

# Inspection Report

<b>Inspection ID</b>	UHUR1_BCP340
<b>Course provider</b>	University of Huddersfield
<b>Validating body (if different)</b>	
<b>Course inspected</b>	Best Interest Assessor
<b>Mode of study</b>	
<b>Maximum student cohort</b>	40
<b>Date of inspection</b>	13 – 14 January 2026
<b>Inspection team</b>	Kate Springett (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Sarah McAnulty (Lay Inspector) Mary – Clare Davidson (BIA Registrant Inspector)
<b>Inspector recommendation</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Regulator decision:</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Date of Regulator decision:</b>	27 April 2026
<b>Link to conditions table</b>	<a href="#">Conditions</a>
<b>Date conditions met and approved:</b>	TBC

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Summary of Inspection.....	3
Inspection Findings.....	4
Outcome .....	16
<b>Conditions</b> .....	17
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	19
Meeting of Conditions.....	20
Findings .....	20

## 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 approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses. We approve courses against these standards to ensure that students who successfully complete a BIA course can meet the requirements set out in the Mental Capacity Act 2005, Schedule A1 and 1A, the Mental Capacity (Deprivation of Liberty: Standard Authorisations, Assessments and Ordinary Residence) Regulations 2008 and the 6 BIA capabilities as described in Annex 1 to the education and training approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses.

2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. This will include a registered inspector who will be a qualified BIA, and a lay inspector who is not BIA qualified. These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review documentary information and evidence, and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, observations, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, 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 Children and Social Work Act 2017, [The Social Workers Regulations 2018 - Social Work England](#) , and our [Education and Training Rules 2019](#).

4. In this document we describe the University of Huddersfield as ‘the course provider’ and we describe the Best Interests Assessor as ‘the course’.

## Summary of Inspection

5. The University of Huddersfield’s Best Interests Assessor’s course was inspected as part of Social Work England’s reapproval cycle, whereby all course providers with BIA courses will be inspected against the new education and training approval standards for BIA courses.

6. A remote inspection took place from 13 – 14 January 2026.

7. As part of this process we gathered feedback from key stakeholders through meetings on inspection. This included the BIA course team, admissions team, and an employer partner. Written feedback was also gathered from students and people with lived experience (PWLE) in advance of the inspection. The PWLE group were known as the PPG (Public Partnership Group) by the course provider.

## Inspection Findings

8. In this section we set out the inspectors' findings in relation to whether the course meets the education and training approval standards for BIA courses. We describe the inspection team in this section as 'we'.

<b>Standard 1. Admissions</b>	<b>Met or not met.</b>
<p>1.1 Confirm that applicants have:</p> <p>i. the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the 6 BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards.</p> <p>ii. the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice.</p> <p>iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.2 Confirm that applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.3 Confirm that applicants have, and can demonstrate, suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation, and demonstrable experience of understanding risk in relation to these.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.4 Confirm that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.5 Ensure that employers, providers of observation opportunities, people with lived experience, and carers are involved in admissions processes.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.6 Ensure that the admissions processes include assessment of the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes appropriate criminal conviction checks.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.7 Ensure that there are equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.8 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place. This will include information about the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modes, location of study, assessment methods, duration, and observation requirements including the expectations around arranging or securing observation opportunities.</p>	<b>Met</b>

### Key observations for standard 1

9. The application process set by the course provider involved completion of a document called the application toolkit which was completed by the applicant and their sponsoring employers. The toolkit had several parts to it, which included; applicant details, application and interview, and expectations and declarations.

10. The course team told us that most applications were sponsored by an employer/local authority. We explored independent students with the course provider and were informed that independent applicants would be considered, however they would need to provide their own observation opportunities. Independent applicants were rare, however, they would be subject to the same requirements as sponsored applicants, should they apply. (1.1)

11. It was clear from evidence submitted (the application toolkit) and from discussions with the course team that there were clear expectations as to what experience was required from applicants to be successful in obtaining a place on the course. The requirement was either 2 years relevant experience or completing a module set by the course provider. (1.1)

12. The above criteria enabled the course provider to ensure applicants could demonstrate suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation, have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the BIA capabilities and eligibility criteria, and have adequate ICT skills. (1.1, 1.3). We also noted that legal literacy was demonstrated by the applicant via questions in the application toolkit. (1.4)

13. There was a process in place whereby the applicant's relevant registration was checked, and this was done as part of the admissions process. In addition to this, students were made aware that they must inform the course provider should their registration status change. (1.2)

14. In relation to stakeholder involvement in the admission process, it was clear that employers led on the admissions process. (1.5)

15. Not only are employers involved in interviews, but we saw minutes of a meeting with the course provider and a local authority which discussed the development of the admissions process. (1.5)

16. We also heard that PWLE were involved in and were consulted about the development of questions. (1.5)

17. During the inspection, the course provider also acknowledged PWLE should be included in further design and review of the admissions process going forwards and this is recommended by the inspectors.

