

Inspection Report

Course provider: Bournemouth University

Course approval: BA Social Work, MA Social Work
(& PGDip exit route)

Inspection dates: 28th – 31st May 2024

Report date:	26 th July 2024
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	1 st October 2024
Date conditions met and approved:	27 th March 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	10
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	13
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	17
Standard five: Supporting students	22
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	25
Proposed outcome.....	26
Recommendations	27
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	28
Regulator decision	35

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 are carried out either on site at the education provider's campus, or remotely using virtual meetings.
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 previously been 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. Bournemouth University's BA and MA Social Work programmes (including PGDip exit route) 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. The inspection was for reapproval of the existing courses and approval of updated new versions of the courses. As there were no substantial differences in how these awards met the Education and Training Standards, they are being written up together within this report.

Inspection ID	BUR1
Course provider	Bournemouth University
Validating body (if different)	N/A
Courses inspected	BA Social Work, MA Social Work, PGDip Social Work (exit route)
Mode of study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	35 per cohort (BA), 25 per cohort (MA & PGDip)
Date of inspection	28 th – 31 st May 2024
Inspection team	Joseph Hubbard (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Michael Isles (Registrant Inspector) Michelle Loughrey (Lay Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	Approved with conditions

Language

16. In this document we describe Bournemouth University as 'the course provider' or 'the university' and we describe the BA Social Work and MA Social Work (inclusive of PGDip exit route) as 'the course/s', 'the BA', 'the MA', 'the PGDip' or 'the programme/s'.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 28th – 31st May 2024. As part of this process the inspection team met with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and placement providers, pastoral and academic support services, practice educators 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 3 MA students from across both year groups and 6 BA students from across all year groups. Discussions included admissions, placement provision, student support, and assessments.

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, senior management, practice-based learning team, and support services.

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 design and delivery of the university's social work programmes through the PIER (Public Involvement in Education and Research) partnership. Discussions included admissions, course development and delivery, training and support. For part of the meeting, university staff involved in coordinating the group joined the discussion to provide further information.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Dorset County Council, Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council, and Wiltshire County Council. They also met with a number of practice educators who work with the university.

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 university provided documentary evidence for this standard which set out university-wide admissions regulations for taught programmes, and additional requirements for regulated programmes. The mapping document confirmed the entry requirements for both programmes and the various aspects of the admissions process, which included an application form, panel interview, and group exercise. Students whose first language is not English require an overall IELTS score of 7.0 to ensure they have a good command of English. As the application process takes place online, applicants' information technology skills can be assessed through their participation in this process. The details of the admissions process were triangulated at inspection through meetings with the admissions team, course team, and students.

26. The inspectors noted that although the admissions process is multidimensional in that it involves a group exercise and individual panel interview, the process does not involve any written component. Consideration was given to whether the personal statement required as part of the UCAS application process may allow the university to assess candidates' academic writing capabilities; however, as applicants often receive assistance with this it was not deemed sufficient. Both programmes' entry requirements include Key Skills 2 or equivalent in English, but as this corresponds to GCSE level the inspectors did not consider this suitable indication of academic writing capability for entry level to either programme. The inspectors were not assured that the admissions process robustly assesses applicants' capability to meet academic standards, with regard to academic writing in particular.

27. The inspection team therefore agreed that this standard was not met, and a condition is being recommended against the standard. Consideration was given as to whether the findings identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it was deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. The inspection team is confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the conditions, monitoring and approval can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) sections of this report.

Standard 1.2

28. The mapping form states that both academic qualifications and experience are considered during the admissions process for the programmes. The BA website confirms that relevant experience is a requirement in most cases, and provides examples of types of relevant paid or unpaid experience which relate to social work. The MA website makes reference to prior relevant experience, but only with regard to applicants who may not meet the usual academic entry requirements. At inspection, the admissions team expanded on how prior experience is taken into account, including at interview where one of the criteria relates to relevant experience. The admissions team stated that information regarding prior relevant experience is also provided at open days and applicant days. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

29. The university's documentary evidence outlined that the PIER partnership has had involvement in the design of the admissions process, and a pre-recorded video of a PIER partner is used for the group assessment. When discussed further in additional evidence and at inspection, it was confirmed that there used to be PIER partner and employer partner representation on the interview panel, but this is no longer the case. During inspection meetings, both stakeholder groups stated that they had valued the direct involvement they had in admissions by being on interview panels and would like to return to this. A PIER partner stated that having direct involvement in admissions sends a clear message to applicants about the importance of people with lived experience's involvement in the programme from the beginning.

30. The inspectors did not consider the level of involvement of either stakeholder group to constitute direct involvement as required by this standard. The inspection team therefore agreed that the standard was not met, and a condition is being recommended against the standard. Consideration was given as to whether the findings identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it was deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. The inspection team is confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the conditions, monitoring and approval can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) sections of this report.

