

Inspection Report

Inspection ID	BUR1_BCP323
Course provider	Bournemouth University
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	MCA 2005
Mode of study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	40
Date of inspection	7 – 8 October 2025
Inspection team	Daisy Bragadini (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Kate Springett (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Rebecca Staff (Lay Inspector) Surj Sall-Dullat (BIA registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	30/01/2026
Conditions	Standard 1.1 Standard 3.3 Standard 1.4 Standard 1.5

	Standard 1.6 Standard 2.2 Standard 3.1 Standard 3.3 Standard 4.2
Date conditions met and approved:	10/06/2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of Inspection.....	4
Inspection Findings.....	4
Outcome	16
Conditions	16
Meeting of Conditions.....	19
Findings	21

Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses. Inspections form part of our process to make sure that courses meet our education and training approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses. We approve courses against these standards to ensure that students who successfully complete a BIA course can meet the requirements set out in the Mental Capacity Act 2005, Schedule A1 and 1A, the Mental Capacity (Deprivation of Liberty: Standard Authorisations, Assessments and Ordinary Residence) Regulations 2008 and the 6 BIA capabilities as described in Annex 1 to the education and training approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses.
2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. This will include a registered inspector, who is a qualified BIA, and a lay inspector who is not BIA qualified.
3. These inspectors, along with a minimum of one officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake an activity to review documentary information and evidence, and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, observations, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.
4. The process we undertake is described in our legislation: The Children and Social Work Act 2017, [The Social Workers Regulations 2018 - Social Work England](#), and our [Education and Training Rules 2019](#).
5. In this document, we describe Bournemouth University as ‘the course provider’, and we describe the MCA 2005 as ‘the course’.

Summary of Inspection

6. Bournemouth University and their MCA 2005 course were inspected as part of Social Work England’s reapproval cycle, whereby all course providers with BIA courses will be inspected against the new education and training approval standards for BIA courses.

7. A remote inspection took place from 7 – 8 October 2025.

8. As part of this process, the inspection team gathered feedback from key stakeholders through meetings on inspection. This included members of the course providers' course team, admissions team and students. In addition to staff from the university we met with people with lived experience, and employer partners. Written feedback was also gathered from students who were unable to attend the inspection meeting.

Inspection Findings

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

Standard 1. Admissions	Met or not met.
<p>1.1 Confirm that applicants have:</p> <p>i. The potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the 6 BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards.</p> <p>ii. the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice.</p> <p>iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</p>
<p>1.2 Confirm that applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>1.3 Confirm that applicants have, and can demonstrate, suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation, and demonstrable experience of understanding risk in relation to these.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</p>
<p>1.4 Confirm that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</p>
<p>1.5 Ensure that employers, providers of observation opportunities, people with lived experience, and carers are involved in admissions processes.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</p>

<p>1.6 Ensure that the admissions processes include assessment of the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes appropriate criminal conviction checks.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</p>
<p>1.7 Ensure that there are equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>1.8 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place. This will include information about the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modes, location of study, assessment methods, duration, and observation requirements, including the expectations around arranging or securing observation opportunities.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p><u>Key observations for standard 1</u></p> <p>10. The course provider confirmed that they accept both sponsored and independent students onto their MCA 2005 programme.</p> <p>11. A copy of a redacted application form was provided to the inspection team during the inspection. This is evidence that, as part of the application process, applicants must provide their employment history, qualifications and a personal statement when applying for the MCA 2005.</p> <p>12. In addition to the application form, a reference for the applicant from their sponsor employer was sought as part of the application and admissions process.</p> <p>13. We were satisfied that the application process for sponsored applicants was robust, but identified that there was a lack of process in relation to independent applicants. (1.1)</p> <p>14. The inspection team sought information from the course provider to show they ensured that all applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations. Admissions staff confirmed that professional registration was checked at the point of application, against the relevant register. (1.2)</p> <p>15. We were satisfied that the course provider considered whether sponsored applicants had suitable prior relevant experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, and a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas. (1.3, 1.4) This was based on the application form and the sponsor's employer reference. This, however, was only relevant to sponsored applicants and not applicable to independent applicants.</p>	

16. As indicated above, it was identified that there was no application process in place for independent students, which has resulted in conditions around standard area: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4.

