



Inspection Report

Course provider: Canterbury Christ Church University

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work, MA Social Work (full-time), MA Social Work (part-time), PG Dip (exit route only) (full-time), PG Dip (exit route only) (part-time)

Inspection dates: 14 – 17 March 2023

Report date:	4 May 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	14 June 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	7 November 2023

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	22
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	25
Proposed outcome.....	25
Conditions	26
Recommendations	27
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	29
Regulator decision	36
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	37
Findings	38

Introduction

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

What we do

5. When an education provider wants to make a change to a course, or request the approval of a new course, they are asked to consider how their course meets our education and training standards and our professional standards, and provide evidence of this to us. 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 appearance 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- or four-day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final decision about the approval of the course.
13. The decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. Canterbury Christ Church's BA (Hons) Social Work, and MA Social Work with a PG Dip exit route (both available full- and part-time) 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	CCCUR1
Course provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work MA Social Work (full-time) MA Social Work (part-time) PGDip Social Work (exit route only) (full-time) PGDip Social Work (exit route only) (part-time)
Mode of Study	BA: Full time MA: Full time and Part time PGDip (exit route only): Full time and Part time
Maximum student cohort	BA (Hons) Social Work: 45 MA Social Work: 45
Date of inspection	14 March – 17 March 2023
Inspection team	Nikki Steel-Bryan (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Gill Nixon (Education Quality Assurance Operations Manager) Aidan Worsley (Lay Inspector) Jane Reeves (Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	Approved with conditions

Language

16. In this document we describe Canterbury Christ Church University as 'the education provider' or 'the university' and we describe the BA, MA and PGDip as 'the courses'.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 14 March – 17 March 2023. 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 elected student reps from years 2 and 3 of the BA (Hons) Social Work degree and from years 1 and 2 of the MA Social Work programme. Discussions included the student experience of placement allocation, curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment, support available through the university, the student voice and attendance monitoring and absences.

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 and student support services.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in the delivery of the BA and MA as well as other courses within the faculty. Discussions included their role in the interview processes, their contributions to curriculum development, 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 Kent County Council, Medway Council, Porchlight Homeless Charity and Home Start.

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 including the course specification and special regulations for the BA, and the course specification, special regulations and link to the programme webpage for the MA.

26. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection detailed entry criteria for the MA as a 'relevant degree' and the inspection team were keen to better understand which degrees were considered to be relevant. Through discussion with the course team it was made clear that undergraduate study within the social sciences was considered as directly relevant for entry to the MA, and where the undergraduate degree was outside of the social sciences applicants were to have had experience within the social care sector.

27. The inspection team queried the volume of interviews undertaken with experts by experience as the documentary evidence noted that involvement was in 50% of interviews for the BA. The inspection team heard from the course team and staff responsible for admissions that while the university did not stipulate that experts by experience would be involved in all interviews, they aimed for 100% engagement. At the time of the inspection the course provider was limited by the size of the pool of experts and their availability however the faculty were actively recruiting to these roles and the inspection team heard that there was an expert by experience lead for the faculty, a strategy running to 2025 and a named expert by experience lead within the Social Work course team. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

28. Through discussion with staff responsible for admissions and selection the inspection team heard that applicants were expected to reflect upon their prior learning and experience within the UCAS form, as part of the written test, and when responding to interview questions. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the university's Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) policy that was supplemented by a faculty RPL Policy. RPL was overseen within the faculty by the Faculty Quality Sub-Committee (FQSC) and that the entry requirements for the MA included a requirement for applicants to

have significant social work-related experience at an appropriate level, gained in either a paid, personal, or voluntary capacity. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

29. The course specification submitted for both the BA and MA outlined the interview arrangements and specifically noted that candidates were interviewed by a panel made up of an academic staff member, and, either a practitioner or an expert by experience. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team heard from placement partners, practice educators and experts by experience that they were included in admissions processes, participating in the development of interview questions and scenarios, and as members of an interview panel. There was some evidence from practice educators and the PVI sector that they were not as involved in interviews as they had been previously and that they would continue to welcome that involvement if it was offered. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to consider the way that PVI sector partners were included in course monitoring, delivery and development. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 1.4

30. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were able to see that students were asked to complete the MS form, *BA Social Work Ongoing Declaration of Suitability for the Health Care Professions* at the start of Year 2, on return from interruption or for a reassessment with attendance for the BA programme or the MS form *MA Social Work Ongoing Declaration of Suitability for the Health Care Professions* at the start of Year 2, on return from interruption or for a reassessment with attendance for the MA programme for ongoing declaration. Within the course specification documents for both programmes there was evidence to suggest that students completed a *Good Health, Good Character* form, an occupational health screening and the Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) screening at admission. However, the inspection team did not have sight of those processes or forms.