Standard 1.4

31. The university provided documentary evidence outlining their policies and processes for assessing the suitability of applicants' conduct, character, and health in the admissions process. Information is requested through UCAS about whether applicants have a disability, and if so the nature of the disability. Offer-holders are required to complete an occupational health check and Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) enhanced check, and a Disclosure Panel is held to assess any issues arising from the latter. The university's admissions policy regarding criminal records outlines the requirement for equivalent background checks

and/or certifications of good character for applicants not resident (or only recently resident) in the UK. Additional evidence was requested regarding assessment of conduct and character beyond criminal conviction checks, and the university provided an ongoing suitability declaration which students are required to complete. The declaration provides check boxes for students to confirm they are of “good health” and “good character” per HCPC (Health and Care Professions Council) requirements. The examples provided on the declaration regarding what might need to be declared are limited to criminal conviction and finding of misconduct by another regulatory body. There is also no option for the student to provide any details on the form – instead they must check the box “I am unable to confirm my good character and/or health” and await contact from a member of staff to discuss.

32. On reviewing these mechanisms, inspectors noted that the assessment of applicants’ conduct and character is limited and based on regulatory guidance which no longer applies to social work. Inspectors also noted that while applicants are asked to declare any unspent criminal convictions through UCAS, there did not appear to be an opportunity to declare spent convictions ahead of these being flagged through DBS. While applicants’ suitability does appear to be assessed robustly regarding health, and criminal conviction checks are in place, the inspectors did not believe that the current process supported a robust assessment of applicants’ conduct and character. The inspection team therefore agreed that the standard was not met, and a condition is being recommended against the standard. Consideration was given as to whether the findings identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it was deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. The inspection team is confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the conditions, monitoring and approval can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) sections of this report.

Standard 1.5

33. Documentary evidence was provided prior to the inspection indicating that there is a university-wide admissions policy in place which covers widening participation and fair access, as well as applicants with disabilities and/or support needs. In line with this policy, staff ensure that any applicants who disclose a disability or health condition through UCAS are provided with reasonable adjustments for the admissions process if needed. The AccessBU scheme supports widening participation by allowing applicants from certain demographics to have their application considered for an offer up to 16 UCAS points lower than the published entry requirements.

34. At inspection, the admissions team provided some examples of how the EDI (equality, diversity and inclusion) policies are implemented and monitored, such as spot checks of all rejected applicants to ensure no group is being disadvantaged. They also described widening participation activities the university engages in such as outreach to schools, summer schools, and events for care experienced young people. It was confirmed at

inspection that staff involved in admissions complete annual EDI training, which includes content around unconscious bias. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.6

35. Review of the university's course webpages confirmed that clear information is provided regarding staff research interests, placement opportunities, fees and funding, course structure, content, and assessment. Open days and admissions days provide further opportunities for applicants to receive any information they need to make an informed choice about enrolling on either of the programmes. Clear information is also provided on the programme webpages regarding the professional standards and regulation of social work. A platform called Unibuddy is also made available for applicants, which allows them to discuss the course with current students, and current students participate in admissions days to provide further information. At inspection, some students felt that they hadn't been given clear information about whether and when they may need access to a car for placement. However, review of the programme websites at the time of inspection confirmed that these do state that access to personal transport is usually required due to the rural locations of placements. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

36. The inspectors noted that while the documentary narrative states that both programmes require Key Skills Level 2 in Maths and English, the MA website does not include this in the entry requirements. The requirements for previous experience, and for an international equivalent of a DBS check where appropriate, are also not explicit on the MA programme website. The inspection team felt that a recommendation around this would be beneficial to ensure all entry requirements are made clear on the website – full details of the recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) section of this report.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

37. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection confirmed that students on both programmes spend the required 200 days of learning in contrasting practice settings. This includes 30 skills days for which attendance is mandatory and monitored, through both manual registers and a digital check in system. Students are also required to complete a reflective log following each skills day which serves to consolidate learning and evidence engagement. At inspection, students had a clear understanding of the requirement to complete 30 skills days and stated that this is monitored carefully, with any missed days needing to be made up. Students were asked about their placement experiences and confirmed they have all had contrasting experiences, and those in their final year had all had at least one statutory placement experience. The practice-based learning team confirmed that a student's practice supervisor and practice educator monitor their attendance throughout placement, and formally record this at the mid-way and final placement review

meetings. Students confirmed that where placement days had been missed due to health or other reasons, their placements had been extended to ensure they completed the required number of placement days. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 2.2

38. The documentary evidence provided by the university for this standard included programme specifications, placement overviews, policies, and placement handbooks. These documents outline the expectations of student learning opportunities while on placement, including ensuring students work towards meeting the professional standards. The documentation also sets out administrative and practical information in relation to what students are expected to learn. The Placement Learning Agreement (PLA) outlines the learning opportunities available on placement to enable students to meet the learning outcomes, which are mapped to the professional standards. At inspection, students were positive about their learning experiences on placement, and support provided by practice tutors. The inspection team spoke to placement providers and university staff about the process of matching students to placement opportunities, confirming students complete an application form for placement which covers the logistics of placement management, practical arrangements, and students' previous experience, skills, and qualities. The placement team also outlined the onboarding process the university follows for new placement providers to ensure they can deliver the required learning opportunities. New settings are visited in person to discuss the requirements of social work placements, and a mandatory training day is provided for on-site supervisors. The inspection team determined that the standard was met.

