

Inspection Report

Course provider: Kingston University

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Inspection dates: 17 October – 19 October 2023

Report date:	5 December 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	16 February 2024
Date conditions met and approved:	25 June 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	10
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	14
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	17
Standard five: Supporting students	23
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	27
Proposed outcome.....	28
Conditions	28
Recommendations	29
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	30
Regulator decision	37
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	38
Findings	39

Introduction

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

What we do

5. When an education provider wants to make a change to a course, or request the approval of a new course, they are asked to consider how their course meets our education and training standards and our professional standards, and provide evidence of this to us. We are also undertaking a cycle of re-approval of all currently approved social work courses in England following the introduction of the Education and Training Standards 2021.
6. The education quality assurance officer reviews all the documentary evidence provided and will contact the education provider if they have any questions about the information submitted. They also provide advice and guidance on our approval processes.
7. When we are satisfied that we have all the documentary evidence required to proceed with an inspection we assign one registrant and one lay inspector. We undertake a conflict of interest process when confirming our inspectors to ensure there is no bias or perception of bias in the approval process.
8. The inspectors complete an assessment of the evidence provided and advise the officer if they have any queries that may be able to be addressed in advance of the inspection.

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

9. During this time a draft plan for the inspection is developed and shared with the education provider, to make sure it is achievable at the point of inspection.
10. Once the inspectors and officer are satisfied that an inspection can take place, this is usually undertaken over a three to four day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, approved without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval. Where the course has been previously approved we may also decide to withdraw approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final regulatory decision about the approval of the course.
13. The final decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. Kingston University, BA (Hons) Social Work Integrated Degree Apprenticeship was inspected as part of the Social Work England reapproval cycle; whereby all course providers with qualifying social work courses will be inspected against the new Education and Training Standards 2021.

Inspection ID	KIUR3
Course provider	Kingston University
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	Full Time
Maximum student cohort	75
Date of inspection	17 October – 19 October 2023
Inspection team	Nikki Steel-Bryan, Education Quality Assurance Officer Bradley Allen, Lay Inspector Anne Mackay, Registrant Inspector

Language

16. In this document we describe Kingston University as ‘the education provider’ or ‘the university’, we describe the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship as ‘the course’, ‘the programme’ or ‘the apprenticeship’ and we describe students studying for the award as ‘the students’ or ‘the apprentices’.

Inspection

17. An onsite inspection took place from 17 October 2023 to 19 October 2023 at the Kingston Hill Campus where the course provider is based. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

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

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with students on the programme. The students represented all the levels of study and the group included four course representatives. Discussions included the students experience of placements and allocations, the curriculum, teaching and assessment, support available within the department and through the university including reasonable adjustments, the student voice and attendance.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course team, those involved in selection and admissions, the senior leadership team, staff involved in placement-based learning, student support services and the subregional assessors (SRAs) who also acted in the practice educator role.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with two people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in the delivery of the BA (Hons) Social Work Integrated Degree Apprenticeship. Discussions included their role in the admissions processes, their contributions to the curriculum, course design and course delivery and the support they receive to carry out their role.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Kingston Council, Merton Council and the London Borough of Hounslow Council. The inspection team also met with one employer mentor as part of the inspection.

Findings

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

Standard one: Admissions

Standard 1.1

25. The course provider submitted documentary evidence that included examples of the interview questions and scoring alongside the timed written tests, and as part of a secondary submission the university provided the interview question model answers. The university also supplied the programme specification document (PSD) where the entry criteria was detailed. Applicants were required to have GCSE English graded 4-9 (C or above), to be in employment for 30 hours per week and to have had two-years relevant experience or learning at level 3. To ensure that applicants had the appropriate ICT knowledge and skills the university undertook a self-declaration exercise which was demonstrated in the submitted document *Social Work Information Checklist for Academic Year 2023/24*. Applicants were required to complete the declaration which included the following statements: *'I am able to word process documents on a computer, I am able to send and receive emails, I am able to attach documents to emails and I am able to use the internet to browse and search for materials'*.

26. Following review of the documentary evidence the inspection team understood that the application and interview processes were carried out remotely and were keen to better understand how well the university felt this worked. The staff involved in admission and selection reported that they felt that the online process worked well and that they were satisfied that the process resulted in the correct students being selected for the programme.

27. The inspection team heard that the written test was invigilated by a member of academic staff in the remote environment immediately prior to the interview and interview panels included a member of academic staff, and either an employer partner or a person with lived experience of social work. The inspection team queried how conflicts of interest were resolved where employer partners had a place on an interview panel for applicant apprentices. The course team confirmed that the employer representative on any given panel would always be from another authority to the candidates. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

28. Through discussions with the staff responsible for admissions and selection the inspection team heard that applicants were expected to reflect upon their prior learning and

experiences as part of the interview process, and the documentary evidence submitted included an interview question that dealt with prior experience: *'please tell us about what relevant experience you have had that would assist you in becoming a social worker. This might include relevant work, volunteering, study or personal experience'*. The course team explained that they were interested in candidates prior experience, but, more importantly the way in which candidates framed their experience as developing social work skills. The students met by the inspection team responded positively when asked if they had been questioned about prior experience at interview.