31. A second submission of evidence submitted prior to the inspection provided the inspection team with the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Social Care PSRB Policy 2022–23 that included detail around the expectations of the admissions processes in relation to regulated programmes. Through discussions with the course team the inspection team heard that applicants were required to complete the MS form *Good Health, Good Character* at the end of each academic year in order to progress and the form was provided to the inspection team as evidence during the inspection. The staff involved in admission and selection further explained that the university had a central compliance team that managed the DBS and occupational health service checks, initiated by an automatic email sent from the central system, SITs, once an offer was made. This included a form for applicants to

declare their suitability for social work and asked for detail in relation to previous experience, poor health and contact with social work or social care services. It was confirmed that this is returned to the compliance team, and not to the course team.

32. Representatives from the admissions team outlined the process should a DBS form be returned with an entry, noting that these are received by the central DBS team who collect additional information from the candidate to contextualise the entry. During inspection the course team provided additional evidence to the inspection team which detailed the follow-on process. This comprised of internal consideration of an anonymised applicant statement by the professional lead and a principal lecturer, further evidence collection if necessary, an internal decision and an external comment from the Principal Social Worker at Kent County Council as to whether the supplied entry would prevent an offer of the 100-day placement. The inspection team agreed that this standard is met.

Standard 1.5

33. The university submitted information on the institution's commitment to EDI (equality, diversity and inclusion) which was articulated as 'advanc[ing] Equality, Diversity and Inclusion outcomes and representation and redress inequity, discrimination, progression and attainment imbalances for our staff and students'. The BA and MA Course specification included detail on how the EDI policies were implemented and monitored. Further information confirmed that EDI data across a wide number of groups, and indices informed the institutional targets in the Access and Participation plan (APP), provided as supplementary evidence in submission and further explained that targets were identified across the student lifecycle (access, success, retention and progression to employment). Data, derived largely from a combination of HESA and OfS return data, was confirmed to be considered at faculty and institutional level, but less so at course level.

34. Meetings with key participants confirmed that applicants were given an opportunity to declare any need for reasonable adjustments at interview as part of the central admissions processes. This is communicated to the faculty. Examples of reasonable adjustments previously implemented were provided and there was confirmation that members of admissions and interview panels were required to have undergone an induction and completed unconscious bias training, and equality and diversity training in order to register and be set up on the sessional database. Opportunities to shadow interviews were also offered. The inspection team agreed that this standard is met.

Standard 1.6

35. The course provider shared the website page for the courses which was a source of information for prospective candidates.

36. The BA webpage included information about the entry requirements, an overview of the course and modules, an introduction to the teaching, learning and assessment approach of

the provider including confirmation that a portfolio was used to assess the 70- and 100-day placement, future career opportunities, fees, funding and other costs, industry links and professional accreditation. The MA webpage included information about the entry requirements, an overview of the course and modules, an introduction to learning and teaching approach of the provider, a short paragraph on how students were assessed, future career, fees, funding and other costs and a brief sentence relating to graduate eligibility to apply for registration with Social Work England.

37. The inspection team noted that the modules displayed on the website at the point of inspection did not reflect the structure of the programme from September 2023 as the courses had been through internal revalidation in the 2022/23 cycle. Furthermore, through discussion with the employment partners it was clear that students who did not drive could be at a disadvantage for statutory placement allocation as neither Kent County Council, the largest provider of statutory placement to the programmes, nor Medway Council accepted non-driving students for placement. 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 two: Learning environment

38. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were made aware that the university was using the SWEET Project as a statutory placement provider, as the course provider had reported it as part of the Annual Monitoring Process. The SWEET Project is an independent provider of learning experiences within the health and social care sector who offer virtual, simulated, case experience for students. As a result, the university was asked to supply data relating to the use of the SWEET Project for scrutiny in advance of the inspection, and the inspection team noted 11 students undertaking a 100-day placement on the SWEET Project in the academic year 2022/23. Social Work England confirmed that the use of this learning environment could not be considered as a formal placement in either the voluntary or statutory setting and that the practice could not continue as it did not meet the requirements of standard 2.1 of the Social Work England Education and Training Standards. 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 two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect*), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

*An immediate condition was agreed by the regulator to ensure that students who were undertaking the SWEET project would have appropriate placement experience to allow them to meet the professional standards.

