



Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Leeds

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work

Inspection dates: 14-16 April 2026

Report date:	10 June 2026
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	10 July 2026
Date conditions met and approved:	

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do	3
Summary.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Language	5
Inspection	6
Meetings with students	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Meetings with course staff.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment.....	9
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality	12
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	15
Standard five: Supporting students	19
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	22
Proposed outcome	23
Conditions	23
Recommendations	24
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	25
Regulator decision	32
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	32
Findings	33

Introduction

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

What we do

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

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

officer if they have any queries that may be able to be addressed in advance of the inspection.

9. During this time a draft plan for the inspection is developed and shared with the education provider, to make sure it is achievable at the point of inspection.

10. Once the inspectors and officer are satisfied that an inspection can take place, this is usually undertaken over a three- or four-day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards.

11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval.

12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final decision about the approval of the course.

13. The decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.

14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. Course details: The University of Leeds wish to run a three year BA (Hons) Social Work programme.

Inspection ID	ULECPP158
Course provider	University of Leeds
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of Study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	50
Proposed first intake	September 2026
Date of inspection	14-16 April 2026
Inspection team	Kate McEleny (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Monica Murphy (Lay Inspector) Stephen Stericker (Registrant Inspector)

Language

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

Inspection

17. An onsite inspection took place from 14th to 16th April 2026 at the University of Leeds, where the education provider is based. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

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

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with students on the current BA course at all 3 levels of study. Discussions included admissions, teaching, support, feedback and placements.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course team, admissions team and placement team.

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 course. Discussions included involvement in admissions, design, content and review of the course.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with one independent practice educator who was employed by the course provider, as well as employer partners from local authorities, and the voluntary sector.

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. The course provider presented a comprehensive admissions process to the inspection team. The process included an interview, group exercise and a written exercise.

26. The process demonstrated applicants who were successful had appropriate ICT skills due to the online component. There was also a requirement for applicants to have appropriate qualifications in English, which evidenced applicants has a good command of the language.

27. The inspection team agreed that overall, the admissions process enabled applicants to demonstrate they had the skills necessary to fulfil this standard via the three stages mentioned above.

28. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 1.2

29. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection demonstrated that prior relevant experience was considered during the admissions process, as part of the interview and group exercise.

30. The inspectors triangulated this during the inspection and heard examples of what was considered as relevant prior experience from the admissions team.

31. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard 1.3

32. When considering involvement of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work (PWLE) in the admissions process, the inspectors read that PWLE were part of the interview panel and were involved in formulating interview questions and the group/written tasks.

33. The inspection team met with PWLE as part of the inspection, and the above information was triangulated and confirmed.

34. In relation to employer partners and placement provider involvement, the inspection team heard from the admissions team that engagement was inconsistent in relation to involvement in interviews and contributing to admissions activities and processes.

35. Whilst the stakeholders who met with us were involved, the inspectors heard from the course team that there were biannual meeting involving employers where feedback was sought on the interview questions.

36. Based on discussions with employer partners and the course team, inspection team did not feel assured there was consistent involvement of employer partners or practitioners.

37. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 1.3 in relation to the approval of this course.

38. 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 1.4

39. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated there was a process in place for DBS and occupational health checks, and applicants were required to submit a Declaration of Health and Character form. This was triangulated during the inspection with the admissions team and students.

40. The inspection team also there were processes to consider candidates with convictions prior to any offer of a place on the course that included consultation with placement representation. This was also confirmed by employers, and the inspection team were satisfied with the steps taken to consider an applicant's suitability.

41. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 1.5

42. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors saw relevant policies the course provider had for EDI in admissions.

43. As part of the inspection, the course team demonstrated, via a presentation, that they held EDI data, and this was monitored and reviewed.

44. The inspectors heard that EDI training was provided to staff, and reasonable adjustments were made to applicants where necessary.

45. The inspection team felt assured that the application process was accessible and agreed the standard was met.

Standard 1.6

46. Documentary evidence provided included a presentation provided at selection event, and the public facing university website.