17. In relation to the consideration of applicants' conduct, character and health, we were assured that health was covered as part of the application process; although there was no oversight of DBS, which the course provider held the sponsoring organisation responsible for and therefore standard 1.6 was not met. (1.6)

18. We were not feel assured that there was a robust process for ensuring the assessment of the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct and character and therefore imposed a condition against standard area 1.6

19. In relation to stakeholder involvement, there was clear evidence that employers/providers of observation opportunities were involved directly in the admissions process. This was demonstrated by their references provided for applicants.

20. The course provider was, however, unable to evidence any involvement of people with lived experience, and/or carers. This was further supported by the attendees of the people with lived experience meeting. The group had a range of ideas on how they could be involved in the MCA 2005, but these were yet to be considered and implemented. A condition was set against standard 1.5 due to a lack of stakeholder (people with lived experience and/or carers) involvement in the admissions process. (1.5)

21. We were satisfied that the course provider had equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants and that they were implemented and monitored. The course provider was able to provide examples of this during the inspection, which demonstrated they met the relevant standard. (1.7)

22. There was clear information available online regarding the course requirements, cost, and structure, and therefore applicants were given all of the information they required to enable them to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the MCA 2005. (1.8)

Standard 2. Course governance, management and quality.	Met or not met
2.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in delivering, resourcing and managing the quality of the course.	Met
2.2 Ensure that effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with relevant lived experience, including carers, and students.	Not met See key observations for standard 2

	for further information.
2.3 Ensure that admissions are aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of: i. wherever appropriate, local and regional capacity for observation opportunities; and ii. The availability of part-time or other flexible course arrangements to widen access wherever possible.	Met
2.4 Ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course is a relevant qualified professional (social worker, occupational therapist, psychologist or nurse) with appropriate experience of BIA practice.	Met
2.5 Ensure that there is adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.	Met
2.6 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation and policy, including recent developments, and the practical application of this via the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, including giving support to undertake continuing professional development relevant to their role.	Met
2.7 Ensure that students have the opportunity to provide feedback about the course and that this feedback is analysed, shared with employers and others involved in commissioning places on the course, and used to inform the management and development of the course.	Met
<p><u>Key observations for standard 2.</u></p> <p>23. We explored whether the course was supported by a governance plan which had adequate staffing to ensure the course delivered was of quality. The course was led by a qualified BIA who was also registered with Social Work England. (2.1, 2.4)</p> <p>24. Documentary evidence provided included an organisational chart and a narrative which explained the lines of responsibility. During the inspection, we heard that there were contingencies in place for any unplanned staff absences, and they felt the overall plan and governance were robust. We were satisfied that there was adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff on the MCA 2005 and felt the course staff were supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation and policy. (2.1, 2.5, 2.6)</p>	

25. Members of the teaching staff told us they keep up to date with legislation, and the inspection team also heard that visiting lecturers had access to the library resources to enable them to remain up to date. (2.6)

26. We explored whether admissions numbers were aligned to a clear strategy for placement capacity and observation opportunities, as well as widening participation by offering flexible course arrangements. (2.3)

27. Employers explained how they had in the past negotiated with the course provider in relation to arranging cohorts, which demonstrated the flexibility of the course provider in when to offer the MCA 2005. (2.3)

28. The course team explained they had minimum and maximum student numbers, and they could arrange bespoke courses, as indicated above, in response to employer partner needs. (2.3)

29. It was understood that student numbers fluctuated based on practicalities and local need, and should they take on a higher number of students compared to average, they had visiting lecturers and additional staff to assist with marking. Based on this, we agreed there was a strategy in place for student numbers. (2.3)

30. In relation to the inclusion of employers, people with relevant lived experience, including carers, and students in monitoring, evaluating and improving the course, the inspection team heard from students that they had fed back about how the course could be improved, and their feedback was taken on board, and examples of this were provided. (2.2)

31. However, it was made clear to us by employers and people with relevant lived experience that they have not been involved in monitoring, evaluating or improving the course. As a result, we decided that a condition against standard 2.2 would be appropriate, in order to address the lack of stakeholder involvement in the above mentioned actions. (2.2)

32. Students were able to confirm to the inspection team that they had the opportunity to provide feedback about the course, and all students who met with the inspection team recalled being asked to complete a questionnaire on the course. (2.7)

33. The inspection team agreed the course provider was receptive to feedback, as they had used student feedback to adapt hours of study and had delivered courses face to face when requested by employers. (2.7)

Standard 3. Observation opportunities.

Met or not met

3.1 Ensure that each student has the opportunity to undertake a minimum of 2 practice observation opportunities, which:

Not met

i. enables the student to shadow a BIA or community DoLS assessment.