Standard 2.1

39. The course specification document for both the BA and MA programmes detailed 30 skills days, one 70-day placement, and one 100-day placement. The placements were spread over years 2 and 3 of the BA programme, and years 1 and 2 of the MA programme, with the 100-day placement being identified as the statutory setting. The inspection team were content that there was appropriate planning in place to ensure that students experienced contrasting placements, which was confirmed through discussions with staff from the practice learning unit who explained there were administrative processes in place to track placement types using a colour coded system. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided, with the exception of the use of the SWEET Project ([c.f. para 38](#)). Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

Standard 2.2

40. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included a practice learning handbook, the BA and MA course specification, course handbooks, external examiner reports and practice learning agreement. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, stakeholders provided examples of a culture of support from the course team with placement partners talking positively about their relationship with the university and articulated clear lines of communication with named contacts. Teaching partner meetings take place quarterly and students confirmed that their responsibilities while on placement increased in complexity in line with their development through the programme of study. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided, with the exception of the use of the SWEET Project ([c.f. para 38](#)). Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

Standard 2.3

41. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the practice learning handbook and the course specifications, which highlighted the use of Placement Learning Support Plans (PSLPs) to support student success. The inspection team heard from placement providers that they were unaware of the PLSP, highlighting the student profile as the only place reasonable adjustments might be communicated. The course team reported that the PLSP is student owned and students are encouraged to share the details of the plan with the placement provider, however, the university cannot insist that the plan is shared.

42. Through discussions with the staff involved in placements the inspection team heard that induction arrangements were detailed within the practice learning agreement, and that induction was signed off during the practice learning agreement meetings. Statutory placement partners explained that placement students were considered as staff members for the purposes of support whilst on placement, whereas PVI placement providers noted that they, on occasion, declined to accept students on placement as they did not always have the infrastructure, or funding available, to make reasonable adjustments that may be necessary. Students spoke very highly of their practice educators, using participles such as 'amazing' to describe the support received which ranged from recommending journal articles to bringing in specialist social workers from different fields to contextualise learning during online meetings. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided, with the exception of the use of the SWEET Project ([c.f. para 38](#)).

43. 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 two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

Standard 2.4

44. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the placement learning handbook, practice 1 and practice 2 module descriptors, the placement learning agreement form and the interim review meeting form. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided and heard from students that placements increased in complexity, and from practice educators that they found the preliminary, midway and final meetings purposeful. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided, except for the use of the SWEET Project ([c.f. para 38](#)). Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

Standard 2.5

45. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the practice learning handbook, which detailed a variety of assessment tasks to ascertain readiness for practice, which was supported in both the course specifications and the Social Work Readiness for Practice (RDP) Shadowing Framework 2023/24. The inspection team heard from MA students that they undertook more skills days running up to placement, and they felt well prepared for practice experience. The inspectors queried where readiness for practice was delivered in the MA programmes and confirmed with the course team that it was included as part of the *Foundations of Social Work Practice* module. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided, with the exception of the use of the SWEET Project ([c.f. para 38](#)). Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that two conditions are appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard (one issued with immediate effect), and we are confident that once these conditions are 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 the report.

Standard 2.6

46. Following review of documentary evidence provided and their discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were unable to confirm that the university maintained a record of practice educators registration status, currency and qualifications. Through discussions with staff involved in placement activity the inspection team heard that the university maintains the required records for the practice educators they employ, however where the practice educators are part of a statutory partner organisation this was maintained by the local authority and not all practice educators reported recalling being asked to confirm their registration status, qualifications and currency. 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 courses would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this condition 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 the report.

Standard 2.7

47. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the Raising and Escalating Complaints / Concerns within Practice Environments (RAEC) process, and the inspection team noted that a student facing explanation of the RAEC process was also included in the practice learning handbook. The inspection team agreed that this standard is met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

48. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the CCU Strategic Plan, ASC Workplan, the Faculty Programme Planning Executive (FPPE) Terms of Reference, Course Specifications and Course Improvement Plans. The inspection team were unable to ascertain a clear understanding of the governance and management structures from the evidence and asked a number of questions about the course governance arrangements throughout the inspection. Through discussions with the course team and the senior leadership team, the inspection team heard that there were a number of quality, governance and leadership meetings (Boards of Study, Academic Strategy Committee, Faculty Quality Committee, Faculty Quality Sub-Committee, Faculty Portfolio Planning Executive and the Course Improvement Plan process) and that in addition to leading the faculty, the Faculty PVC is a member of the Senior Management Team of the university. The inspection team heard from the senior leadership team that the university was financially stable, but in a period of change. They had a relatively new Vice Chancellor that had resulted in the development of a new vision and strategy, which had included university wide consultation. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

49. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the course specifications, which provided detailed information on practice education on the courses. The terms of reference for the Strategic Contract and Quality Review Group and the Escalation Quality Contract Review Group were also provided, and the direct observation form which included instructions on gaining service user or carer consent. The inspection team were keen to better understand the placement breakdown process and heard from staff involved in placements and placement providers that early intervention was valued by all stakeholders, with the placement tutor at the university identified as the key role to support resolution and recovery of the placement. The inspection team also noted the placement learning agreement, which included information on 'issues arising in placement' including named senior representatives at the placement provider and the university, should resolution with the practice educator and placement tutor be unsuccessful. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

50. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the placement learning handbook, the placement audit forms and the course specifications. In addition, the university also submitted the placement learning agreement where completion dates for training such as 'health and safety including lone working policy', 'whistleblowing' and 'risk assessment policies and procedures' were recorded. Through discussions with a variety of stakeholders the inspection team were assured that there was a strong culture of support

across the university and placement providers. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

51. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided in the programme management table that detailed a number of standardised management meetings, including the external stakeholder meetings (once per term), the Kent, Medway and Southeast teaching partnership meetings (quarterly), placement allocation meetings (quarterly with additional contact during placement allocation process) and the practice panel (once per term).