Standard 2.3

39. Documentary evidence was provided ahead of the inspection, confirming that a Practice Learning Agreement (PLA) is completed for each placement which sets out requirements in relation to students' induction, supervision, and support. A PLA meeting is then held to confirm mutual understanding of the expectations, and document the agreed induction, supervision, and workload plans. The PLA establishes the importance of ensuring work-life balance for students on placement, as well as the appropriateness of work for students' stage of learning. At inspection, practice educators (PEs) discussed the workload and caseload protections which are in place for students, and how this is monitored and managed by the PE and on-site supervisor. Students had no concerns regarding induction or workload; however, it was reported that some students have struggled in their final placement due to their PE being in training rather than fully qualified, resulting in inconsistent support. Students stated that they had raised this with the university and felt it had been taken on board. The inspection team discussed this with the university, who stated that there is always a fully qualified mentor assessor assigned to trainee PEs to oversee and support them. The university assured the inspection team that Practice Educator Professional Standards (PEPS) mentor assessors sign off all PE students' work,

attend meetings with them, and receive feedback from students without the PE present. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

40. Documentary evidence provided by the university for this standard demonstrated that a range of processes are in place, as discussed within standard 2.3, to establish students' learning needs at the beginning of each placement and ensure their responsibilities on placement are appropriate. The learning objectives outlined in the PLA are individual to the student, and the student's first placement portfolio is submitted ahead of their final placement to ensure that their new learning objectives build on existing learning. The mid-way review meeting serves as a checkpoint to ensure the parameters of the PLA are being met, including in terms of the appropriateness of the student's responsibilities. During the inspection, as noted, PEs discussed the workload and caseload protections which are in place for students, and how this is monitored and managed by the PE and on-site supervisor. The practice-based learning team reported that they make the baseline expectations around workload explicit to students, supervisors, and PEs, and review this as part of the interim meeting to identify any issues. The inspection team determined that the standard was met.

Standard 2.5

41. Prior to inspection, the university outlined the various requirements a student must meet prior to carrying out any direct practice in a service delivery setting. As discussed within standard area 1, all students must obtain an enhanced DBS certificate and occupational health assessment, followed by arrangement of reasonable adjustments where appropriate. Details were provided of the Readiness for Direct Practice unit which students undertake in the first year of either programme to prepare them for practice learning and assess their preparedness. The assessment of this module involves an assessed activity with a person with lived experience of social work from the PIER partnership, and a reflective portfolio entry. Details of the content of skills days were provided to evidence further preparation for practice which takes place outside of the Readiness for Direct Practice unit itself. Students are required to pass the Readiness for Direct Practice unit before they are permitted to begin their first placement.

42. During the inspection, students reported that they felt the unit prepared them well for placement, and placement providers stated that students generally arrive on placement well-prepared. PIER partners confirmed that their involvement in the unit is robust, and that they provide feedback to students alongside academic staff. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 2.6

43. The university's mapping narrative for this standard stated that they ensure practice educators have the necessary knowledge and skills by checking PEs' qualifications and providing link days and workshops regularly. The university also contributes to the regional practice educator learning partnership network, which delivers PEPS training and participates in regular Practice Educator Learning Partnership Meetings with the local Teaching Partnership. At inspection, the placement team were asked to provide details of how the university has oversight of PEs' registration and currency. The placement team reported that for PEs based at local authorities, each local authority holds a list of PEs' relevant details which the university monitors through quarterly PEPS panels and a SharePoint site. The university confirmed that they monitor independent social workers' currency and registration directly. Both LA-based and independent PEs are required to produce a portfolio of evidence every 2 years to evidence their currency, and the university checks that all PEs are registered when the portfolios are submitted. Review of practice educators' work is also included in wider quality assurance processes such as placement audits and the annual Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) surveys. The inspection team determined that the standard was met.

Standard 2.7

44. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection confirmed that there is a university-wide whistleblowing policy in place, which signposts to an external organisation for support and advice. At inspection, the course team confirmed that there are various mechanisms to support students in instances where they may need to raise concerns, such as an open-door policy to academic staff and various student support services. The course team provided examples of how situations were handled where students needed to raise concerns about the behaviour of other students in class, and an instance of concern around employer wrongdoing. Students informed the inspection team that they knew who to raise concerns with and how, and confirmed that any issues they have raised have been dealt with swiftly. The inspection team determined that this standard was met. The inspectors noted that while the whistleblowing policy is referenced within the placement handbook, they recommend that this information be made clearer and more readily accessible to students. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) section of this report.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

45. The university provided documentary evidence ahead of the inspection which confirmed that governance of the programmes is managed through the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences. The head of department and deputy head of department line manage the programme leads, who then oversee programme delivery. There are unit leads responsible for each unit, as well as year leads for each year of both programmes. The management and

quality assurance of the programmes is overseen by the Faculty Academic Standards and Education Committee (FASEC), through oversight of the Annual Monitoring and Enhancement Review (AMER). Further quality assurance mechanisms include Unit Boards, Assessment Boards, and External Examiners. The details of these arrangements were discussed and confirmed with members of senior management at inspection. It was confirmed that FASEC meets monthly, and that the budget planning process follows an annual cycle, linked to student numbers. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

46. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection indicated that formal agreements are in place with all placement providers through the PLA. PLAs are in place for all placements which confirm the expectations the university has of placement providers. The PLA lays out how placement learning must meet the relevant regulatory standards, and the placement handbook outlines procedures for dealing with concerns and placement breakdown. There is a guidance document for direct observations, which sets out the requirement to gain informed consent from service users. At inspection, practice educators, university staff, employer partners, and students demonstrated a shared understanding of the processes to follow in response to any concerns on placement, and all reported that these procedures are effective. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

47. Prior to inspection, the university confirmed that all necessary health and wellbeing policies and associated expectations are addressed as part of the PLA form and meeting. These confirm the students' understanding of policies and procedures whilst on placement. This includes policies relating to health and safety, lone working, and risk assessment. Any specific needs of the student related to health, disability, caring responsibilities, etc. are noted through the PLA and any reasonable adjustments or additional support are also agreed at this stage. At inspection, the practice-based learning team outlined the onboarding process for new placement providers which ensures there is appropriate employment-based support available for students whilst on placement. Support services staff outlined the various services which are available remotely and outside of office hours, and therefore accessible for students who are on placement. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

48. Documentary evidence provided by the university confirmed that employers are involved in the management and monitoring of the programmes through the Teaching Partnership Steering Group, Quality Forum, and Practice Education Learning Partnership. Practitioners also regularly contribute to the programmes as guest lecturers, and the

university works with employers on the allocation of practice education through placement allocation meetings. At inspection, employer partners confirmed their involvement in these mechanisms, and outlined how local authority workforce development teams work with the university on allocation of practice education. Employers also noted how different teams had contributed to the review and development of relevant areas of the curriculum. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

49. Review of the university's documentary evidence submission confirmed that a number of the quality assurance processes in place for the programmes involve employers, students, and people with lived experience of social work. As above, employer partners are involved with monitoring of the programmes through the Teaching Partnership Steering Group, Quality Forum, and Practice Education Learning Partnership. Practitioners also regularly contribute to the programmes as guest lecturers, and the university works with employers on the allocation of practice education through placement allocation meetings. The programmes are subject to the university-wide AMER process, which is fed into by PIER partners and students. A number of mechanisms are in place for student participation in course improvement, such as the student staff forum, National Student Survey (NSS), and SimOn feedback platform. The PIER partnership produces an annual report on their involvement in programmes, which goes through the university board system for review.

50. Placements are reviewed annually through the QAPL process, which collates feedback from students and practice educators on their placement experiences. External Examiners provide a further quality assurance mechanism for both programmes. At inspection, students confirmed that they have the opportunity to contribute to programme improvements through the above routes, and feel their feedback is heard and acted on. Employers and PIER partners also confirmed that their contributions to programme evaluation are listened to and actioned appropriately. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 3.6

51. The university's documentary evidence submitted for this standard states that the target annual recruitment numbers are 35 for the BA programme, and 25 for the MA programme. These figures have been determined in collaboration with the teaching partnership, who have developed a Labour Market and Workforce Planning document, which the university provided as evidence for this standard. At inspection, the course team and senior management discussed the admissions strategy and local factors that can affect placement capacity. It was acknowledged that while the target recruitment across the programmes of 50-55 students is not currently being met, the university is working to maintain relationships with placement providers, and taking action to systematically increase recruitment. As the evidence for this standard indicated that there is an appropriate strategy in place and action

is being taken to address under-recruitment, the inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 3.7

52. The lead social workers for both programmes are registered with Social Work England and their CVs confirm they are appropriately qualified for the role. The inspection team concluded that the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection was sufficient to demonstrate that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

53. The inspectors' review of the staff profiles provided within the university's evidence submission confirmed that staff are appropriately qualified and experienced, and represent a breadth of specialist knowledge. A pool of guest lecturers is also available to provide further specialist expertise where needed. The inspectors determined that there appeared to be an adequate number of robustly experienced staff across the course team, practice learning team, and wider university support services to deliver the programmes effectively. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 3.9

54. Documentary evidence provided for this standard confirmed that the university monitors student progression in a number of ways, throughout the academic year. Academic staff are able to review progress for individual students or for specific units at any point, and personal tutors check on tutees' progress before regular meetings. At programme level, progression is monitored through the AMER process, which assesses progression data for all units and identifies any actions needed. The AMER process also reviews progression rates in relation to a number of EDI metrics, and identifies any actions needed in response to this data. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

55. The evidence submission for this standard outlined the university's commitment to Fusion Based Learning, which centres the importance of combining education, professional practice, and research. Academic staff undertake peer reviews of each other's teaching to foster continuous improvement, and complete annual personal development reviews to identify development objectives. Examples were provided, both in the evidence submission and during inspection, of practice-based activities academic staff are engaged in, such as running support groups, undertaking Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) assessments, and research activity grounded in practice. At inspection, the course team confirmed that continuing professional development is built into workforce management for all staff. It was also reported that a number of the teaching staff are employed in practice as well as in their

academic roles, further embedding the Fusion Based Learning approach. The inspection team agreed that this standard had been met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

56. The documentary evidence provided prior to inspection demonstrated that the programmes have been developed in line with relevant guidance and frameworks. The curriculum and learning outcomes for both programmes have been mapped to Social Work England's Professional Standards and BASW's (British Association of Social Workers) PCF. At inspection, students from both courses were clear about their obligations to meet the professional standards, and aware of how the standards are met in academic and practice learning. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met. While the evidence confirmed that the programmes have been comprehensively mapped to the professional standards, the inspection team felt that students could benefit from the professional standards mapping information being made accessible to them, and is recommending that the provider considers this. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) section of this report.