18. In relation to applicants conduct, character and health, the application toolkit made it clear that a DBS was required, and we heard during the inspection that this was checked by the admissions team as well as the sponsoring employer, where applicable.

<p>19. We also heard that there was a process in place should something concerning conduct, character or health be declared by the applicants, or flagged on the DBS. (1.6)</p> <p>20. EDI policies were available to applicants and the admissions team explained during the inspection that applicants were invited to declare if they required additional support or reasonable adjustments. (1.7)</p> <p>21. Whilst we agreed EDI data was considered, there was acknowledgement this was challenging at course level due to low numbers.</p> <p>22. We were satisfied applicants were given all information they required to make an informed choice about whether to accept a place on the course. This was provided on the course provider website, at course events and in the application toolkit. (1.8)</p>	
<p><b>Standard 2. Course governance, management and quality.</b></p>	<p><b>Met or not met</b></p>
<p>2.1 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 delivering, resourcing and managing the quality of the course.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>
<p>2.2 Ensure that effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with relevant lived experience including carers, and students.</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>see key observations for standard 2 for further information</i></p>
<p>2.3 Ensure that admissions are aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of: i. wherever appropriate, local and regional capacity for observation opportunities; and ii. the availability of part-time or other flexible course arrangements to widen access wherever possible.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>
<p>2.4 Ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course is a relevant qualified professional (social worker, occupational therapist, psychologist or nurse) with appropriate experience of BIA practice.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>
<p>2.5 Ensure that there is adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>
<p>2.6 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation and policy, including recent developments, and the practical</p>	<p><b>Met</b></p>

application of this via the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, including giving support to undertake continuing professional development relevant to their role.	
2.7 Ensure that students have the opportunity to provide feedback about the course and that this feedback is analysed, shared with employers and others involved in commissioning places on the course, and used to inform the management and development of the course.	<b>Met</b>
<p><b>Key observations for standard 2.</b></p> <p>23. As part of the documentary review, we saw there was a clear management structure which set out roles and responsibilities regarding governance. Overall, the inspectors felt that there was provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, as not only were there BIA and social work qualified lecturers, but there were also visiting lecturers who contributed to the teaching on the course. (2.1, 2.5)</p> <p>24. We also were provided with details of the person with overall professional responsibility for the course, and they were a qualified BIA and undertook complex case work. (2.4)</p> <p>25. The course lead was responsible for the delivery of teaching and marking the assessments and whilst this was accepted, the inspectors recommend there was a contingency in place to ensure delivery of the curriculum and consistent marking, should they be unavailable. (2.5)</p> <p>26. There was a requirement for the course provider to effectively monitor, evaluate and improve the course, with input from employers, PWLE and students. We saw evidence of student input via feedback at the midpoint, and end of the course and evidence submitted prior to the inspection event demonstrated feedback was considered/reviewed at a course committee meeting and would be discussed at an annual review meeting. (2.7)</p> <p>27. The plans to hold an annual review meeting would also include the involvement of employers and they would provide feedback on the course, including the admissions process and feedback from their sponsored students/employees.</p> <p>28. It was unclear how PWLE would be involved in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement of the course. We saw and heard that the course team hoped to develop a regular review of the teaching via their group of PWLE at the university and be part of the above-mentioned annual review. We agreed that there needed to be clearer plans in terms of PWLE involvement, and we concluded that standard 2.2 was therefore not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the proposed outcome section, therefore recommended a condition against this standard. (2.2)</p> <p>29. We heard that the course provider considered capacity and that provision was in place to accommodate 40 students. This was aligned to resourcing and teaching capacity. We also heard that the course provider had access to visiting lecturers, should they be required. We heard that</p>	

shadowing opportunities had to be undertaken to access the course and for sponsored applicants, these were provided by their local authority. (2.3)