52. The inspection team heard from statutory employer and placement partners that they were involved in interviews, were invited each year to provide feedback on curriculum developments and that they input into skills days, conferences and employment days. However, the inspection team heard that the PVI sector partners were not provided with the same variety of opportunities to be involved in the courses reporting that they had offered expertise in recent years and had no response. Practice educators reported that they provided teaching on the programme and have been involved in admission interviews. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to consider the way that PVI sector partners were included in course monitoring, delivery and development. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.5

53. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the course specifications, the practice learning handbook, SSLC minutes, evidence of student curriculum development consultation and the student charter. As a supplementary submission the university also supplied the student representation policy from the quality manual and practice panel minutes, information on the university's Periodic Course Review and Managing the Academic Portfolio. During the inspection the inspection team were provided with a 'You said, We Listened document'. The inspection team heard from experts by experience that they were involved in employability days and interviews and that their views on course development are sought. They heard from student representatives that they found the SSLC meetings helpful and from statutory employers that they provided support for skills days and were involved in lecturing. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to consider the way that PVI sector partners were included in course monitoring, delivery and development. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.6

54. The inspection team were satisfied that the Strategic Contact and Quarterly review meeting minutes demonstrated that the university, alongside regional employers, had a forum to consider placement capacity. Through discussion with the senior leadership team the inspection team were assured that the courses recruited on target and did not go into clearing. They heard that two IT systems new to the university (SITs and PowerBI) were allowing the faculty more access to data than they had previously, and that at present there was no intention to grow the Social Work provision. The inspection team also met with staff responsible for placements, who confirmed in the last cycle the university had more offers of statutory placements than they had students they could place in them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.7

55. The evidence provided to support this standard included a CV for the lead social worker, which detailed relevant qualifications, experience and registration number. The inspection team noted that the lead social worker was the same for both courses and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

56. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included staff CVs noting that 10 of 11 staff were qualified social workers. Throughout the inspection the university invited appropriate staff with specialist knowledge in admissions, student support and wellbeing, quality management and course design and development and the course leaders spoke confidently about their course development plans. The inspection team heard from the senior leadership team that the student staff ratio (SSR) on both courses was 19:1 and noted that the university had recently introduced an hours-based workload allocation model. Students confirmed that staff used their research within teaching, answered positively when asked if they found them inspirational and used adjectives such as approachable and supportive to describe course staff. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.9

57. The inspection team reviewed external examiners reports, boards of study meeting minutes where data was considered, module leader reports, course improvement plans and EDI data. The inspection team heard from students that they were overall satisfied with the timeliness and quality of assignment feedback. The inspection team queried the way in which formative feedback was provided, and the course team explained that they provided comments on first drafts of summative assessments, or used PebblePad to communicate feedback comments and the inspection team concluded that this was satisfactory.

58. The inspection team was keen to better understand whether EDI data was available for progression and how it was collated. The Faculty Registrar provided information on

PowerBI, an internal system that takes data from the student record and makes it available to course staff via a self-service dashboard, and provided a screenshot of the system demonstrating that progression data was available and could be presented by a number of student characteristics including ethnicity, disability, sex and awarding gap. Staff also have access to the Faculty Data Officer who can create bespoke reports if necessary. The inspection team noted that the course improvement plan for the BA programme made strong use of the available data, however, felt the course improvement plan for the MA was less driven by the available statistics. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation that the course leader considers a tighter link between the EDI data and the course performance plan for the MA. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.10

59. The inspection team reviewed the staff CVs submitted as evidence in support of this standard and were satisfied with the evidence provided. It was noted that there was evidence of staff development through enrolment in PhDs and the Academic Apprenticeship. Through discussion with the senior leadership team the inspection team additionally heard that there were a number of opportunities for staff to develop their teaching practice through qualifications, leading to fellowship of Advance HE and that there was support for those members of staff who wished to progress to senior fellow. In addition, a shadowing opportunity was available through the Kent and Medway teaching partnership where staff could arrange a short shadowing placement in practice to update their knowledge and understanding of current practice.

60. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the course team were ensuring that they covered contemporary issues of social work which were impacting their region at the point of inspection. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team were assured that the course team were drawing on appropriate external resources to deliver satisfactory training. The inspection agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

61. Documentary evidence submitted to support this standard included comprehensive curriculum mapping documents that demonstrated how the courses met the BASW PCF, Social Work England Professional Standards and the QAA (2019) Subject Benchmark Statement for Social Work at a programme level. The course specification documents included module specifications that had detail on the delivery of the Social Work England Professional Standards at a modular level. Through discussion with students the inspection team were assured that the regulatory frameworks were being disseminated, as the students discussed the knowledge and skills statements and demonstrated that they

understood the role of Social Work England. The inspection team agreed that this standard had been met.