Standard 4.2

57. As discussed within standards 3.4 and 3.5, employers (including practitioners) and PIER partners are directly involved in the development and review of the programmes through a number of routes. Employer partners participate in the evaluation of the programmes through the Teaching Partnership Steering Group, Quality Forum, and Practice Education Learning Partnership. Practitioners also regularly contribute to the programmes as guest lecturers, and the university works with employers on the allocation of practice education through placement allocation meetings. The programmes are subject to the university-wide AMER process, which is fed into by PIER partners. The PIER partnership produces an annual report on their involvement in programmes, which goes through the university board system for review. At inspection, PIER partners confirmed that they are involved in curriculum development through cowriting presentations, taking part in the recent curriculum consultation, and meeting with academics to discuss what should be included on the courses. Practitioners from employer partners reported that they are able to influence curriculum in a responsive way, ensuring academic content reflects learning from practice. The course teams confirmed that consultations were held with employers and PIER partners to inform the development of the new curricula. The inspection team agreed the standard was met.

Standard 4.3

58. As discussed within standard 1.5, documentary evidence was provided prior to the inspection indicating that there is a university-wide admissions policy in place which covers

widening participation and fair access, as well as applicants with disabilities and/or support needs. In line with this policy, staff ensure that any applicants who disclose a disability or health condition through UCAS are provided with reasonable adjustments for the admissions process if needed. The AccessBU scheme supports widening participation by allowing applicants from certain demographics to have their application considered for an offer up to 16 UCAS points lower than the published entry requirements. The evidence submitted prior to inspection also included a broader university-wide Equality and Diversity Policy and implementation document. There is a faculty inclusivity lead who is responsible for working to embed and advance the inclusion and diversity agenda. The social work team also facilitate an Anti-Racist Practice Steering Group, which contributes to the ongoing development of social work programmes. The programme handbooks and specifications demonstrated that social work values around EDI are woven throughout the courses.

59. At inspection, the admissions team provided some examples of how the EDI policies are implemented and monitored, such as spot checks of all rejected applicants to ensure no group is being disadvantaged. They also described widening participation activities the university engages in such as outreach into schools, summer schools, and events for care experienced young people. It was confirmed at inspection that staff involved in admissions complete annual EDI training, which includes content around unconscious bias. The course team outlined how anti-oppressive practices are embedded throughout the curriculum for both programmes – from induction onwards – throughout all programme units. Academic staff also undertake research centred on anti-oppressive social work, including through the Research Centre for Seldom Heard Voices. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

60. Review of the documentary evidence for this standard confirmed that the programmes are reviewed every year as part of the AMER process, which identifies necessary updates to programmes and implements action plans accordingly. Amendments and updates to programme content are informed by ongoing consultation with practitioners through the teaching partnership. Research produced by members of the course team also goes on to inform and update programme content. The annual unit assessment boards provide a formal opportunity to evaluate and update individual units in response to feedback and progression data. At inspection, the course team outlined the development of the ‘head, heart and hand’ approach to the delivery of social work programmes, where the three aspects represent research, professional practice, and relationships. Employers reported that responsive changes are made to the programmes in response to updates in best practice, research, and legislation. The inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

61. Evidence provided prior to inspection indicated that the integration of theory into practice is woven throughout the programmes, with each unit underpinning social work practice learning with theory. The design of both programmes is based on the principle that practice should be informed by evidence, and evidence should be grounded in theoretical approaches. The programme specifications and handbooks show that learning objectives and assignments establish explicit links between theory and social work practice. At inspection, practice educators discussed how they work with students to integrate theory and practice, using creative resources and reflective practice. Students confirmed that their practice educators required them to link theory to practice regularly in supervision. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

62. The university's documentary submission provided examples of the involvement of other professionals in course teaching, and noted that practice placements provide substantial opportunity for students to work with other professions. The intended learning outcomes for the programmes make reference to working with and recognising the roles of other professionals. The BA programme includes a module which is taken jointly with students from other programmes, such as nursing and paramedic science. While the MA does not have a joint module, they have a range of professionals attending to deliver content during skills days. Both programmes also feature guest lecturers from different professional backgrounds. At inspection, students confirmed that they had engaged with interprofessional learning opportunities, including moot court and mock child protection case conferences. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 4.7

63. Documentary evidence for this standard confirmed that the designated hours of structured academic learning required are clearly stated in the programme and unit specifications. These hours conform to university-wide requirements for contact hours and self-led learning. At inspection, employer partners confirmed that students generally arrive on placement well-prepared. University staff explained the structures in place to identify and resolve situations when a student's attendance may not be sufficient to meet the required competence level. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 4.8

64. Review of the documentary evidence for this standard confirmed that assessment strategies for the programmes are subject to a university-wide assessment design policy. All assessments are developed with reference to the relevant regulatory standards and PCFs, and students are required to pass every unit to ensure they can meet all of the professional standards. A varied range of assessment methods are used across the programmes, including essays, presentations, reflective writing, posters, and practical assessments.