47. Current students report they felt they had sufficient information, at application stage, to make an informed choice about whether to accept a place on the course, and there wasn't anything they felt surprised by once they started the course.

48. The inspection team agreed that all areas required by the standard were covered, however, student/public facing information in relation to course content was incorrect as the website information was out of date regarding modules and practice learning. Additionally, the website incorrectly identifies the year one work experience as placement.

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

50. 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 two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

51. Documentary evidence provided prior to inspection demonstrated that a 100 day and 70 day contrasting placement was completed as part of the requirement for students to complete 200 days in a practice setting.

52. Documentation also indicated there were an appropriate number of skills days, however the inspection team felt unclear about this particular aspect and were keen to explore this further.

53. During the inspection, the placement team explained that students completed 30+ skills days, which included shadowing and work experience.

54. The inspection team were satisfied that the 200 days was appropriately monitored, with contingencies in place if days were missed. Students were aware of the attendance requirement and what to do should they miss a skills or placement day.

55. The inspectors explored whether appropriate consent was gained for students to work with service users.

56. During triangulation at inspection, the inspection team heard conflicting evidence regarding whether appropriate consent was gained. The discussions were sufficient to assure that the standard was met but led to a recommendation from the inspection team.

57. The inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 2.1. We recommend that the need for consent for shadowing, work experience of placement is documented.

Standard 2.2

58. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated there were mechanisms in place for ensuring placements had appropriate learning opportunities. This included there being certain requirements for statutory placements, and a practice learning agreement which facilitated identification of learning opportunities.

59. The inspection team felt assured there were an adequate number of placements and the placement team were able to consider which placements were appropriate for each student.

60. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 2.3

61. The Practice Module Handbook was provided in advance of the inspection which identified a requirement for students to receive placement induction and frequent supervision where workload was reviewed.

62. Current students reported receiving adequate and appropriate induction which included being given relevant policies and procedures. They also confirmed they had regular supervision and an appropriate workload

63. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard 2.4

64. Inspectors reviewed the practice learning agreement provided as part of the documentary evidence submission and felt that this document had focus on ensuring

the students placement responsibilities were appropriate for their stage of education and training.

65. During the inspection, students reported feeling that they knew what was and wasn't appropriate in relation to their responsibilities as a student. The inspection team heard from that students' progress was reviewed to ensure their responsibilities were appropriate.

66. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 2.5

67. The inspection team reviewed documentary evidence which demonstrated students undertook a readiness for practice module before going on placement. The module included assessment which had to be passed to commence placement.

68. The inspection team were keen to explore the module further during the inspection and heard that it was completed prior to students going to their work experience, which formed part of the skills days. The inspection team felt that the assessment ensured students had the required skills and were prepared for placement.

69. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard 2.6

70. Documentary evidence and narrative provided prior to inspection clearly demonstrated there was a robust process in place for ensuring practice educators were on the register and had appropriate knowledge and experience as per the requirements of the standard.

71. The course provider held a document which contained all relevant information on practice educators, and this was checked as part of each placement cycle.

72. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 2.7

73. Documentary evidence demonstrated there were relevant policies/guidance on whistleblowing in place. The inspection team also noted there was a skills day which focused on creating a safe space for students to learn in.

74. Students confirmed they were aware of whistleblowing policies, and these were introduced to them as part of their placement induction.

75. The inspection team were satisfied that the standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

76. The inspection team saw an organisational staff chart prior to the inspection, and as part of the inspection, the senior leadership team were able to provide additional detail on this.

77. The inspection team agreed there were clear lines of accountability and the governance processes in place were comprehensive. They also felt there were adequate staffing resources to successfully run the course.

78. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.2

79. Documentary evidence provided prior to inspection included a placement audit form, memorandum of understanding, the placement handbook and information on the practice assessment panel (PAP).

80. The inspection team felt assured that relationships with placement providers were well established, and the course provider had confidence in the standard of placements offered. This was supported by the placement audit form.

81. The practice educator the inspection team met with informed there was a process in place for escalating placement concerns where necessary, which included a referral to the PAP.