Standard 4.2

62. The course specifications submitted prior to the inspection in support of this standard provided details about the faculty's approach to consultation with external stakeholders, the faculty's Service User Partnership Strategy 2022 – 2025 and associated Service User and Carer, Experts by Experience Partner Toolkit 2022 – 2025, and the Expert by Experience Strategy Group Terms of Reference. The university also submitted a consultation summary document demonstrating how students, partner employers, academic staff, experts by experience and stakeholder practitioners were consulted in relation to changes to the courses.

63. The inspection team found that throughout the inspection, stakeholders provided examples of how they were incorporated into programme design and development activities. Experts by experience described being consulted on module changes, and statutory employer partners noted being invited to an annual meeting to discuss proposed curriculum development. PVI sector placement organisations noted that they were not involved in wider programme development opportunities and where they had attended specific events and provided feedback it was not acknowledged. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to consider the way that PVI sector partners were included in course monitoring, delivery and development. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.3

64. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included university level policies, such as the university's Strategic Plan 2015 – 2022, the Access and Participation Plan, the Equality Diversity and Inclusion policy and Equality Objectives 2019 – 2022. Implementation of the Equality Diversity and Inclusion Policy was overseen by the Equality and Diversity committee, who reported into the governing body via the committee structure. There was also a Dignity at Work policy, a Student Complaints Procedure, a Student guide to bullying and harassment at the university level and Raising and Escalating Concerns in Practice guidance at a faculty level. The inspection team noted that Law and Human Rights were evidenced within the module descriptors for *Social Work Context in Practice 1* and in *Social Inclusion and Social Justice*.

65. Throughout the inspection, during discussions with key stakeholders, the inspection team heard that the faculty were engaged with the university initiatives, for example 'Closing our GAP' and the decolonising the curriculum health check. The course team provided additional support through the MAPs projects which aimed to provide a space for

global majority students to develop academic skills or to raise issues at the programme level. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

66. Through review of the documentary evidence the inspection team considered the currency of the programme modules, including the reading lists. They were keen to better understand how the courses were reviewed and updated, with particular reference to safeguarding where the reading list looked to be dated, and human development which looked to have been removed through the programme update. Human development was cross checked against the documentary evidence and was confirmed to be covered in the *Development, Identity and Culture* module. Through meetings with the course team the inspection team were satisfied with the detail supplied on contextual safeguarding within the programme. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

67. The inspection team reviewed the *Theory and Evidence-based Social Work* module descriptor, the practice learning handbook and the marking rubric for the BA. The team also looked at the practice learning handbook and the *Social Work Theory and Methods* module descriptor for the MA course. Through discussions with students, it was clear to the inspection team that they were aware of theory and how it integrated with practice. The BA students were able to cite individual theories, and MA students who had been supporting practice prior to starting the programme acknowledged that they had been using theories in the workplace without realising and that they could now identify them. Students also reported Practice Educators provided support with theory into practice by recommending reading or by bringing specialist practitioners to online peer meetings. The inspection team heard from Practice Educators that there were some issues with students linking theory to practice, however, overall, it was felt that the integrative processes were in place and supported. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

68. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course specifications and the practice learning handbook. Through meetings with the course team the inspection team heard that the faculty use the Hydra suite for BA and MA skills days and that a member of the Social Work team had recently qualified as a Hydra Instructor. Students were aware of the Hydra suite, and those that had completed the Hydra skills day spoke enthusiastically about how the exercises practically contributed to their understanding of interprofessional practice.

69. The inspection team felt confident that interprofessional learning was embedded in the curriculum and evidenced in the BA course by the *Collaborative Working and Social Work Values* module, and in the MA course in the aims of the *Safeguarding* module. However,

they were keen to better understand whether students were taught alongside students of different professions. Through discussion with the senior leadership team the inspection team heard that this gap had already been identified by the school and that it was planned to be addressed in the Professional Education strategy. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

70. The inspection team reviewed the course specifications and practice learning handbook submitted in support of this standard. The inspection team noted that the documentation demonstrated a sufficient number of learning hours and a clear timetable, however they noted that the timetable was crowded and did not allow for much flexibility. As a result, they were keen to understand the process should a placement not start on time. Through discussion with staff involved in placements the inspection team heard that, in the event a student cannot start the placement on time they have the opportunity to make up placement days during timetabled breaks and / or during the scheduled half term break. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

71. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the course specifications which included the module descriptors, submitted in support of this standard and noted that the assessment strategy was considered and provided detailed pedagogical ideas that emerged in the module descriptors with a strong emphasis on theory across the programme. Assessment was varied, and through discussion with employer partners the inspection team heard that there were no concerns over employing graduates from the university, indicating that the assessment strategy within university teaching, and on placement, ensured that graduates of the courses were suitable to enter the profession.