See key observations for standard 3

<p>ii. Provide practice experience that can be applied to a variety of settings and types of supervisory bodies.</p> <p>iii. enables the student to observe a suitably qualified and experienced relevant qualified professional who has relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to demonstrate safe and effective practice.</p> <p>iv. enables the student to produce a detailed analysis of relevant practice issues, which forms part of the student's overall assessment.</p>	<p>for further information.</p>
<p>3.2 Ensure that the number, duration and range of observation opportunities are appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>3.3 Maintain clear collaborative arrangements for planning and communication with providers, including a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 3 for further information.</p>
<p><u>Key observations for standard 3.</u></p> <p>34. The course provider required students to undertake a minimum of 2 observations, specifically in the field of deprivation of liberty. They also incorporated a ‘third-party testimony’ which evidenced that students met the BIA capabilities and could therefore meet the course learning outcomes following their 2 observations. (3.1, 3.2)</p> <p>35. However, we found that the course provider put the responsibility on the applicant/student to arrange their own observation opportunities. (3.1)</p> <p>36. The inspection team met with employer partners, who felt it could be challenging to provide observation opportunities due to workloads, and the inspectors understood there was not a robust arrangement in place between employer partners and the course provider. (3.3)</p> <p>37. We found there was an absence of collaboration with employers, and therefore concluded standard 3.1 and 3.3 were not met.</p>	
<p><u>Standard 4. Curriculum and assessment</u></p>	<p><u>Met or not met</u></p>

<p>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 requirements of the role as set out in the 6 BIA capabilities set out at Annex 1, as well as a sound understanding of cross-national border issues in relation to practice in Wales, where this is appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Not met</u></p> <p>See key observations for standard 4 for further information.</p>
<p>4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.5 Ensure that the integration of policy, legal literacy and practice is central to the course.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.6 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.7 Provide staff involved in leading and delivering the training with sufficient protected training time to keep their own practice and knowledge up to date in line with statutory and regulatory requirements.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.8 Ensure that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to make robust, independent and well-evidenced assessments in the best interests of the person. This should include regular monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards to ensure that they remain robust and reliable.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.9 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>
<p>4.10 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation, underpinned by</p>	<p><u>Met</u></p>

skills, knowledge and an ability to interpret and respond appropriately to legislative and policy change and case law.	
4.11 Ensure that the course equips students with knowledge and skills in relation to identifying and anticipating areas of conflict arising from DoLS processes and outcomes, and supporting individuals, families, carers and agencies to understand the checks and balances of the DoLS system, to support a robust, independent and well-evidenced determination in the best interests of the person.	Met
4.12 Clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the course.	Met
4.13 Clearly specify that any equivalent award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as a BIA.	Met
4.14 Clearly specify a process for the appointment of at least 1 external examiner who must be an appropriately experienced and relevant qualified professional.	Met
<p><u>Key observations for standard 4.</u></p> <p>38. Overall, we found that the course enabled students to develop the necessary knowledge and skills to practise as a BIA. The course provider gave an overview of the course content in their documentary evidence submission, and the course learning outcomes aligned with statutory frameworks and the programme content aligned with DoLS regulations. (4.1, 4.11)</p> <p>39. The course provider shared evidence which demonstrated that they collaborated with external experts who taught on the course and shared their knowledge and expertise. (4.4)</p> <p>40. Students informed us that case law was updated as changes happened, and this was throughout the course. They reported being able to reflect on case law and use their learning in practice. We were assured that the course was continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law. (4.4, 4.10)</p> <p>41. There was also evidence that the integration of policy, legal literacy, and practice was central to the course. In the documentary evidence submission, the assignment briefs were provided, which explained the process of how academic reflection was based on practice and observation. (4.5)</p> <p>42. The course provider had a policy which guided EDI (equality, diversity and inclusion) in relation to the course which the inspection team reviewed, and it was also demonstrated that the Human Rights Act was incorporated in the course design. (4.3)</p> <p>43. We heard examples of ways the course provider had demonstrated EDI as part of the course design, and they agreed the course was designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks. (4.3)</p>	

44. There is a requirement that employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum; however, the inspection team were not satisfied that this was met. (4.2)

45. We understood that there were some discussions with employer partners in relation to the above, but these were informal, and there appeared to be a lack of relationships with the course provider and employer partners. (4.2)

46. When we with employer partners and PWLE, it was made clear that both stakeholder groups were not involved in the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum. (4.2)

47. We were satisfied that the course provider had considered the number of hours spent in structured academic learning, and this was adequate. Further to this, the course team explained that they had increased the number of hours as changes were made to the course, and it was likely this was to increase further as they involve PWLE in the course. (4.6)

48. Feedback was provided to students throughout the course, which included third-party testimonies and group discussions. We felt that the learning environment was one of openness, where students could express their views and get feedback on a more informal basis. (4.9)

49. The assessment guidelines and marking were clear for the students, which ensured fairness, consistency, and achievement, and the inspection team agreed the assessments were robust, fair, reliable and valid.