65. Placements are assessed through observed practice, review meetings, and a practice portfolio. A template was provided for feedback on direct observations; this was comprehensive and made specific reference to whether the student has met the professional standards. An external examiner system provides external scrutiny of standards of assessments and compares currency with other social work courses in England. At inspection, students reported that the variety of assessment types serve to meet a range of learning styles. The inspection team were satisfied that the standard was met.

Standard 4.9

66. The university's evidence submission included a document outlining how all unit assessments are mapped to curriculum content and learning outcomes, and sequenced to match students' progression. The marking criteria for assessments progresses from level to level, and learning outcomes become increasingly complex, as expected. Discussion with course staff on inspection demonstrated how the assessment methods are sequenced to match student progression through the programme. It was confirmed in documentation and at inspection that students must successfully complete the readiness for practice assessment before going out on placement, and the first placement before undertaking the final placement. Formative assessments are provided for students in order that they can receive initial feedback to inform areas of development before submitting their summative assessments. Timetables for assessment are annually reviewed with consideration given to student feedback, and assessments are staggered throughout the programme to avoid bunching. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

67. The evidence submission for this standard stated that all feedback across the programmes follows university-wide marking criteria and rubrics, including the requirement to incorporate positives as well as areas for improvement. As discussed in standard 4.9, formative assessments are provided for students in order that they can receive initial feedback to inform areas of development before submitting their summative assessments. Feedback is also provided in a more ongoing and informal way through the personal tutoring system, with students' personal tutors providing individual feedback to support their tutees' development. At inspection, the course team discussed how formative assessments also provide an opportunity for tutors to identify areas where students may benefit from study skills support, and to signpost accordingly. The university's mapping narrative for this standard explained how practice educators carry out direct observations and assessment of students' practice and provide written feedback. Students also stated that they have found the feedback provided by PIER partners to be particularly constructive and valuable. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

68. Prior to the inspection, the university provided staff and external examiner details confirming that staff carrying out assessments are appropriately qualified, and external examiners are qualified and registered. The appointment of external examiners is reviewed by the university's Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group, followed by approval by the Academic Standards Committee to ensure appointments are appropriate. Students' placement portfolios and direct observations are assessed by practice educators whose qualifications and currency are monitored per the processes outlined in standard 2.6. At inspection, the course team outlined the assessment moderation process, whereby all summative assessments are first marked and then moderated, with unit leads completing all first marking to further ensure consistency. It was reported that all new markers are paired with an experienced marker for support, and that regular workshops are provided for staff on assessment and marking. The inspection team concluded that the evidence indicated this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

69. The university's documentary evidence outlined the range of people whose input contributes to decisions about student progression, including academics, PIER partners, placement service users, and practice educators. The mapping document also confirmed that practice educators carry out direct observation of student practice as part of placement assessments. Students have the opportunity to re-submit failed assessments and repeat failed modules where appropriate. Annual assessment boards are held to determine students' progression and final awards. Exit points are clearly laid out in the university regulations and programme specifications. Each students' academic suitability for the programme they are on and for social work practice is assessed throughout their programme, and decisions regarding progression made accordingly. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 4.13

70. Evidence was provided ahead of inspection that evidence-based practice is embedded throughout the curricula of both programmes, supported by up to date reading lists. Teaching material is informed by staff research activities and developments in wider social work research. Several units require demonstration of research-mindedness, and the Critical Literature Review unit on both programmes (and optional Dissertation unit on the MA) provide an opportunity for students to develop in-depth evidence-based knowledge in a chosen area of social work practice. As discussed within standard 4.5, the design of both programmes is based on the principle that practice should be informed by evidence, and evidence should be grounded in theoretical approaches. During inspection, the inspection team heard that students on the programmes are taught how to assess the quality of evidence, analyse evidence and reference evidence. The course team spoke about how social work students are invited to engage in research projects as co-researchers. Employers reported that responsive changes are made to the programmes in response to updates in

best practice, research, and legislation. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

71. Documentary evidence provided by the university confirmed that students have access to a broad range of support services, including a careers and employability service, confidential counselling service, disability support, and occupational health. Where a student requires reasonable adjustments, the university works with the student and placement provider to identify and implement these both on campus and on placement. Students are made familiar with key support services during induction and are signposted to others as appropriate throughout their programmes. At inspection, course and support staff provided further details of the support services available, and students reported having had positive experiences of accessing the available support when needed. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met.

Standard 5.2

72. The university's documentary evidence submission confirmed that students have access to a range of resources to support their academic development, including personal tutors, a subject librarian, library resources, study skills programmes through the Academic Support Hub, and IT support. At inspection, course team and support services staff provided further detail about these resources and how they work for students. At induction, '10 Bites of Learning' are delivered for both programmes to support students in the transition from school or the workplace to university. Students spoke positively of their experiences with and access to their personal tutors, library support provision, and the Academic Support Hub services. The inspection team determined that the standard was met.