72. The MA students highlighted a difficulty with the first assessment feedback deadline as, although the feedback was not returned late to them, the submission dates of the first two assignments were close together and as a result they did not receive the feedback until after the next assignment had been submitted. As this was the first feedback opportunity of the course, they felt that this had been a disadvantage. However, overall, the inspection team agreed that opportunity for feedback on assessment was satisfactory and concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

73. The inspection team reviewed the course specifications, practice learning handbook and course handbooks and noted that assessments were mapped and appropriately matched student progression through the courses. The inspection team concluded that the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection was able to demonstrate that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

74. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course handbook for each programme, the course specifications and learning, teaching and assessment strategies embedded in the module descriptors. The inspection team noted that the documentary evidence detailed a 15-day turnaround time for student feedback and that the external examiner reports were favourable about the consistency of clear and detailed student feedback. The inspection team heard from students that they were generally happy with the timeliness of feedback and that it signposted them to additional support where appropriate. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

75. The inspection team reviewed the course staff CVs and external examiner reports for the courses. The inspection team noted that staff had appropriate expertise to undertake assessment for social work and that the external examiners were suitably qualified and on the register. Through discussion with students the inspection team heard that where marking was undertaken by a tutor who had not taught the module, students felt it was, on occasion, less valuable. Students also reported that they were aware of staff research areas, and that staff integrated their research into teaching, with one student reporting doing a dissertation in a research area of interest to their supervisor. The inspection team concluded that that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

76. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university's assessment procedures, the course specifications and the practice learning handbook. The inspection team confirmed with the course team that fails could not be trailed. There were pre-, mid- and final placement meetings where placement progression is monitored, and direct supervision of practice was satisfactory. The inspection team noted that the mitigating circumstances processes did not appear to be in the handbooks, however, acknowledged that there was an institutional process for exceptional circumstances and that this was detailed in the BA course specification. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met with a recommendation to include the exceptional circumstances procedures in both the BA and MA Handbooks. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.13

77. The inspection team reviewed the course specifications in advance of the inspection and were content that the programme appeared to be underpinned by research and evidence based practice, noting that the *Research Mindedness in Social Work* and the dissertation covered these aspects of the curriculum in the BA, and the module *Social Work Research* and the dissertation helped fulfill the standard in the MA. Through discussion with the

course team the inspection team were further reassured that the course team drew upon their research in learning and teaching, including as dissertation supervisors, and heard from students that they were able to identify where tutor research was used within the programme. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

78. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, student support was articulated clearly within the documentary evidence submitted prior to inspection and through discussions with stakeholders.

79. Central wellbeing services reported clearly on the forms of support on offer to students, which included counselling and occupational health. The university provided two types of student owned support plans; one for academic support and the Placement Learning Support Plan (PSLP) that was written for the placement environment. Employer partners noted that they felt that the information provided in the student profile for individual student needs was not as complete as it could be on occasion and the course team acknowledged that, although they encouraged students to share the PSLP, they could not require them to disclose it. During the inspection the inspection team reviewed the actions from the Staff Student Liaison meeting held in November 2022, and noted that the welfare concerns raised by global majority students had been satisfactorily actioned with the support of the institutional International Office.

80. Through discussions with experts by experience and employer partners the inspection team heard that both groups were involved in two employability skills days held at Level 6 to prepare students for interview, the requirements of the ASYE that had the support of the institutional Careers and Enterprise Hub and that the course specifications discussed the embedded, holistic approach to careers support within the courses. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

81. In advance of the inspection the inspection team reviewed the course specifications, that detailed that there was a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) system in place on the courses and weblinks to central university services.

82. The inspection heard, through discussions with the central services, that the Learning Skills Team provided support with time management and academic writing skills, and that the Library provided support with information literacy, search and retrieval, and referencing skills. It was understood that the services were moving towards a more embedded approach to deliver study skills within modules at a cognate time within the student journey, and that Padlets had been recently developed. Self-study online modules were also

available. Students identified that the Learning Skills Hub had delivered additional lectures on the BA course and cited the self-study online study materials, however, felt that it was difficult to book a one-to-one appointment as they had a long lead in time.

83. The senior leadership team confirmed to the inspection team that the PAT system was allocated within the workload model at a rate of 5 hours per student, and students identified that their PATs provided one to one academic support when they were unable to access the Learning Skills Hub session. They described them as approachable, highlighting their ability to signpost them to other services should they need it. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

84. Prior to inspection the inspection team reviewed the course specifications, the BA and MA Practice Learning Handbook and the declaration of suitability *Good Health & Good Character* form submitted in support of this standard. They further requested to see the Fitness to Practice Policy. The inspection team noted that the entry requirements of the programmes required applicants to meet occupational health screening requirements and satisfactorily complete an Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check. Students were required to declare their suitability at the start of academic Years 2 and 3. This was articulated differently in the BA and MA course specification, however, both detailed the DBS and occupational health requirements.