82. The inspection team heard that placements were reviewed at the midpoint, to ensure that the appropriate learning opportunities were provided to students.

83. Additionally, the inspection team heard there was a process in place for dealing with placement breakdowns.

84. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.3

85. The inspection team were directed to public facing information provided by the course provider on policies for student health, wellbeing and risk.

86. The inspectors agreed there was appropriate and adequate support available to students while on placement which was formed not only from policies, but the placement induction.

87. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.4

89. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated that employer stakeholders were involved at a strategic level in the course relating to management and monitoring through the curriculum review sub-group of the teaching partnership.

90. During the inspection, the course team informed that employers were also involved in the course as guest lecturers, and the inspection team heard from employer partners that they were involved in allocating students to placements.

91. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.5

92. The inspection team felt that overall, documentary evidence provided was insufficient to be assured systems were in place for monitoring, evaluating and improving the course.

93. In relation to student involvement, the inspection team were satisfied there was adequate provision for the inclusion of students. There was evidence of improvements made because of student involvement feedback as part of the annual programme review. In addition to this, students fed into the course via the staff-student partnership, programme management group, module evaluations and the student representative system.

94. The inspection team were less clear about how employers were involved. The inspector's heard employers were involved in the curriculum review group however there was no evidence to demonstrate the content of these meetings.

95. The inspectors understood that employers were involved in teaching and developing the curriculum but were not satisfied there was sufficient evidence to be assured these constituted a systematic and robust process that resulted in contributions and effective improvements.

96. Overall, the inspectors felt there was not sufficient involvement of employers in the required monitoring, evaluation and improvement of the course, as there was no clear documentation or audit trail to support this.

97. In relation to involvement of PWLE, there was evidence of their involvement in the programme management group (PMG) which met 5 times each year. However, minutes provided indicated PWLE only attended once over a 19-month period, and the inspectors agreed there was not consistent involvement.

98. 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 proposed outcome section](#).

Standard 3.6

99. Documentary evidence demonstrated that the number of students admitted to the course was subject to review by the course provider and teaching partnership and aligned with relevant organisational strategy.

100. During the inspection, the inspectors were assured there were sufficient placements to accommodate all students on the course, and there were no concerns regarding this in the future.

101. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.7

102. Documentary evidence demonstrated that the course was led by a registered social worker, and they had appropriate experience and qualifications to carry out the role.

103. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.8

104. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the academic staff CVs, which showed they were appropriately qualified and experienced.

105. The inspection team felt there was a range of experience across the team, and in relation to staff numbers, this was appropriate in relation to the number of students on the course.

106. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.9

107. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection demonstrated there were mechanisms in place to evaluate information concerning student performance, progression and outcomes.

108. During the inspection the course team gave examples of how progress was reviewed, and this included through the practice assessment panel, and through external examiner reports.

109. The inspection team were assured that EDI data was considered when measuring performance and agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.10

110. Documentary evidence demonstrated there were processes in place for staff to individually develop.

111. The inspection team understood that staff were supported to maintain their currency and develop their skills and knowledge and were provided with 10 days per year to do this.

112. The inspection team heard some examples of development opportunities from the course team, which included obtaining further qualifications and conducting relevant research.

113. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

114. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated that the programme specification and the modules mapped learning to the professional capabilities' framework and Social Work England professional standards. In addition to this, the inspectors noted that the modules were mapped to formative and summative assessments learning outcomes and skills outcomes.

115. When meeting with students, the inspectors were told they were clear about the links between theory and practice, and they knew about the professional standards.

116. Triangulation of evidence provided reassurance to the inspection team that the placements were aligned to the professional standards.

117. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.2

118. Inspection team reviewed documentary evidence which demonstrated the development of the curriculum was done in conjunction with employers and PWLE. Employers also informed the inspection team that they were involved in workshops about curriculum design.

119. The inspection team noted that there was a strategy for the involvement of PWLE at the time of the inspection. However, the strategy was due to terminate within the

year. Through discussions the inspectors understood that the course provider valued the input of PWLE, and had plans to develop co-creation with PWLE, but acknowledged that this had not been developed at the point of inspection.

120. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 4.2. We recommend that the course provider integrate the key principles of co-production in coming to a common understanding of co-production for incorporating PWLE and employers/practitioners in the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.

Standard 4.3

121. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection demonstrated that the course was designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.

122. There was a module on anti-oppressive practice and social justice perspective, and the inspector saw how PWLE would be included in the modules.

123. During the inspection, the inspectors were able to triangulate with the course team who explained how they incorporated legislation and research into their roles.

124. Additionally, there was a range of health and wellbeing support available to students, and they were encouraged to promote their wellbeing

125. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard 4.4

126. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors read that the Curriculum Review Group ensured that the course content remained accurate, relevant and up to date.

127. The inspectors were keen to hear more about how the course provider kept the course up to date, and heard from the course team how they regularly brought in practitioners to ensure the content of teaching was contemporary and current. This was triangulated with employer partners who gave examples of how feedback they had offered was taken on board.

128. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.5

129. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the module specifications which demonstrated that theory was an area of focus on the course. In addition to this, the placement handbook specified the requirements of the practice educator to link theory to practice during placement.

130. The inspection team felt that integration of theory and practice was demonstrated within the curriculum, and this was further confirmed by practice educators and students during the inspection.

131. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.6

132. Documentary evidence of interprofessional learning within the university setting was provided prior to inspection. Examples included via conferences and teaching sessions.

133. The inspectors agreed there were multiple opportunities for students to work with and learn from other professions in placements, during shadowing, and work experience (which formed skills days).

134. The inspection team were satisfied the standard was met.

Standard 4.7

135. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection outlined taught hours, and hours which were spent on independent study.

136. The inspection team agreed that evidence presented demonstrated that the hours spent in structured academic learning was appropriate and sufficient to enable students to meet the professional standards.

137. It was also agreed there was an appropriate expectation around attendance and there was an adequate process in place for if learning was missed.

138. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.8

139. Documentary evidence provided included an assessment strategy and a map which detailed the difference range of assessments.

140. The inspection team understood that the external examiner reviewed samples of student work related to academic assessments, but there was no external oversight of placement portfolios. Despite this, the inspectors felt assured assessments were robust, fair, reliable, and valid.

141. The inspection team felt that methods of assessments for the modules enabled students to demonstrate their analytical and evaluative skills.

142. During the inspection, the course team explained how learning was scaffolded over the duration of the course and the inspectors felt the curriculum and associated

assessments enabled students to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional requirements standards.

143. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met, but following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 4.8. We recommend that a mechanism of externality is introduced, in relation to the oversight of student placement portfolio assessment submissions.

Standard 4.9

144. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the programme assessment map and assessment strategy.

145. During the inspection, the course team demonstrated that they had improved the sequencing of assessments to match students' progression

146. The inspectors understood that information on assessments was made available to students through the digital learning environment.

147. The inspectors agreed that assessments were mapped to the curriculum and the standard was met.

Standard 4.10

148. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors had sight of a marking criteria which was followed in relation to marking assessments.

149. They also reviewed the external examiners report which commented positively on assessment feedback

150. Students confirmed that feedback was timely and meaningful. They also explained that if they wanted additional feedback, they advised they could approach their tutor or module lead for this.

151. The inspectors agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.11

152. The inspection team reviewed evidence demonstrating there was an adequate process for recruiting external examiners

153. The inspection team were satisfied that the external examiner for the education provider was appropriately qualified, registered with Social Work England, and experienced to oversee the course assessment and marking methods.

154. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

155. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated that there were appropriate processes in place to manage student progression, and that there were mechanisms in place to identify and track students at risk of failure.

156. Feedback was not only provided by the course team, but by PWLE and PEs and this was discussed and confirmed in the relevant inspection meetings.

157. It was also made clear that Placement portfolios required direct observation of practice and feedback from PWLE.

158. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.13

159. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated the professional standards were mapped throughout the course, and research informed both theoretical modules and practice.