Standard 5.3

73. As discussed within standard 1.4, the university provided documentary evidence outlining their policies and processes for assessing the suitability of applicants' conduct, character, and health in the admissions process. Additional evidence was requested of the process for assessing the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health. The university provided an ongoing suitability declaration which students are required to complete annually on enrollment. The declaration provides check boxes for students to confirm they are of "good health" and "good character" per HCPC requirements. The examples provided on the declaration regarding what might need to be declared are limited to criminal conviction and finding of misconduct by another regulatory body. There is also no option for the student to provide any details on the form – instead they must check the box "I am unable to confirm my good character and/or health" and await contact from a member of staff to discuss.

74. The university's mapping narrative for this standard stated that students are expected to inform the university of any issues regarding health and wellbeing which may impact upon their studies, and the inspection team also noted that a fitness to practice procedure policy is in place. However, on reviewing the mechanisms in place to assess the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health, inspectors found these to be limited and based on regulatory guidance which no longer applies to social work. The inspection team therefore agreed that the standard was not met, and that the condition recommended against standard 1.4 also applies to this standard. Consideration was given as to whether the findings identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it was deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. The inspection team is confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the conditions, monitoring and approval can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) sections of this report.

Standard 5.4

75. As discussed within standard 1.5, documentary evidence was provided prior to the inspection indicating that there is a university-wide admissions policy in place which covers widening participation and fair access, as well as applicants with disabilities and/or support needs. The evidence also included a broader university-wide Equality and Diversity Policy and implementation document. If additional learning needs are identified during the programme, the student is supported by the Additional Learning Support (ALS) team. This team works with the student to assess their needs and put adjustments and support in place as required. Support service staff outlined how they work with academic staff to meet students' access needs, and confirmed that bursaries are available for students who are not yet diagnosed and cannot afford a full assessment. Reasonable adjustments are noted on the PLA and discussed in the PLA meeting. An example was given of where the university and placement provider worked together to ensure software was available on placement devices. The ALS team may also provide advice on reasonable adjustments such as extra time or other considerations for assessment. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

76. Review of the documentary evidence for this standard confirmed that information provided to applicants and students gives a clear picture of the details of the programmes. Programme handbooks for both courses give information on curriculum, assessment, and placements. The university has a careers and employability service who provide advice and support for seeking employment, alongside support from the course team such as mock interviews and workshops on job applications. A session is delivered to students regarding the Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE), with current ASYE students and employers who run ASYE programmes attending to provide information and advice. At

inspection, students confirmed that the requirement to meet the professional standards on graduation is made clear to them from the beginning of the programme and reinforced throughout. The inspection team determined that the standard was met.

Standard 5.6

77. Documentary evidence provided prior to the inspection confirmed that the programme handbooks lay out the mandatory attendance requirements for all elements of the courses. Expectations for attendance requirements at placement and skills days is made clear within the placement portfolio. Attendance at taught content is monitored through an electronic system, and students are contacted immediately by academic staff if they miss taught content without notifying the relevant staff member. If the student does not respond or continues not to attend, this contact is then escalated in line with policy, as necessary, to determine if the student requires support or may need to interrupt their studies.

78. Attendance at skills days is monitored as discussed in standard 2.1, and students are required to complete make-up activities for any skills days they miss. Placement attendance is recorded and verified by the student's PE to ensure all students attend the required minimum number of placement days. At inspection, students were clear about the attendance requirements of their programmes, including the 30 skills days, and confirmed that where health or other circumstances had led to them missing placement days, their placements had been extended to ensure they met the requirements. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

79. As discussed within standards 4.8 and 4.10, all feedback across the programmes is expected to be developmental, following university-wide marking criteria and rubrics, including the requirement to incorporate positive feedback as well as 'in-text' feedback. An Independent Marking and Moderation policy is in place to ensure consistency in marking and feedback. Feedback and feedforward statements highlight strengths and areas for improvement in formative assessments so students can receive initial feedback to inform areas of development before submitting their summative assessments. Students discussed their experiences of feedback, reporting positively as to the quality and timeliness of assessment marking. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

80. Review of the evidence provided prior to inspection confirmed there is a university-wide academic appeals process in place, as well as a complaints procedure. The university website details both the appeals and complaints processes; however, the programme handbooks provide no information regarding appeals other than to clarify that the complaints process does not cover academic appeals. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met, but is recommending that the course provider considers providing more

detailed information regarding appeals within the programme handbooks. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcomes](#) section of this report.

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

Standard 6.1

81. As the qualifying courses are a BA, MA, and PGDip exit route, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met for the programmes.