85. The inspection team noted that the *Good Health & Good Character* form contained information about the requirements and that the Fitness to Practice policy was satisfactory and included low-level concerns. Through discussions with the course teams, the inspection team heard that, for both courses, a low-level concern could be referred into the Fitness to Practice process if necessary, and at the highest level of the process the university included a registered professional as a panel member on the Fitness of Practice Panel. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

86. The inspection team reviewed the practice learning handbook, the course specifications and the institutional webpages providing information on the Learning Support Plan prior to the inspection and were keen to understand how the process worked in practice. Through discussion with employer partners the inspection team were reassured that in the statutory employers' reasonable adjustments were identified, and that support was in place before the student started their placement. However, the PVI sector partners reported a lower level of support from the university and acknowledged that, as third sector organisations, they would find it difficult to put some reasonable adjustments in place due to financial limitations.

87. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team understood that Placement Learning Support Plans (PSLPs) were a student owned document and while they encouraged students to disclose these to placement partners, they could not require them to do so. The inspection team noted that there was a process in place to provide Learning Support Plans, and Placement Learning Support Plans supported by a central service. Students were able to access the process or be referred in. Students, employers and practice educators were all aware that LSPs and PSLPs were in use and no evidence was presented to suggest that students were being disadvantaged because adjustments had not been made. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

88. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the course specifications, the practice learning handbook and the course handbook which were reviewed prior to inspection. On review the inspection team highlighted that some of the references to registration with Social Work England incorrectly stated that 'on successfully graduating from the course, you will be granted membership through registration with Social Work England' and reported that the correct wording should be 'eligible to apply to register'.

89. The inspection team noted that the Level 6 *Leadership, Professionalism, and Specialist Knowledge in Social Work* module addressed the transition from social work student to social work practitioner for the BA programme. The inspection team were unable to identify a similar module in the MA programme, however noted that the *Developing Critical Practice* module mapped to the Social Work England Professional Standards 3.1 - 3.3, 3.5 - 3.7, 3.14, 4.2 - 4.4 and 4.6 - 4.8. Through discussion with students, it was clear that they identified as social workers and the inspection team heard the MA students discuss that they had been prepared for the ASYE, and the BA students noted that they were aware of Social Work England, the requirement to register and the professional frameworks in operation.

90. 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 courses would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this condition 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 the report.

Standard 5.6

91. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the course handbooks and the practice learning handbooks for both programmes submitted as evidence to support his standard. Following discussions with stakeholders the inspection team were assured that attendance was compulsory and was recorded via a card swipe in system, and a secondary

paper register. Students reported understanding what they needed to do should they be absent and provided an example of a placement taking place within a school over a half term period, and how this was made up. The course team detailed the institutional engagement monitoring policy stating that they are notified by email when students are below the threshold of engagement. The inspection agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

92. Following a review of documentary evidence provided, 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 assessments. Feedback was also provided by practice educators and on their placement portfolio and centrally the Learning Skills Team offered support to students on interpreting their feedback. Students reported that feedback was timely, consistent 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

93. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the institutional academic appeal process documentation via a student facing webpage, which linked to the appeal procedure. The inspection team noted that the policy was available and some information on academic appeals was included in the placement handbook. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

94. The inspection team reviewed the course specifications for both courses and agreed that the awards for the BA (Hons) and MA programmes met the standard, noting that other exit awards were clearly distinguished from the registered award.

Proposed outcome

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

Conditions

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

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 1.6	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that the webpages for the courses have been updated to reflect the correct programme structure and module titles as approved at internal validation.	14 September 2023	Paragraph 37
2	Standard 1.6	The education provider will provide evidence of an acknowledgement on the course webpages that clearly states the impact being a non-driver may have on placement opportunities.	14 September 2023	Paragraph 37
3	Standard 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5	Immediate condition agreed with the regulator: The education provider is required to source suitable supplementary placement experience to provide each student currently undertaking a SWEET project placement with statutory experience in a real life setting, to include the statutory tasks as set out in standard 2.1 of the Social Work England Education & Training Standards. The education provider is required to provide evidence of how this has been done this for each student.	9 June 2023	Paragraph 38
4	Standard 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5	The education provider is to ensure that the SWEET Project is not used as a placement provider from the academic	14 September 2023	Paragraph 38

		year 2023/24 and provide evidence that appropriate alternative placements have been sourced.		Paragraph 39 Paragraph 40 Paragraph 43 Paragraph 44 Paragraph 45
5	Standard 2.6	That the education provider will provide evidence that the university has a system to ensure oversight of the registration status, qualifications and currency of all practice educators working with its students.	14 September 2023	Paragraph 46
6	Standard 5.5	That the education provider would review and update all documentation so that it is clear that, on completion of the programme, students would be <i>eligible to apply</i> to register with Social Work England and provide evidence that this has been completed.	14 September 2023	Paragraph 88 Paragraph 90