30. In relation to maintaining currency and undertaking continuing professional development we heard that the course provider is supportive of this. We heard about how the BIA lead was given time to undertake CPD. They attended BIA partnership forums, shadowed BIAs within local authorities, and maintained practice by working part time at Calderdale council, which contributed to maintaining their knowledge. (2.6)

<b>Standard 3. Observation opportunities.</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
<p>3.1 Ensure that each student has the opportunity to undertake a minimum of 2 practice observation opportunities which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. enables the student to shadow a BIA or community DoLS assessment.</li> <li>ii. provide practice experience that can be applied to a variety of settings and types of supervisory body.</li> <li>iii. enables the student to observe a suitably qualified and experienced relevant qualified professional who has relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to demonstrate safe and effective practice.</li> <li>iv. enables the student to produce a detailed analysis of relevant practice issues which forms part of the student’s overall assessment.</li> </ul>	<b>Met</b>
<p>3.2 Ensure that the number, duration and range of observation opportunities is appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>3.3 Maintain clear collaborative arrangements for planning and communication with providers including a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities.</p>	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 3 for further information</i>
<p><b>Key observations for standard 3.</b></p> <p>31. There is a clear expectation from the course provider that 2 observation opportunities must be undertaken, and this was outlined in the application toolkit, which is part of the admissions process, as well as the shadowing guidance provided to employers.</p> <p>32. Documentation provided as part of the evidence submission stated the observations must be contrasting and examples of appropriate opportunities were provided.</p>	

33. There was an expectation that a form was completed by the BIA logging the observation opportunity, and we heard that the module lead reviewed these to check quality and contrast. (3.1, 3.2)

34. We felt that the observations enabled students to give a detailed analysis of relevant practice issues which forms part of the student’s overall assessment, however the inspectors felt students would benefit further from there being a documented opportunity to reflect on their shadowing experience as they undertook this. The inspectors recommend the course provider introduce a reflection document students could complete during their observations. (3.1)

35. There must be clear collaborative arrangements for planning and communication with providers including a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities. When we explored these areas, the inspectors reported there were gaps. The inspectors agreed there needed to be documentation in place to ensure and check appropriate consent is gained prior to students attending observation opportunities. They also felt it needed to be made clear to employers and students that observation opportunities can be completed a maximum of 12 months prior to starting the course. The inspectors also felt that the two observation opportunities were not robustly documented.

36. We concluded that standard 3.3 was therefore not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the proposed outcome section (3.3)

37. The inspectors identified during the evidence review that there was not a process in place for ensuring consent was obtained by the provider for the student to shadow. This was explored as part of the inspection and when discussed with the course provider, we heard consent is obtained but there was no documented process in relation to this. We also understood from the inspection event that whilst observations could be completed, a maximum of 12 months prior to the start of the course, this was not documented and made clear to students and/or providers (3.3).

38. We understood that should both shadowing experiences be completed with the same BIA, only one form documenting the opportunities was completed. The inspectors were not assured that this was an effective approach to enable the course provider to consider where, when and how an individual observation opportunity was undertaken. The relevant professional who was shadowed or observed or how ethical considerations were made and appropriate consents were agreed for each individual observation as required by the standard. We agreed that a condition would be appropriate in relation to 3.3.

<b>Standard 4. Curriculum and assessment</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
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	<b>Met</b>

demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the requirements of the role as set out in the 6 BIA capabilities set out at Annex 1, as well as a sound understanding of cross-national border issues in relation to practice in Wales, where this is appropriate.	
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 4 for further information</i>
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and, human rights and legislative frameworks.	<b>Met</b>
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law.	<b>Met</b>
4.5 Ensure that the integration of policy, legal literacy and practice is central to the course.	<b>Met</b>
4.6 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.	<b>Met</b>
4.7 Provide staff involved in leading and delivering the training with sufficient protected training time to keep their own practice and knowledge up to date in line with statutory and regulatory requirements.	<b>Met</b>
4.8 Ensure that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to make robust, independent and well-evidenced assessments in the best interests of the person. This should include regular monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards to ensure that they remain robust and reliable.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 4 for further information</i>
4.9 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	<b>Met</b>