50. We heard that there was support available for those who did not pass assessments, which helped them improve and be successful when retaking assessments. (4.8)

51. The programme handbook stated there was a requirement of obtaining the full 40 credits to be eligible to be approved, and when we met with students, they felt assured that applicants/students were aware of this information. The course provider also explained in their evidence submission that there is no equivalent award in relation to the BIA module. (4.12, 4.13)

52. We saw evidence to demonstrate that the programme lead was able to keep their practice and knowledge up to date through their own BIA practice, attending BIA forums, and being involved in research. The course teaching team also confirmed they had protected time to keep up to date and that they attended forums. (4.7)

53. We agreed there was a process in place for recruiting an EE (external examiner) and the EE in post was registered with Social Work England. (4.14)

Standard 5. Supporting students.

Met or not met

5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing, including confidential counselling services. The course must also equip students to understand the potential impact of BIA practice on their own

Met

emotional and mental well-being, and the importance of identifying ways to handle this impact.	
5.2 Ensure that students have access to a system of academic and pastoral support for their progression, development and welfare.	Met
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	Met
5.4 Make reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the specialist capabilities in accordance with relevant legislation.	Met
5.5 Provide timely information to students about their curriculum, observation requirements, assessments, and implications for their continuing practice, including arrangements for annotation of the register and requirements for periodic refresher training.	Met
5.6 Ensure that students can draw links between the completion of their BIA course and ongoing refresher training, and the ongoing requirements of their professional registration, such as continuing professional development.	Met
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	Met
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	Met
5.9 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational	Met

wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.

Key observations for standard 5.

54. Evidence demonstrated that support for students began at the application stage and was available throughout the course via the personal tutor system and the virtual learning environment. The inspection team agreed that support was both academic and pastoral. (5.2)

55. The course provider was able to provide documentation to evidence that there was adequate support available for students to access, if necessary. In addition to the documentary evidence, this was triangulated with the course team and students as part of the inspection. Students reported feeling supported by the course provider in their studies. (5.1)

56. We found that the processes for ensuring an applicant's conduct, health and character did not meet the standard (see standard area 1). However, despite this, we felt that the arrangements for ongoing suitability appropriately met standard 5.3, as this was demonstrated by the content in the student handbook. In addition to this, students confirmed that they were aware of the steps they would need to take should their professional registration lapse. We were satisfied there were positive working relationships with employers and providers of observation opportunities, so they were further assured of course provider oversight, as they had support from employers in relation to this. (5.3)

57. We received evidence in relation to specific reasonable adjustments which were made for students with health conditions or impairments, which enabled them to progress through the course and meet the specialist capabilities. (5.4)

58. We agreed that the virtual learning environment enabled the course provider to have an accessible and inclusive approach, as learning and resources could be accessed and adapted as required for students. (5.4)

59. Information about the curriculum, observation requirements, assessments, and implications for their continuing practice, including arrangements for annotation of the register and requirements for periodic (annual) refresher training, was provided at the application stage and was in the programme handbook, on the virtual learning environment and in assignment briefings. There was also an appeals policy in place, which was accessible via the student online portal. (5.5, 5.6, 5.8)

60. In relation to feedback on assessments, there was documentary evidence which showed there were processes in place for providing feedback, and, during the inspection, students reported feedback was constructive and available at different stages of the course. (5.7)

61. Evidence seen demonstrated there were relevant and adequate policies and processes in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and the inspection team were satisfied that this included in workplace settings. (5.9)