160. During the inspection, students advised they knew the importance of evidence-informed practice, and they told the inspection team they were supported in their learning through input including from library services that helped them analyse and evaluate evidence.

161. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

162. Documentary evidence provided demonstrated there was a vast range of support available to students.

163. During the inspection the inspection team were told about Confidential counselling services, careers advice and support, and occupational health services.

164. The inspection explored how students could access services and were advised students could self-refer.

165. The inspection team felt that signposting to relevant support service was clear, and students confirmed they were aware of support available to them.

166. The inspection team felt support services were extensive and agreed the standard was met.

Standard 5.2

167. In addition to support referred to above, additional documentary evidence provided prior to inspection confirmed students had an Academic Personal Tutor, where contact was a minimum of 4 times per year, and was available in both group settings, and on a 1:1 basis.

168. During the inspection, the inspectors heard from support staff about the range of support available from the library and agreed this was supportive of academic development.

169. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 5.3

170. Prior to the inspection, evidence was submitted which demonstrated there was a procedure for student declarations/DBS checks. Expectations around declarations was made clear in the student handbook, and students were expected to complete a declarations form at the beginning of each academic year.

171. This information was triangulated with students during the inspection, who confirmed they were aware of the expectations and procedures in place.

172. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 5.4

173. Documentation submitted ahead of the inspection made clear that there was a process in place for making supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments.

174. During the inspection, the inspection team heard that in addition to the overall university student support services, there were additional mechanisms in place for students on placement. Each student had a practice learning agreement for their placement, which could include reasonable adjustments or additional support if necessary.

175. In addition to the practice learning agreement, students could have specific reasonable adjustment plans and the inspection team heard examples of adjustments that had been made for students.

176. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 5.5

178. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors reviewed what information was available to students, from a range of sources. These included the public facing website, the virtual learning environments, and handbooks.

179. In addition to this, the inspectors heard about what information is provided to students as part of the inspection. The inspectors heard that recall days incorporated information on the Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE), and student support services confirmed they provide employment information to students on the transition to becoming registered social worker.

180. The inspectors were satisfied information was provided to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

181. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 5.6

182. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed a student guide which highlighted which elements of the course were mandatory.

183. During the inspection students confirmed they knew what was mandatory and this included 170 placement days and 30 skills days.

184. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 5.7

189. Prior to the inspection, the inspectors had sight of a marking criteria which was followed in relation to marking assessments.

190. They also reviewed the external examiners report which commented positively on assessment feedback

191. Students confirmed that feedback was timely and meaningful. They also explained that if they wanted additional feedback, they could approach their tutor or module lead for this.

192. The inspectors agreed the standard was met.

Standard 5.8

193. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection demonstrated the university had an academic appeals process which was available to students

194. When the inspection team met with students during the inspection week, they confirmed they knew where to find the policy.

195. The inspection team were satisfied that the standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

196. As the qualifying course is BA (Hons) 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 are binding and must be met by the education provider within the agreed timescales.

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 1.3	The education provider will provide evidence that they have a formalised plan to involve employer partners and practitioners in the admissions process	10 October 2026	1.3
2	Standard 3.5	The education provider will provide an implementation plan that it can have documented audit trails that ensure regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place that include stakeholder employers and PWLE	10 October 2026	3.5
3	Standard 1.6	The education provider will provide evidence that student facing information is accurate.	10 October 2026	1.6

Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	Standard 2.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider that the consent requirement for shadowing, work experience and placement is documented for placement providers and students.	2.1
	Standard 4.2	The inspectors are recommending the course provider integrate the key principles of co-production in coming to a common understanding of co-production for incorporating PWLE and employers/practitioners in the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	4.2
2	Standard 4.8	The inspectors are recommending that a mechanism of externality is introduced, in relation to the oversight of student placement portfolio assessment submissions.	4.8

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

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

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

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

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

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

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendati on given
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.	☒	☐	☐
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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendati on given
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 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendati on given
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.	☒	☐	☐
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			

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
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 the [education and training standards](#).

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1			
2			
3			

Findings