29. Through discussions with the staff involved in admissions and selection the inspection team heard that candidates put forward to interview were not always successfully offered a place on the course. When applicants were unsuccessful at the university interview stage they were provided with feedback on areas for development, and in some cases applicants came back, and were successful in subsequent years. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

30. The *Admissions Guide 2022/23* submitted by the university as evidence against standard 1.3 outlined the interview arrangements and specifically noted that the candidates were interviewed by a panel made up of an academic staff member, and either an employer partner, or a person with lived experience. The guide also included a clear statement on the participation of stakeholders across the admission processes which was evident in the timetable of interviews provided to the inspection team which included dates, academic staff members, and the redacted details of stakeholders.

31. Through discussion with the people with lived experience met by the inspection team, the inspection team heard that they were involved in the interviews for the apprenticeship programme. Employers undertook the initial sift of applicants within their organisations, were invited to participate on interview panels and could feed into the process via the single point of contact (SPOC) committee. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.4

32. Prior to the inspection the inspection team noted that students were asked to complete the *Declaration of Suitability for Social Work 2023* form which covered declarations relating to criminal convictions and legal records, disciplinary matters and unprofessional conduct, personal involvement with social services and applicant health. The programme specification document (PSD) included an occupational health and an enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) screening under the course entry requirements.

33. Through a secondary submission of evidence the university provided an overview of the process should a DBS form be returned with an entry, or should an applicant self-disclose. Through discussion with the staff responsible for admissions the inspection team heard that,

where there was a question regarding an applicant's suitability, the course leader would contact the candidate to contextualise the entry or query and the discussion would be minuted. The staff involved in admissions would consider the case and agree an outcome. The outcome could be that no further action would be taken, or it could require the applicant to inform their employer of the entry, or query. If the latter was the case, the employer would have to confirm to the university in writing whether they would continue to nominate that applicant for entry to the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

34. The university submitted a weblink to the institutional commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) which was articulated as a series of objectives and a progress report against the EDI strategy that had been dated 2016 – 2020. The university also submitted the university admissions policy which stated that there was *“a commitment to provide all our applicants with a well organised, objective and fair service, making sure that equal opportunities, fair access and inclusion are observed, and that no applicant is disadvantaged or, in any way, treated unfairly”*.

35. During the inspection, the inspectors were keen to understand whether the employer nomination process had an impact on the student demographics. Through discussion with the staff involved in admissions and selection the inspection team heard that employers were provided with a set of strategic principles (received into evidence during the inspection) detailing how employers should focus the opportunity to be available to everyone. The staff involved in admissions and selection reported that, in their experience, employers nominated more candidates than they could provide places for and allowed the university to discern the most appropriate applicants through their interview process. The staff reported that monitoring applicant data, including EDI data, was a standard university process via a dashboard, however, acknowledged that they did not have access to any EDI breakdown from the initial employer sift.

36. Through discussion with key stakeholders the inspection team heard that university staff undertook standard EDI training in line with institutional requirements, and that unconscious bias training was offered to people with lived experience involved in interview on an annual basis. The students met by the inspection team reported that they felt that the admissions process was fair and confirmed that they had the opportunity to request reasonable adjustments. Staff involved in admissions and selection confirmed that the invite to interview letter included information on reasonable adjustments as standard and the team provided examples of how candidate needs had been met in previous cycles. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.6

37. In support of this standard the course provider shared an example of a presentation delivered to prospective applicants covering topics such as student support, modules, course structure, entry requirements and onboarding and enrolment. During inspection the inspection team heard that these presentations were offered to employer partners annually and the students met by the inspection team responded positively when asked if they felt that they had enough information about the course to make an informed decision.

38. At the time of the inspection, the course webpage included information on fees, funding and additional costs, the course structure and that successful students were eligible to apply to register with Social Work England. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

39. The PSD detailed 30 skills days, one 70-day contrasting learning experience (CLE), and one 100-day final placement learning experience (FPLE). The placements were spread over years 2 and 3 (levels 5 and 6) and in addition, students undertook a 30-day on-the-job learning experience in year 1 (level 4). The inspection team were content that there was appropriate planning in place to ensure that students experienced contrasting placements. This was confirmed through discussion with the course team, who explained that there was a spreadsheet maintained of all placements.

40. The inspection team noted that they had reviewed attendance proformas for the CLE (submitted as part of the secondary submission of evidence) and the FPLE, however, had not seen attendance records of skills days. Meetings with key groups identified that attendance at skills days was not routinely recorded in a consistent way and that there was no contingency in place for students to catch up on skills day should they miss one.

41. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.1 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 2.2

42. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included an on-the-job handbook, a mentoring agreement and paperwork in relation to the CLE (CLE agreement, guidance, timetable and induction) and the FPLE (FPLE agreement, guidance, schedule, induction and dates). The inspection team highlighted that the documentary evidence demonstrated a

detailed process for shaping the placement to the needs of the apprentice. Employer mentors were engaged in supporting students during placements and the university also provided example materials from the mentor support programme, including training presentations and a link to a video training session.

43. The students met by the inspection team spoke clearly regarding their understanding of the professional standards noting that they were first introduced to them as part of the admission process where they were asked to grade themselves against them. They felt that they were able to gauge their progression against the standards as they were actively engaged in a process of providing evidence and receiving feedback from their mentor, onsite supervisor and their sub-regional assessor (SRA, the SRA undertook the practice educator role please see [paras 21, 55 and 60](#) for more information). The inspectors further reflected that the employer partners had discussed the learning objectives of the CLE and the FPLE and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

44. Evidence submitted in support of standard 2.3 was the same as had been submitted in support of standard 2.2 (c.f. [para 42](#)). The inspection team paid specific attention to the CLE and FPLE learning agreements when considering this standard.