Outcome

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

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

Conditions

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

65. 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	<p>The education provider must confirm that, at the application stage, independent applicants have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards ii. the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and 	30/04/2026	1.1

		techniques to achieve course outcomes		
2	1.3	The education provider must ensure independent applicants demonstrate suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation, and demonstrable experience of understanding risk in relation to these.	30/04/2026	1.3
3	1.4	The education provider will have a process in place for confirming that independent applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.	30/04/2026	1.4
4	1.5	The education provider must ensure people with lived experience, and / or carers are involved in admissions processes.	30/04/2026	1.5
5	1.6	The education provider must have a robust admissions process that assesses applicants' suitability regarding conduct and character, and includes appropriate checks for criminal convictions. Additionally, if the responsibility of DBS checks is with employer partners, the education provider must develop a mechanism by which they have oversight of this.	30/04/2026	1.6
6	2.2	The education provider must ensure that effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers and people with relevant lived experience including carers.	30/04/2026	2.2
7	3.1	The education provider must have robust and collaborative	30/04/2026	3.1

		arrangements in place, for both sponsored and independent applicants in relation to ensuring they have the opportunity to undertake a minimum of 2 practice observation opportunities.		
8	3.3	The education provider, in collaboration with employer partners, must ensure that there are effective systems in place for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities	30/04/2026	3.3
9	4.2	The education provider must ensure that that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and/or carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	30/04/2026	4.2

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

Meeting of Conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1	Standard 1.1	<p>The education provider must confirm that, at the application stage, independent applicants have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards ii. The potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice iii. The capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes 	Condition met
2	Standard 1.3	The education provider must ensure independent applicants demonstrate suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation, and demonstrable experience of understanding risk in relation to these.	Condition met
3	Standard 1.4	The education provider will have a process in place for confirming that independent applicants have a	Condition met

		robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.	
4	Standard 1.5	The education provider must ensure people with lived experience, and / or carers are involved in admissions processes.	Condition met
5	Standard 1.6	The education provider must have a robust admissions process that assesses applicants' suitability regarding conduct and character, and includes appropriate checks for criminal convictions. Additionally, if the responsibility of DBS checks is with employer partners, the education provider must develop a mechanism by which they have oversight of this.	Condition met
6	Standard 2.2	The education provider must ensure that effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers and people with relevant lived experience including carers.	Condition met
7	Standard 3.1	The education provider must have robust and collaborative arrangements in place, for both sponsored and independent applicants in relation to ensuring they have the opportunity to undertake a minimum of 2 practice observation opportunities.	Condition met
8	Standard 3.3	The education provider, in collaboration with employer partners, must ensure that there are effective systems in place for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities	Condition met
9	Standard 4.2	The education provider must ensure that that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and/or carers are incorporated into the	Condition met

		design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum	
--	--	--	--

Findings

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

71. With respect to the condition set against standard 1.1, 1.4 and 1.6, the education provider now requires all applicants to have a reference.

72. The reference requires the referee to verify applicants meet the requirements set out in standard 1.1. Additionally, the referee is required to confirm applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas which is relevant to standard 1.4. The referee also has to state the applicants' registration body, their registration number and whether or not they have a DBS check in place which is relevant to standard 1.6

73. The inspectors are recommending that the conditions against standard 1.1, 1.4 and 1.6 are met.

74. With respect to the condition set against standard 1.3, the inspectors note that the application process has been amended so that it is the same for both sponsored and independent applicants. The application process requires applicants to list their current and previous employment, and complete a personal statement setting out how their current practice meets the standard. In addition to this, the reference mentioned above requires the referee to confirm the applicants prior experience.

75. The inspectors are recommending that the condition set against standard 1.3 is met.

76. With respect to the condition set against standard 1.5, the education provider has provided evidence that PIER partnership (PWLE) will co-produce questions and participate in interview panel as part of the admissions process. The inspectors are therefore recommending that the condition against standard 1.5 is met.

77. In relation to the condition set against standard 2.2 and 4.2, the education provider are introducing a 'course monitoring board' once every semester, which will include employers and PWLE. Evidence has been provided to demonstrate the arrangements already made in relation to introducing these meetings. The meetings will include monitoring and improving the course as well as influencing developments in the design of the course, including suggestions from members of the PIER Partnership and employers. The inspectors are recommending that the conditions set against standard 2.2 and 4.2 are met.

78. A condition was set for standard 3.1, whereby the course provider must ensure that all applicants can undertake 2 practice observations. We have received narrative explaining observations will form part of the agenda for the course monitoring board, and there is a process in place where the course provider assist students in obtaining observations if necessary. The inspectors are recommending that the condition against standard 3.1 is met.

79. With respect to the condition set against standard 3.3, the introduction of the course monitoring board ensures there are effective systems in place for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities, as these will be discussed in the meeting. In addition to this, employers are required to complete evaluation forms on the observation opportunities. The inspectors are recommending that the condition against standard 3.3 is met.

Regulator decision

80. Conditions met.