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 1.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 4.2	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider the ways in which PVI sector partners are given the opportunity to be involved in course development and monitoring, interviews, placement allocation and practitioner teaching.	Paragraph 29 Paragraph 52

			Paragraph 53 Paragraph 63
2	Standard 3.9	The inspection team recommends that the university considers how EDI data is used and articulated in the development of the course performance plan for the MA and PG Dip courses.	Paragraph 58
3	Standard 4.12	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers including information about the exceptional circumstances processes within the handbook for the BA and MA courses.	Paragraph 76

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

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
Admissions			
1.1 Confirm on entry to the course, via a holistic/multi-dimensional assessment process, that applicants: i. have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards ii. can demonstrate that they have a good command of English iii. have the capability to meet academic standards; and iv. have the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.	☒	☐	☒
1.2 Ensure that applicants' prior relevant experience is considered as part of the admissions processes.	☒	☐	☐
1.3 Ensure that employers, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work are involved in admissions processes.	☒	☐	☐
1.4 Ensure that the admissions processes assess the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes criminal conviction checks.	☒	☐	☐
1.5 Ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.	☒	☐	☐
1.6 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to 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. Inspectors will undertake the conditions review and make recommendations 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	Inspector recommendation
1	1.6	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that the webpages for the courses have been updated to reflect the correct programme structure and module titles as approved at internal validation.	Condition met
2	1.6	The education provider will provide evidence of an acknowledgement on the course webpages that clearly states the impact being a non-driver may have on placement opportunities.	Condition met
3	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5	The education provider is required to source suitable supplementary placement experience to provide each student currently undertaking a SWEET project placement with statutory experience in a real life setting, to include the statutory tasks as set out in standard 2.1 of the Social Work England Education & Training Standards. The education provider is required to provide evidence of how this has been done this for each student.	Condition met
4	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5	The education provider is to ensure that the SWEET Project is not used as a placement provider from the academic year 2023/24 and provide evidence that appropriate alternative placements have been sourced.	Condition met
5	2.6	That the education provider will provide evidence that the university has a system to ensure oversight of the	Condition met with recommendation

		registration status, qualifications and currency of all practice educators working with its students.	
6	5.5	That the education provider would review and update all documentation so that it is clear that, on completion of the programme, students would be <i>eligible to apply</i> to register with Social Work England and provide evidence that this has been completed.	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 response to condition 1 recorded against standard 1.6 the course provider submitted documentation that included webpage links and webpage screenshots. The inspectors reviewed the evidence and noted that the content on the webpages provided was satisfactory and agreed that the condition was met.
6. The course provider submitted the relevant webpage links and screenshots in response to condition 2, recorded against standard 1.6. The university evidenced a clear statement on driving had been included within the information available to applicants. The inspection team reviewed the evidence and agreed that the driving statement was appropriate and that the condition was met.
7. Condition 3, recorded against standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 was issued immediately by the regulator following the inspection in response to concerns over use of the SWEET project as a statutory placement. The course provider was required to source suitable supplementary placement experience for all students undertaking a SWEET project placement at the time of inspection. Evidence submitted in response to the condition included a letter provided to students and details of how the condition had been met for each student and that the additional placement days would be logged. Inspectors considered the evidence submitted and agreed that the condition had been met.
8. The course provider submitted a list of placement providers, highlighting placements that were new providers for the 2024/25 academic year in response to condition 4 recorded against standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5. The inspectors considered the evidence and agreed that the condition had been met.
9. In order to satisfy the inspection team that condition 5 recorded against standard 2.6 was met, the course provider submitted a flow chart illustrating the process for the collection of practice educators registration number, qualification and currency and a

sample google form issued to practice educators for data collection. The inspectors noted that one of the outcomes of the flow chart was the recording of practice educator information onto an 'allocation spreadsheet' which was not submitted. The course provider was asked to make a supplementary submission to ensure that the condition was fully met. The university submitted the requested spreadsheet that demonstrated the way in which data would be stored. Inspectors agreed that the condition was met with a recommendation that the university update the process forms to request information on the practice educators continuous professional development (CPD).

10. In relation to condition 6 recorded against standard 5.5, the course provider submitted the course specification, course handbook for both the BA and MA programmes, the practice learning handbook and a signposting document to articulate the pages which had been updated with correct registration wording. The inspectors reviewed the evidence and agreed that this condition was met.
11. 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, MA Social Work (full-time), MA Social Work (part-time), PG Dip (exit route only) (full-time) and PG Dip (exit route only) (part-time) are met.

Regulator decision

Conditions met.