45. The inspection team noted that the learning agreements included four role profiles that contributed to the supervision and support of apprentices when on placement; the mentor, the SRA, the onsite supervisor and the line manager. It was clear from the role descriptors included within the learning agreement that line managers were responsible for the students' workload when on placement including *'discuss[ing] and agree[ing] all case allocation with the apprentice, onsite supervisor and mentor'*. The agreement also included a checklist which recorded the date that a student read the relevant policies; health and safety (including guidance on managing aggressive behaviour of service users), EDI, confidentiality, data management, security and data protection, records access, whistleblowing, complaints, harassment and disciplinary, lone working, major incidents and IT arrangements.

46. Throughout the inspection stakeholders spoke positively about the support provided for students and employers. Employer partners commented that the SRAs were responsive to queries and students described the support they received on placement as 'very high'. Some apprentices reported having a peer buddy who was an apprentice a year ahead of them, and some students highlighted mentors, line managers, SRAs and the tripartite meetings as being important to their development and support.

47. Students reported that they were provided with timely, and useful, information about their placements and that inductions to placements were good. Experiences of induction varied depending on the level of familiarity the student had with the host team, however, at

their most supportive they included timetabled activities, scheduled meetings with managers, and shadowing.

48. Apprentices acknowledged that the balance of work on the FPLE could be high and that this was complicated to manage, demonstrating their reflective and measured approach to learning. Students and the course team provided examples of practice where workload on placement was too high, and the SRA intervened to ensure a positive outcome. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

49. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the on-the-job learning handbook, the mentor agreement and the CLE and FPLE learning agreements. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided. During the inspection the inspection team heard from the course team that student workloads while on placement were collaboratively managed between the university and the employer partner and provided examples of an instance where an SRA had to intervene regarding the workload of an apprentice (c.f. [para 48](#)). The course team noted that if there was a serious concern over the level of responsibility being given to a student on placement the university would rely on the training services agreements they held with employer partners, who had agreed to provide suitable practice learning opportunities.

50. The students met by the inspection team appeared to be satisfied with the learning objectives set for them, and the way these were sequenced within the programme as they reported that the course developed their skills and knowledge and that they could recognise their own professional growth.

51. The inspectors noted that three out of fourteen students reported in the QAPL that they had not received an initial placement review meeting. The course team reported that this should not occur, and noted that in the previous year the CLE had been organised too late in the cycle. The lead in time for this placement had been brought forward in the current academic year to address these types of inconsistencies. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

52. From the documentary evidence the inspectors understood that readiness for direct practice (RDP) was assessed by direct observation of practice. In support of this standard the university submitted a module at a glance document which included a table of module activity and showed the date, task and explanatory notes for students on the RDP observation. The university also submitted the on-the-job handbook and a student facing guidance document on preparing for the RDP observation.

53. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that the apprentice undertook the RDP in a work situation, working with a service user, and that they received feedback from the assessing SRA. The observation was marked as a pass / fail and made up 10% of the portfolio submitted for the module SW4014, *On The Job Learning*. The inspectors were satisfied with the assessment of RDP and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

54. Following review of the documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection, and through discussion with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were unable to confirm that the university maintained the means, or had sufficient oversight, to ensure that practice educators were on the register and that they had the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experiences to support safe and effective learning.

55. The inspection team understood that the practice educator role was undertaken by the SRA for apprentices. Through discussion with members of the course team involved in practice learning the inspection team heard that SRAs were required to be PEPS qualified and on the register at the point of employment, and that currency was maintained as each SRA supported at least one student each year. In addition, the course team reported that the university reimbursed SRAs for their Social Work England registration fees on an annual basis, if it was claimed, which provided some oversight of registration status. However, the course team conclusively reported that they did not have a formal oversight structure to ensure the status of practice educators that would satisfy this standard.

56. As a result, following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 2.6 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in [the conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 2.7

57. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the CLE and FPLE learning agreements which included a checklist where students recorded the date the placement whistleblowing policy was read. The students met by the inspection team responded positively when asked if they knew what whistleblowing was and when asked if they knew what the policies were. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

58. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included a resources document that set out *'the resources and services designed to ensure that students studying on pre-qualifying social work courses offered in the Department of Social Work and Social Care (DSWSC) can maximise their learning opportunities'*. Lines of accountability were clearly articulated from the head of department and professor of social work, through to hourly paid staff and the document also included a table of staff, their full-time equivalence (FTE) and line manager.

59. The PSD provided a list of the quality assurance processes implemented on the course that included: use of external examiners, boards of study, annual monitoring and enhancement, periodic review undertaken at subject level, apprenticeship evaluations including module evaluation questionnaires (MEQs), level surveys and the National Student Survey (NSS), moderation, representation and feedback from stakeholders (employers and people with lived experience) and through engaging with Social Work England. In addition, the inspection team heard that the SPOC managed any emergent business as and when it occurred.

60. Through discussion with the Senior Leadership Team (SLT), the inspectors heard that the university developed the SRA role in response to the challenges of placements within the apprenticeship which were not funded by the apprenticeship levy. The SLT explained that the SRA role was new to the university, developed for this course, alongside employer partners and through the SPOC.

