format. All students report the shift to online based resources and course information as being successful, but some found navigation problematic, as different modules do not follow a standardised format for populating the virtual learning environment with resources and information.

123. Documentary evidence included a copy of the Academic Assessment Regulations. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

124. Documentary evidence provided the inspection team with details about how academic appeals are managed via the central university academic appeals process. The Assessment Regulations and the Academic Appeals Regulations were provided. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

125. As the qualifying course(s) are a BSc. (Hons) Social Work and MSc. Social Work, 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	3.4	Develop and implement a strategy formalising engagement of employer stakeholders in all aspects of the course that includes monitoring, management and placement allocation.	Friday 4 August	Paragraph 58
2	3.5	Develop and implement a strategy for people with lived experience of social work that identifies processes for engagement, training and deployment in course activities including participation in monitoring, evaluation and monitoring systems.	Friday 4 August	Paragraph 64
3	4.2	Develop and implement a strategy for all stakeholders that incorporates them into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	Friday 4 August	Paragraph 78
4	4.7	Provide structured learning, supervision for students under the direction of an educator and monitoring for all missed University taught sessions.	Friday 4 August	Paragraph 94
5	5.6	Implement systems and actions to inform, monitor and actively manage all mandatory parts of the course.	Friday 4 August	Paragraph 121

Recommendations

In addition to the conditions above, the inspectors identified the following recommendations for the education provider. These recommendations highlight areas that

the education provider may wish to consider. The recommendations do not affect any decision relating to course approval.

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	1.5	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider standardises training in relation to EDI principles and bias for all people involved in admissions activities including introducing a system for recording this and periodic updates.	Paragraph 34
2	3.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider strengthening process, roles and accountability for course governance in supporting students that reduces potential conflict of interest.	Paragraph 50
3	4.1	The inspectors are recommending that the course makes explicit in all student facing documentation and information the requirement to demonstrate the necessary knowledge and skills to meet professional standards.	Paragraph 75
4	4.6	The inspectors recommend that further development of university-based collaborative learning and exposure to other students from allied professionals (police, nursing, teaching) on professional perspectives of multi-disciplinary working on a common situation is considered (e.g. adult/child safeguarding, mental health, domestic violence, developing neighbourhoods).	Paragraph 89

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			

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
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 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
ii) a minimum of one placement taking place within a statutory setting, providing experience of sufficient numbers of statutory social work tasks involving high risk decision making and legal interventions.			
2.2 Provide practice learning opportunities that enable students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
2.3 Ensure that while on placements, students have appropriate induction, supervision, support, access to resources and a realistic workload.	☒	☐	☐
2.4 Ensure that on placements, students' responsibilities are appropriate for their stage of education and training.	☒	☐	☐
2.5 Ensure that students undergo assessed preparation for direct practice to make sure they are safe to carry out practice learning in a service delivery setting.	☒	☐	☐
2.6 Ensure that practice educators are on the register and that they have the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	☒	☐	☐
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to 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	☐	☐	☒

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.			
3.2 Ensure that they have agreements with placement providers to provide education and training that meets the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards. This should include necessary consents and ensure placement providers have contingencies in place to deal with practice placement breakdown.	☒	☐	☐
3.3 Ensure that placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 Ensure that employers are involved in elements of the course, including but not limited to the management and monitoring of courses and the allocation of practice education.	☐	☒	☐
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.	☐	☒	☐
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which 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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
3.8 Ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, to deliver an effective course.	☒	☐	☐
3.9 Evaluate information about students' performance, progression and outcomes, such as the results of exams and assessments, by collecting, analysing and using student data, including data on equality and diversity.	☒	☐	☐
3.10 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice.	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum and assessment			
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.	☐	☐	☒
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	☐	☒	☐
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion 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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
4.5 Ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.6 Ensure that students are given the opportunity to work with, and learn from, other professions in order to support multidisciplinary working, including in integrated settings.	☐	☐	☒
4.7 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	☐	☒	☐
4.8 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students' progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☒	☐	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
progression including via direct observation of practice.			
4.13 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation.	☒	☐	☐
Supporting students			
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: I. confidential counselling services; II. careers advice and support; and III. occupational health services	☒	☐	☐
5.2 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their academic development including, for example, personal tutors.	☒	☐	☐
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☒	☐	☐
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
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	3.4	Develop and implement a strategy formalising engagement of employer stakeholders in all aspects of the course that includes monitoring, management and placement allocation.	Condition met
2	3.5	Develop and implement a strategy for people with lived experience of social work that identifies processes for engagement, training and deployment in course activities including participation in monitoring, evaluation and monitoring systems.	Condition met
3	4.2	Develop and implement a strategy for all stakeholders that incorporates them into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	Condition met
4	4.7	Provide structured learning, supervision for students under the direction of an educator and monitoring for all missed University taught sessions.	Condition met
5	5.6	Implement systems and actions to inform, monitor and actively manage all mandatory parts of the course.	Condition met

Findings

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

After the review of the documentary evidence, the inspection team are making the recommendation that all of the conditions set against the approval of the BSc. and MSc. Social Work courses are now met.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.4 the education provider submitted a Partnership Strategy and Placement Team Engagement Strategy, advising that the placement team engagement strategy had been developed by the team and will be overseen by the Social Work Partnership group, as set out in the Partnership Strategy. The inspectors noted that review meetings will be held three times a year.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.5 the education provider submitted a Partnership Strategy and a Strategy for People with Lived Experience, they advised that the Strategy for People with Lived Experience will be overseen by the Social Work Partnership group, as set out in the Partnership Strategy. The inspection team agreed that the action table in the Strategy for People with Lived Experience and the Terms of Reference in the Partnership Strategy provided adequate evidence for this condition.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.2 the education provider submitted a Partnership Strategy and Admissions Strategy, a Strategy for People with Lived Experience and minutes of the Winchester University Social Work Program Partner Meeting. The inspectors agreed that the evidence was sufficient to recommend approval of the condition, but would recommend that the education provider records the representative status of attendees at the and include an agenda item that Winchester University Social Work Program Partner Meeting and have a standing agenda item that relates to the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.7 the education provider submitted evidence that satisfied the structured learning element of the condition but initially the inspectors did not feel that this provided satisfactory evidence in relation to a process for attendance monitoring of the structured learning. The education provider subsequently provided narrative detail of a process and procedure to monitor and support student engagement, which the inspectors considered and recommend that the condition is now met.

In relation to the condition set against standard 5.6 the education provider submitted evidence relating to the placement days and required attendance and information relating to the skills days for the courses. The programme handbook and placement learning agreement outlined the number of placement days and attendance required. Narrative evidence supplied explained the monitoring and sign-off system. The template alternative learning form for skills days was provided indicating sign-off is required.

Regulator decision

Conditions approved.