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	1.1	The course provider will evidence that the admissions process includes robust assessment of candidates' capability to meet academic standards, particularly with regard to academic writing.	2 nd January 2025	Paragraph 25
2	1.3	The course provider will evidence that employers and people with lived experience of social work are directly involved in the admissions process.	2 nd January 2025	Paragraph 29
3	1.4	The course provider will evidence that the admissions process robustly assesses candidates' suitability with regards to conduct and character.	2 nd January 2025	Paragraph 31
4	5.3	The course provider will evidence that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct and character.	2 nd January 2025	Paragraph 73

Recommendations

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 1.6	The inspectors are recommending that the MA programme website is amended to make the following requirements explicit; 1. Key Skills Level 2 Maths and English or equivalent 2. international equivalent of DBS check where appropriate 3. prior relevant experience.	Paragraph 35
2	Standard 2.7	The inspectors are recommending that the information provided to students regarding whistleblowing is made more accessible.	Paragraph 44
3	Standard 4.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university make the professional standards mapping information accessible to students.	Paragraph 56
4	Standard 5.8	The inspectors are recommending that the university provide more detailed information within the programme handbooks regarding academic appeals.	Paragraph 80

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

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

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
information about the professional standards, research interests and placement opportunities.			
Learning environment			
2.1 Ensure that students spend at least 200 days (including up to 30 skills days) gaining different experiences and learning in practice settings. Each student will have: i) placements in at least two practice settings providing contrasting experiences; and ii) a minimum of one placement taking place within a statutory setting, providing experience of sufficient numbers of statutory social work tasks involving high risk decision making and legal interventions.	☒	☐	☐
2.2 Provide practice learning opportunities that enable students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
2.3 Ensure that while on placements, students have appropriate induction, supervision, support, access to resources and a realistic workload.	☒	☐	☐
2.4 Ensure that on placements, students' responsibilities are appropriate for their stage of education and training.	☒	☐	☐
2.5 Ensure that students undergo assessed preparation for direct practice to make sure they are safe to carry out practice learning in a service delivery setting.	☒	☐	☐
2.6 Ensure that practice educators are on the register and that they have the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.	☒	☐	☒
Course governance, management and quality			
3.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.	☒	☐	☐
3.2 Ensure that they have agreements with placement providers to provide education and training that meets the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards. This should include necessary consents and ensure placement providers have contingencies in place to deal with practice placement breakdown.	☒	☐	☐
3.3 Ensure that placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 Ensure that employers are involved in elements of the course, including but not limited to the management and monitoring of courses and the allocation of practice education.	☒	☐	☐
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.			
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity.	☒	☐	☐
3.7 Ensure that a lead social worker is in place to hold overall professional responsibility for the course. This person must be appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
3.8 Ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, to deliver an effective course.	☒	☐	☐
3.9 Evaluate information about students' performance, progression and outcomes, such as the results of exams and assessments, by collecting, analysing and using student data, including data on equality and diversity.	☒	☐	☐
3.10 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice.	☐	☐	☒
Curriculum and assessment			
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☒
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design,	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
ongoing development and review of the curriculum.			
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.	☒	☐	☐
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.5 Ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.6 Ensure that students are given the opportunity to work with, and learn from, other professions in order to support multidisciplinary working, including in integrated settings.	☒	☐	☐
4.7 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	☒	☐	☐
4.8 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students' progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☒	☐	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
4.12 Ensure that there are systems to manage students' progression, with input from a range of people, to inform decisions about their progression including via direct observation of practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.13 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation.	☒	☐	☐
Supporting students			
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: I. confidential counselling services; II. careers advice and support; and III. occupational health services	☒	☐	☐
5.2 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their academic development including, for example, personal tutors.	☒	☐	☐
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☒	☐	☐
5.5 Provide information to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.	☒	☐	☐
5.6 Provide information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory.	☒	☐	☐
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	☒	☐	☐
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	☒	☐	☒
Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register			
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor's degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure education providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the [education and training standards](#).

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	1.1	The course provider will evidence that the admissions process includes robust assessment of candidates' capability to meet academic standards, particularly with regard to academic writing.	Met
2	1.3	The course provider will evidence that employers and people with lived experience of social work are directly involved in the admissions process.	Met
3	1.4	The course provider will evidence that the admissions process robustly assesses candidates' suitability with regards to conduct and character.	Met
4	5.3	The course provider will evidence that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct and character.	Met

Findings

Regarding the condition against standard 1.1, the university provided evidence confirming that their admissions process has been amended to include a rigorous group assessment and written task, as well as panel interview. Having reviewed the details of these assessment stages, the inspectors determined that the admissions process now robustly

assesses candidates' suitability. The inspectors' recommendation is that this condition is now met.

For the condition on standard 1.3, the university's evidence included interview day timetables demonstrating that employers and people with lived experience of social work are now involved in various elements of the admissions process. The documentation indicated that these stakeholder groups now participate in delivering a course talk to candidates, and both groups also observe and provide feedback on candidates' performance in the group task. The inspectors' recommendation is that this condition is now met.

To evidence the conditions on standards 1.4 and 5.3, the university provided an admissions policy for applicants with a criminal record, and a screenshot of a health and character declaration which students must complete when beginning their programme, and then at enrollment each subsequent year. The health and character declaration has been amended to reference Social Work England rather than the previous regulator. The inspectors' recommendation is that both of these conditions are now met.

Regulator Decision

Conditions met.