61. The SLT reported that the university was committed to the development and support of apprentices at a strategic level which was demonstrated by the introduction of APTEM, a software system for the records management of apprentice students, and the separate university regulation of apprentices. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

62. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the CLE and FPLE learning agreements that were understood to be signed off by a member of university staff on a per-apprentice basis.

63. The inspectors were keen to better understand the process by which consents were gained from service users during student placements and heard from employer partners that apprentices identified themselves as a *'social work apprentice'* in their email signatures and that appropriate consents were gained in advance of assessed observations and assessed case studies.

64. The inspection team noted that the placement breakdown processes were covered in the CLE and FPLE guidance documentation under '*dispute resolution*' where the initial stage included discussion between the apprentice, line manager, mentor, on-site supervisor and SRA. Where a resolution could not be found the dispute could be escalated to the learning development team and the wider course team for discussion. The on-the-job learning handbook included a section on dealing with concerns on the job with an overview of the process and a detailed flow chart.

65. The inspection team noted that the university held formal agreements with employee partners (c.f. [para 49](#)) which would be drawn on if the experience provided to students did not meet the Social Work England professional standards, or the education and training standards. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

66. The CLE and FPLE learning agreements were submitted as evidence in support of this standard. The agreements contained a table where students recorded the date that they had read specific policies (c.f. [para 45](#)) including the health and safety policies (further annotated as being inclusive of managing any potential aggressive behaviour of service users) and lone working. The learning agreement made it clear that '*it [was] the responsibility of the on-site supervisor to consider the apprentices safety*' with a yes / no response to the question '*does the apprentice understand the policy and procedures for keeping safe whilst at work*'. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

67. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included minutes from the SPOC group. The minutes provided documented examples where the university had asked for stakeholder volunteers to be involved in activities such as task and finish groups to consider changes in the apprenticeship standard, or the suitability processes for admissions as well as a call for volunteers for an upcoming Practice Assessment Panel (PAP).

68. Through discussions with key stakeholders during the inspection the inspection team heard that SPOC meetings included representatives from across the thirty-three local authorities the apprenticeship served. Employer partners reported that they could add items to the agenda and the communication from the university was described as 'excellent'. The employer partners further noted that attendance at the events was good. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

69. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the course enhancement plan, programme assessment board minutes and PAP and SPOC minutes. In addition the inspection team also considered the PSD which listed the quality assurance evaluation and

monitoring processes (c.f. [para 59](#)). As part of a secondary submission the university supplied three examples of minutes from the student voice committee.

70. The inspection team noted that employers were involved in monitoring, evaluation and improvement activities via the SPOC (c.f. [paras 31, 59-60, 67-68](#) and [84](#)) and were represented on the PAP. Students reported that they were able to provide feedback to student representatives, via surveys and through the student voice committee. They noted that they felt they could be open and honest and provided examples where feedback had been provided which resulted in change. People with lived experience of social work were also represented on the SPOC, were involved in teaching on the course and were involved in assessment of practice portfolios as members of the PAP and via engagement with the end point assessment (EPA). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.6

71. The inspection team were satisfied that the documentary evidence submitted in advance of the inspection was able to demonstrate that this standard was met. The inspectors noted that they felt it was clear where the apprenticeship fit within the suite of programmes and what made it distinct. Through discussion with the SLT the inspection team heard that admissions numbers for the apprenticeship were developed through ongoing conversation with employer partners at the SPOC and employers were cognisant of their responsibility to apprentices when they nominated them to study on the course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

72. The evidence provided to support this standard included the name and Social Work England registration number of the professional lead, and of the course lead, and staff CVs. Registration numbers were crosschecked against the Social Work England register, and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

73. Staff CVs were submitted as evidence in support of this standard. The inspection team were satisfied that the evidence submitted in advance of the inspection was able to demonstrate that the standard was met. Throughout the inspection stakeholders were complimentary regarding the level of support received from staff, with students noting teaching was relevant to their contemporary social work practice.

Standard 3.9

74. The inspection team reviewed the department of social work and social care (DSWSC) resources document (c.f. [para 58](#)) and the social work apprenticeship course evaluation plan submitted in support of this standard. During the inspection the course team provided a demonstration of the data dashboard available to the course leader. The course team

reported the points of focus resulting from the data that were current for them at the time of the inspection, and the plans in place to address any emergent awarding or progression gaps. The course team provided examples of actions taken in response to the data, which included changes to the programme and individualised student action plans where appropriate.

75. It was clear from the demonstration that EDI data was available and was acted upon. The inspection team heard, through discussions with the course team, that the course evaluation plan was informed by the data provided and the inspectors acknowledged that at the time of inspection the course was new, and that awarding data was limited to a single completed cohort. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.10

76. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included a number of links to blog posts reporting on engagement in the profession. The examples provided detailed activities such as shadowing, outreach and research. The inspection team also reviewed staff CVs in relation to this standard.

77. Through discussion with the SLT the inspection team heard that members of the course team were provided with 20% self-directed time within the workload model that enabled them to undertake professional activities. The SLT reported that all academic staff within the department were expected to be involved in the Department for Education (DfE) funded teaching partnership as part of the *academic in practice* initiative. Examples were provided of staff members being involved in safeguarding case reviews and crisis intervention. Academic staff were required to define their primary, secondary, and where relevant, third, research interest domains and the university provided training in academic skills on the Kingston academic practice (KAP) programme. Those who completed the training were eligible for fellowship of Advance HE. The SLT further reported that SRAs were supported with bespoke programme based on PEPS and were also provided with the opportunity to develop their academic careers through the KAP.