4.10 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation, underpinned by skills, knowledge and an ability to interpret and respond appropriately to legislative and policy change and case law.	<b>Met</b>
4.11 Ensure that the course equips students with knowledge and skills in relation to identifying and anticipating areas of conflict arising from DoLS processes and outcomes, and supporting individuals, families, carers and agencies to understand the checks and balances of the DoLS system, to support a robust, independent and well-evidenced determination in the best interests of the person.	<b>Met</b>
4.12 Clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the course.	<b>Met</b>
4.13 Clearly specify that any equivalent award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as a BIA.	<b>Met</b>
4.14 Clearly specify a process for the appointment of at least 1 external examiner who must be an appropriately experienced and relevant qualified professional.	<b>Met</b>
<p><b><u>Key observations for standard 4.</u></b></p> <p>39. The course provider explained that there is no equivalent award in relation to the BIA module. (4.13)</p> <p>40. The course outline was provided which mapped the curriculum and learning outcomes to the 6 BIA capabilities. We also saw that teaching remained current as recent case law was used and teaching sessions were used to teach theory, legal frameworks and case law. The inspectors agreed the link between theory and practice was clear and enabled students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation. (4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.10)</p> <p>41. The inspectors agreed that overall, it was clear that over the 4 teaching days, the teaching and learning sufficiently enabled students to demonstrate that they had the necessary knowledge and skills to practice as a BIA on successful completion of the course. (4.1)</p> <p>42. There is a requirement that the course provider involve relevant stakeholders in the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum. (4.2)</p> <p>43. The course provider was able to demonstrate that the views of employers informed the curriculum, as some recent changes had been made as a result of employer feedback. There was</p>	

also evidence that employers taught on the programme and that they would be involved in the annual review of the course. (4.2)

44. In relation to involvement of PWLE, we heard that when considering the curriculum, the course lead had considered the voice of a member of the PPG who shared their experience of being involved in an assessment by a BIA. The inspectors felt that the involvement of PWLE was not enough to satisfy the standard currently and recommended a condition to ensure their ongoing review and development of the curriculum. (4.2)

45. In relation to Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), the course provider had university wide EDI policies and there was evidence the course was designed with EDI principles in mind. During the inspection we heard examples of how EDI was considered in teaching and examples provided included sessions being recorded, hearing loops being considered in advance, printed documentation being on coloured paper, and students being encouraged to disclose reasonable adjustments to ensure inclusivity. (4.3)

46. We noted that the course provider had considered the number of hours spent in structured academic learning, we were satisfied that this was adequate.. (4.6)

47. There was a requirement for the course provider to give teaching staff protected time to keep their own practice and knowledge up to date. As mentioned in standard area 2, we heard that the course provider was supportive of this. Examples included allowing time to undertake CPD, attending BIA conferences and partnership forums, and allowing time to shadow BIAs. (4.7)

48. The assessment strategy demonstrated that assessments were robust, fair, reliable and valid and we saw evidence of the module descriptors being mapped to the Social Work England BIA standards. We also felt it was made clear to students that all elements of assessments must be passed to qualify, and information on the next steps was provided, should they fail an assessment. (4.8, 4.12)

49. We were assured assessments were evaluated annually to ensure they remained fit for purpose. However, the inspectors identified that there was no involvement of PWLE in the monitoring, evaluation or review of assessments, which was a requirement of this standard, and as a result recommended that a condition was appropriate. (4.8)

50. In relation to feedback, we saw evidence that feedback was provided to students throughout the course on both formative and summative assessments. We understood that when the course was previously ran the external examiner felt the course provider has a good process for providing feedback. (4.9)

51. It was noted that content also included addressing key complexities within best interests' assessments, including analysing complex evidence and differing views and case law. (4.11)

52. We agreed there was a process in place for recruiting an EE (external examiner) and the EE in post was registered with Social Work England. (4.14)	
<b>Standard 5. Supporting students.</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including confidential counselling services. The course must also equip students to understand the potential impact of BIA practice on their own emotional and mental wellbeing, and the importance of identifying ways to handle this impact.	<b>Met</b>
5.2 Ensure that students have access to a system of academic and pastoral support for their progression, development and welfare.	<b>Met</b>
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 5 for further information</i>
5.4 Make reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the specialist, capabilities in accordance with relevant legislation.	<b>Met</b>
5.5 Provide timely information to students about their curriculum, observation requirements, assessments, and implications for their continuing practice, including arrangements for annotation of the register and requirements for periodic refresher training.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 5 for further information</i>
5.6 Ensure that students are able to draw links between the completion of their BIA course and ongoing refresher training, and the ongoing requirements of their professional registration such as continuing professional development.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 5 for further information</i>