78. Through discussion with the SRAs the inspection team heard that the university funded a number of training opportunities for them including a safeguarding course and their application to Advance HE for associate fellow. Employee mentors were provided with training and access to a YouTube channel of developmental content, and the inspection team understood the university were developing a programme for the employee mentors that was based on PEPS1 at the time of the inspection. The inspection team noted that developmental opportunities were underpinned by the staff supervision and appraisal programme and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

79. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included the PSD. Also provided were module outlines which were compiled into a module directory document and were clearly mapped to the Social Work England professional standards at a modular level. Through discussions with stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team felt assured that the breadth and depth of the programme was appropriate.

80. However, the inspection team noted that the index of evidence within the on-the-job handbook was mapped to the apprenticeship standard, and to the professional capabilities framework (PCF) but not to the Social Work England professional standards, and that the, linked apprenticeship standard included on the PSD was out of date.

81. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team agreed that the standard was met with two recommendations. Full details of the recommendations can be found in [the recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard 4.2

82. Examples of minutes from the SPOC were provided in support of this standard. The inspection team noted the minuted activity however, were keen to better understand how a model of co-production with stakeholders was embedded across the design, and ongoing development and review of the curriculum.

83. Through discussion with people with lived experience the inspection team heard that the group had felt very included during the initial development of the course and provided examples where their views had helped to shape the programmes approach to items such as the balance of face-to-face and online teaching. The inspection team also heard that people with lived experience were involved in delivering module content and when involved in teaching were active in the development of teaching resources such as the session presentation. They were also provided with an opportunity to debrief, which had a feedback and pastoral emphasis. The course team reported that people with lived experience had recently undertaken a complete curriculum review and further highlighted a departmental project where films were created of people with lived care experience and are now available to all students. The inspection team recognised that people with lived experience were involved in admissions processes, curriculum delivery, assessment and review projects. However, it was unclear to inspectors how intentional this activity was and whether coproduction with people with lived experience was considered holistically across the course in a strategic way, or in isolation by individual module leaders.

84. Employers reported being able to provide feedback and see changes being made to the course as a result. They reported being very involved in providing programme feedback in the early stages of the SPOC and with the development of the SRA role which was considered to be pivotal to the success of the programme.

85. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met, with the recommendation that the strategic level of involvement of people with lived experience was considered as, although activity was taking place, it was unclear to inspectors how joined up, or preplanned it was. Further details of the recommendation can be found in [the recommendations section of this report](#).

Standard 4.3

86. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the learning aims and objectives for the modules SW4012, *Foundational Skills and Knowledge for Practice*, and SW6012, *Consolidation of Knowledge and Skills for Practice*. Learning aims included ‘to promote an appreciation of the potential impact of adversity, poverty and exclusion on people’s lived experiences and outcomes’ and learning outcomes included aspects such as ‘critically discuss how ethics, law and policy can inform an understanding of the complexities of the case study’. The inspection team considered the on-the-job handbook which included a statement of commitment to EDI which highlighted that the university challenged inequality and aimed for an inclusive environment through implementation of institutional policy and lawful positive action.

87. The inspection team asked a series of questions across a variety of stakeholder groups to better assess how EDI principles were enacted during course delivery. The students met by the inspection team reported receiving robust learning support appropriate for their needs noting that the learning support team were very responsive, and appointments were organised quickly. The inspection team heard from a student with lived experience of disability that the support provided to them had been good and enabled them to engage fully in the programme. They had received a home visit, support with access to work and where accessibility of lecture spaces had been an issue, the lectures were moved to more appropriate accommodations.

88. The course team reported that the apprenticeship was made up of diverse cohorts of students and they were cognisant that in some instances apprentices may not always feel that their experiences were fully understood by their peers. The academic staff discussed providing opportunities in class to explore cultural competency, emphasise intersectionality and encourage students to have cultural conversations that may feel uncomfortable noting that they supported this development by being honest, present and active in the conversation themselves. The course team further reported EDI activities that included decolonising the curriculum, strengthening the conversation around neurodiversity and that they intended for their learning materials to be accessible by default for all students. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

89. Through review of the documentary evidence the inspection team considered the currency of the course and were satisfied that the course was current. Employer partners responded positively when asked if the academic information provided was sufficient to underpin the student's practice and students reported feeling satisfied with the currency of the programme (c.f. [para 73](#)). The inspectors were confident that the academic staff were experienced with horizon scanning and heard that staff remained engaged in practice activities (c.f. [para 77](#)) and that an SRA had recently been published. The quality assurance processes that underpinned these activities were detailed within the PSD (c.f. [para 59](#)) and the external examiner was satisfied. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

90. The inspection team reviewed section D of the PSD, *Principles of Teaching, Learning and Assessment*, which detailed that '*a variety of practice integration tools [were] available to enable apprentices to integrate their off the job learning to their practice experience during on the job based learning*'. The mapping document submitted by the university highlighted the SRA, and employee mentors, as support mechanisms for the integration of theory to practice. Through discussions with the employer partners the inspection team heard that students were expected to undertake several reading tasks and show that reading within assessments as well as think about the theories they were utilising when on placement. Employer mentors noted that the apprentices attended their mentoring sessions well prepared.

91. The course team noted that research was important to them as a department and reported that qualified apprentices from previous cohorts are now involved in university research. It was noted that the course team encourage apprentices to seek out relevant research and use it to increase their knowledge base. The department had been focussed on evaluation research in areas of local practice such as the caring dads project and brought these experiences back to the classroom.

92. The SRAs met by the inspection team reported supporting theory in a variety of ways that included asking students to bring live examples to class and consider the theory base, and by challenging students following direct observations in areas that may need further development. SRAs provided theoretical reading to students and to employer mentors, marked student work and highlighted where support may be required if necessary. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

93. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included a preparatory document outlining an interdisciplinary teaching day that took place alongside nursing students in the university's simulation suite. In addition, the university highlighted module SW5010, *Inter-*

professional work and developing your professional identity, as a source of support for this standard as the module aimed to 'enhance apprentices understanding of interprofessional working, conflicting information, or differing professional decisions and recognition of the implications of practice behaviours for individuals, communities and families'. The module assessed students against a learning outcome that measured their ability to 'demonstrate how collaborative and interprofessional social work practice impact[ed] those who are currently living with experience of social work'.

94. Students met by the inspection team commented positively on the interprofessional learning day and the course team provided more detail on how the simulation worked in practice. They confirmed that social work students, and nursing students, undertook the assessment as independent professionals, however, came together afterwards to discuss their outcomes and consider the different approaches for each of the professions. Through discussion with the employer partners the inspection team heard that apprentices accessed interprofessional learning as part of their on-the-job training with some employers detailing that apprentices benefited from links with the mental health trusts and mixed profession outreach activities. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

95. The inspection team reviewed the PSD and the on-the-job handbook submitted in support of this standard and noted that the documentation provided a clear split between on- and off-the-job learning. The inspectors considered the split to be in keeping with sector norms and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

96. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the module directory and external examiner reports submitted in support of this standard. As part of a secondary submission the university also provided an assessment calendar which gave an overview of assessment by module and included the assessment type (e.g. case study, viva voce, presentation etc.) and key dates such as the student feedback deadline, moderations timeframes and the date of the relevant assessment board.

97. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that the assessment strategy had been developed to acknowledge that apprentices came to the programme with existing knowledge and skills. The course team were keen for assessments to be valuable to students in their on-the-job learning and as a result they favoured modes of assessment that were more easily applied in the workplace. As an example, they described an assessment where students were asked to report an issue, challenge or difficulty they had come across at work, and then reflect on it using the theories and principles they had been learning, encouraging students to start to think critically about their practice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

98. The inspection team reviewed the module directory and the assessment calendar and noted that assessments were appropriately sequenced and mapped to the curriculum. Across the inspection, the inspection team heard from a variety of stakeholders that a change had been made to the programme structure in year 2 (level 5) of the course following student feedback. They understood that the change had been made as some modules were difficult to manage alongside the CLE, demonstrating that sequencing of assessment was reviewed and updated where appropriate. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

99. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the PSD and the module directory, however, the inspection team were keen to better understand how formative assessment was offered within the programme.

100. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that feedback was carefully planned to be supportive and developmental. As an example, the first assessment of the programme was designed to be, what the university staff described as a 'low stakes' assessment of a 500 word, written account of the individual student journey into social work and students were able to submit a draft for formative feedback. The course team noted that students had access to a variety of formative feedback opportunities including submitting drafts of written work, verbal feedback on direct observations of practice and written and verbal feedback in their mentoring, and tripartite review meetings.

101. The students met by the inspection team responded positively when asked about the timeliness and usefulness of feedback. They described it as being clear where improvements could be made and citing the opportunity to submit a draft for formative feedback as especially helpful. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

102. The inspection team reviewed the course staff CVs and the external examiner reports noting that staff had appropriate expertise to undertake assessment for social work and that the external examiner was on the register. Throughout the inspection, the inspection team heard that a broad range of stakeholders were involved in assessment and progression activities, with appropriate levels, and scales, of responsibility. The SRAs undertook the first direct observation and the second was carried out by the employer mentor with support from the SRA. People with lived experience were involved in the EPA (c.f. [para 70](#)) and were members of the PAP (c.f. [para 70](#)) and the university was in the process of developing training for employer mentors at the time of the inspection based on PEPS1 (c.f. [para 78](#)). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

103. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included information on the SRA role and on direct observations of practice. The on-the-job handbook, which detailed the process for collecting feedback from people with lived experience of social work following direct observations of practice, was also submitted alongside the module directory.

104. Similar to the evidence submitted for standard 4.11, the inspection team noted that direct observations of practice took place within the programme (c.f. [paras 52, 92 and 102](#)) and that people with lived experience were involved in the EPA (c.f. [para70](#)) and were members of the PAP (c.f. [para70](#)).