5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	<b>Met</b>
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	<b>Met</b>
5.9 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.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>see key observations for standard 5 for further information</i>
<b>Key observations for standard 5.</b>	
<p>53. Prior to inspection, the course provider signposted the inspectors to the university website. This contained information on numerous support services available to students and these included counselling and health and wellbeing support.</p> <p>54. In addition to university wide support, during the inspection we were shown an agreement whereby the course team agreed to support students emotionally, and further to this, teaching materials involved preparing students for practice as a BIA. (5.1, 5.2)</p> <p>55. We were also told as well as pastoral support, students had access to a personal tutor to support them academically. (5.2)</p> <p>56. We were satisfied there was a process in place for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students conduct, character and health. This was done via DBS checks and students declared they agreed to inform the course provider if anything happened, which may impact their ongoing fitness to practise. (5.3)</p> <p>57. During the inspection we explored what happens should a declaration be made, but it was unclear how this information would be assessed and managed appropriately by the course provider. The inspectors recommended a condition against standard 5.3 to ensure that there was a process in place for if a declaration needed to be made. (5.3)</p> <p>58. In relation to providing reasonable adjustments to students, the inspectors agreed these were suitably provided. We heard how disclosure of reasonable adjustments/additional support was</p>	

encouraged at admissions stage, and we heard examples of reasonable adjustments being made, as mentioned in standard area 4. (5.4)

59. The course provider ensured students had access to information on the curriculum, observation requirements, CPD and annotation of the register and this information was provided on the virtual learning environment/student portal and/or discussed as part of the teaching days. (5.5, 5.6)

60. The inspectors did identify, however, that students were not informed of the requirement to have periodic refresher training and as a result recommended conditions against the relevant standards. (5.5, 5.6)

61. There was a requirement for assessment feedback to be provided within 3 weeks as per the course providers website. The course provider submitted the EE report which was completed for the last cohort of students and the feedback from the EE was positive, and the inspectors agreed feedback was both timely and meaningful. There was also an academic appeals policy in place, which was accessible via the university website and student online portal/virtual learning environment. (5.7, 5.8)

62. We were satisfied that there were relevant and adequate policies and processes in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing at the university. However, we identified the course provider had not ensured there were appropriate policies in place when students were undertaking shadowing opportunities within local authorities, and as a result recommend a condition against this standard. (5.9)

## Outcome

We recommend that the course be approved with conditions. These will be monitored for completion.

The regulator decision maker agreed with this [recommendation](#).

## 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 course 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 conditions for this course at this time.

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 2.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates involvement of PWLE in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement of the BIA course.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">2.2</a>
2	Standard 3.3	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is documentation in place to ensure and check appropriate consent is gained prior to students attending observation opportunities</li> <li>b. It is made clear to employers and students that observation opportunities can be completed a maximum of 12 months prior to starting the course.</li> <li>c. the two observation opportunities are robustly documented</li> </ul>	27 August 2026	<a href="#">3.3</a>
3	Standard 4.2	The course provider will ensure people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">4.2</a>
4	Standard 4.8	The course provider will ensure people with lived experience are involved in monitoring and evaluation and improvement of assessments and there is a documented process to demonstrate this.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">4.8</a>

5	Standard 5.3	The course provider will ensure there is a documented process for identifying and responding to declarations regarding students conduct, character and health.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">5.3</a>
6	Standard 5.5 & 5.6	In relation to periodic refresher training the course provider will :  a. demonstrate that they provide timely information to students about the requirements for periodic refresher training  b. ensure students are able to draw links between the completion of their BIA course and the ongoing requirements of their professional registration.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">5.5 &amp; 5.6</a>
7	Standard 5.9	The course provider will demonstrate they have ensured appropriate policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students whilst they undertake their observation opportunities.	27 August 2026	<a href="#">5.9</a>

**As conditions have been attached to the approval, University of Huddersfield must provide evidence of meeting these conditions as outlined in the report and in the timescales agreed. Failure to do so may result in approval being withdrawn.**

## Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	Standard 1.5	The inspectors are recommending PWLE are included in further design and review of the admissions process.	<a href="#">1.5</a>
2	Standard 2.5	The inspectors are recommending the course provider have a contingency plan to ensure delivery of the curriculum and consistent marking, should the course lead be unavailable.	<a href="#">2.5</a>
3	Standard 3.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider introducing a reflection document for students to complete during their observation opportunities.	<a href="#">3.1</a>

## Meeting of Conditions

If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure course providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the BIA standards [insert link to these]

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