105. In addition, the inspection team acknowledge the tripartite meetings as being a point of progression management which they understood to include the SRA, the student, the employer mentor, the line manager and on occasion the local authority learning development manager. Through discussions with the employer partners the inspection team heard that the tripartite review meeting notes were stored on the apprentice data system APTEMS (c.f. [para 61](#)) where they were accessible to partners to review. The inspection team heard an example where a tripartite meeting had identified that a student required some training, and the employer was able to action that need, and made the training available to future apprentices as part of the standard induction offer. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

106. The inspection team reviewed the module directory submitted in advance of the inspection and were content that the course appeared to be underpinned by research and evidence-based practice, noting that the module SW6012, *Consolidation of Knowledge and Skills for Practice*, included the opportunity for students to undertake their own research. Through discussions with employer partners the inspection team heard an example of the evidence-based practice of the apprentices positively impacting the local authority, as the apprentices had been learning trauma informed practice which directly led to the employer providing trauma informed practice training to their existing staff. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

107. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, student support was articulated well and understood the SRA role to be central to the success of the course support systems.

108. Central wellbeing services reported clearly on the forms of support on offer to students which included counselling and disability support services. Students could access six hours

of counselling, provided in one-hour blocks, once a week, each academic year. The service was able to refer students into the external mental health teams should support be required for a longer period of time. The mental health and wellbeing services also offered listening sessions, drop-in appointments and time management sessions.

109. Apprentices were able to access occupational health services through their employer.

110. The university was able to provide students with a statement of support needs (SOSN) which was considered an internal document. Although not routinely shared with employers, apprentices were encouraged to share the SOSN with their employer and the university would do this on their behalf with consent.

111. The careers service reported an embedded model of support. The course had a dedicated careers professional who was involved in the programme in a bespoke way which included providing information and support for the transition to ASYE and delivered specific sessions on how to make the most of the ASYE. The inspection team heard that registration with Social Work England was included as part of this provision, and that academic subject experts were also on hand to provide contextualisation. In addition, the service delivered the future skills student journey programme at all levels of the degree apprenticeship which covered professional and executive functioning skills such as self-motivation and self-awareness. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

112. In advance of the inspection the inspection team reviewed the course handbook that included information on student support, highlighting the SRA as the personal tutor.

113. Through discussions with central support services the inspection team heard that the academic skills centre provided support on challenges such as academic writing and referencing. The service offered one-to-one appointments where students could bring their assignment and a writing sample and receive tailored advice on technique.

114. The library service offered inductions to all new students which concentrated on resources accessible off campus for apprentices. The library also provided bookable one-to-one appointments either face-to-face or via teams depending on the student's preference. Appointments were available five days per week, however an instant messaging (IM) service provided support across seven days. The inspection team also heard that the library delivered embedded sessions across the curriculum providing information literacy training progressively across the levels moving from accessing resources in year 1 (level 4), through legal sources of information in year 2 (level 5) with training on how to do research in year 3 (level 6).

115. The inspection team noted that the SRA had a significant role on the academic and pastoral development of students. Across the inspection the SRA was reported on positively

(c.f. [paras 46, 84 and 107](#)). Through discussion with the SRAs the inspection team heard that in addition to fulfilling a pattern of contact through observed direct practice they also provided themed tutorials which covered a number of developmental areas. The examples provided were exploring confidentiality and collecting feedback from people with lived experience. Some students met by the inspection team reported receiving a weekly group lecture from their SRA that covered emergent issues for apprentices that week, and others described their SRA as being in 'constant communication'. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

116. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the student suitability process documentation submitted in support of this standard. The university also provided the institutional regulations that governed fitness to practice (regulation 4a) and fitness to practice procedures – student health and disability (regulation 4b). The declaration of suitability form completed by students at admissions (c.f. [para 32](#)) included a declaration that stated *'whilst I am an apprentice, I will have to inform university staff of any pending prosecutions, and ... any convictions, cautions, reprimands, or final warnings which will appear on an enhanced DBS certificate at the earliest possible time'*. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team heard that there was no on-going process to check the continuing suitability of students.

117. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 5.3 in relation to the approval of this course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in [the conditions section of this report](#).

Standard 5.4

118. The inspection team reviewed the course handbook and a link supplied to the institutional information on disability and mental health support at the university. Through discussion with central support services the inspectors heard that disability support services worked with students who had lived experience of disability to develop a SOSN for reasonable adjustments within the learning environment. Students were provided with a named advisor.

119. As apprentices were usually ineligible for disabled students' allowance (DSA) the university provided advice, and worked with employers to identify and access other sources of support and funding to ensure that reasonable adjustments were met within the workplace. Where there continued to be a funding gap the university funded the student

and claimed it back from the education and skills funding council (ESFA). Disability support services proactively contacted apprentices who disclosed a disability at admission and continued to run the required reports throughout the year to ensure that they captured all emergent disclosures.

120. The turnaround time for student services was dependant on the time of year, however, response time was typically five days. Students reported positive experiences with contact times, and gave specific examples of where reasonable adjustments had been made (c.f. [para 87](#)).

121. The SRAs reported that they felt able to support students who had an SOSN and noted that in the main they experienced an open dialogue between students, employers and university in relation to reasonable adjustment. However, they were able to provide an example where this did not occur, and an employer had not provided the recommended reasonable adjustments. The SRA was able to confidently advocate for the student to a resolution. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

122. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course handbook which included information on the programme learning outcomes, module detail and assessment strategy. The on-the-job handbook included information on the CLE and FPLE. The students met by the inspection team reported feeling that they had enough information on placements (c.f. [para 47](#)).

123. The careers service provided embedded sessions on the transition to qualified social worker (c.f. [para 111](#)) and students responded positively when asked if they understood the transition to registered social worker.

124. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with the recommendation that the university consider the accuracy of the information included in the on-the-job handbook in relation to registration and the cycle of inspection. Full details of the recommendation can be found in [the recommendation section of this report](#).

Standard 5.6

125. Prior to inspection the inspection team reviewed the on-the-job learning handbook and noted that section 6.5 included a clear statement on attendance which read '*you must attend all programmed sessions in full*'.

126. Through discussions with key stakeholders the inspection team heard that the university implemented an electronic card swipe attendance system, which the course team backed up with paper registers stored by the course leader as required for apprentice attendance monitoring. Students reported understanding that all sessions were mandatory

and that if they were absent from university, they must also inform their employer. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

127. Following a review of the documentary evidence and through discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were assured that students had access to satisfactory points of feedback. Feedback was provided formatively, as well as on assessment. Feedback was also provided by the SRA, on placement portfolios, by the employer mentor and the through the tripartite review meetings. Students reported feedback as timely and clear (c.f. [standards 3.9](#), [4.8](#) and [4.10](#) for more information on student feedback). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

128. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the course handbook with a link to the student regulations and the inspection team noted that institutional regulation AR8, *Academic Appeals - Taught Courses* governed the process for academic appeals at an institutional level. The students met by the inspection team reported being aware of the academic appeal process. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

129. The inspection team reviewed the PSD and agreed that the award of BA (Hons) Social Work Integrated Degree Apprenticeship met the standard, noting that other exit awards were clearly distinguished from the registered award. In addition, the inspection team noted an appropriate variation from the institutional general regulation, AR1.12, preventing the BA (Hons) Social Work Integrated Degree Apprenticeship to be awarded by aegrotat. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Proposed outcome

The inspection team recommend that the course be approved with conditions. These will be monitored for completion.

Conditions

Conditions for approval are set if there are areas of a course that do not currently meet our standards. Conditions must be met by the education provider within the agreed timescales.

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 2.1	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that a process has been developed to: - record attendance at skills days in a robust way; - ensure that there is a consistent approach to missed skills days including appropriate measures to enable students to make up skills days should they be missed.	28 May 2024	Para 40
2	Standard 2.6	The education provider will develop a system that will enable them to 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.	28 May 2024	Para 55
3	Standard 5.3	The education provider will develop a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students conduct, character and health.	28 May 2024	Para 116

Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	Standard 4.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider whether the Social Work England professional standards should be included within the evidence mapping table.	Para 80
2	Standard 4.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university update the apprenticeship standard linked to in the PSD.	Para 80
3.	Standard 4.2	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider the involvement of people with lived experience at a strategic level to ensure that coproduction is occurring holistically across the programme.	Para 83
4.	Standard 5.5	The inspectors are recommending that section 3.6 of the on-the-job handbook, and any other sections that are applicable, are updated to reflect that successful completion of the EPA enables you to <i>apply to register</i> as a social worker.	Para 124
5.	Standard 5.5	The inspectors are recommending that page 15 of the on-the-job handbook is updated to remove the reference to a 3-year cycle of inspection.	Para 124

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

1. 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](#).
2. A review of the conditions evidence will be undertaken and recommendations will be made to Social Work England's decision maker.
3. This section of the report will be completed when the conditions review is completed.

	Standard not met	Condition	Recommendation
1	2.1	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that a process has been developed to: - record attendance at skills days in a robust way; - ensure that there is a consistent approach to missed skills days including appropriate measures to enable students to make up skills days should they be missed.	Condition met
2	2.6	The education provider will develop a system that will enable them to 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.	Condition met
3	5.3	The education provider will develop a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students conduct, character and health.	Condition met

Findings

4. The conditions review was undertaken as a result of the conditions set during the course approval as outlined in the original inspection report above.
5. In addition to items of documentary evidence the course provider also supplied a conditions monitoring mapping form (hereafter 'the mapping form') which included written narrative on the steps taken to meet the conditions.
6. In response to condition 1 the education provider submitted a mapping document that detailed the number, topic and indicative date of delivery of 33 skills days within the course. The mapping form provided narrative to explain that skills days were recorded on MS Teams and apprentices were required to reflect on learning from the skills day in their learning log. Apprentices were required to complete the learning log whether they attended the skills day or reviewed the recording. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.
7. When considering condition 2 the inspection team acknowledged that the practice educator role was undertaken by the sub-regional assessors (SRA) at Kingston University (c.f. paras [21](#), [55](#) and [60](#) for more information on this role). The course provider submitted a document that recorded where the practice educators met the institutional understanding of qualification, currency and registration. The mapping document noted that SRAs were required to confirm, by email, each year that their Social Work England registration was renewed, which was crosschecked by the course team. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.
8. The education provider provided no documentary evidence for condition 3. However, they reported in the mapping document that the paperwork supporting the mentoring agreement, and placement review meetings would be updated to include a self-declaration of continued suitability. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.
9. Following the review of the documentary evidence submitted, the inspection team are satisfied that the conditions set against the approval of the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship are met.

Regulator decision

After reviewing the evidence and the inspectors recommendations the regulator asked for additional information to strengthen the conditions evidence provided. In respect of condition 2 and standard 2.6 the regulator asked for confirmation that the training delivered to SRAs covered the PEPs. This evidence was provided. In relation to condition 3 standard 5.3 the regulator requested to see evidence of the paperwork that had been implemented in relation to ongoing suitability, this was provided. The conditions for this course have been met.