

## Inspection Report

<b>Inspection ID</b>	BSR1_BCP322
<b>Course provider</b>	Bond Solon (in association with Teesside University)
<b>Validating body (if different)</b>	
<b>Course inspected</b>	Best Interest Assessor
<b>Mode of study</b>	Part-time
<b>Maximum student cohort</b>	20
<b>Date of inspection</b>	25 – 26 November 2025
<b>Inspection team</b>	Caroline Reynolds and Sam Jameson, Education Quality Assurance Officers  Andrea McCarthy, Lay Inspector  Kev Stone, BIA Registrant Inspector
<b>Inspector recommendation</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Regulator decision:</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Date of Regulator decision:</b>	12 March 2026
<b>Conditions</b>	Standard 1.2  Standard 1.3  Standard 1.4  Standard 1.5  Standard 2.2

	Standard 2.7 Standard 3.1 Standard 3.2 Standard 3.3 Standard 4.2 Standard 4.8
<b>Date conditions met and approved:</b>	

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Summary of Inspection.....	3
Inspection Findings .....	4
Proposed outcome.....	16
<b>Conditions</b> .....	17
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	20
Meeting of Conditions.....	21
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 will be a qualified BIA, and a lay inspector who is not BIA qualified. These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review documentary information and evidence, and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, observations, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.

3. The process we undertake is described in our legislation: The Children and Social Work Act 2017, [The Social Workers Regulations 2018 - Social Work England](#) , and our [Education and Training Rules 2019](#).

4. In this document we describe Bond Solon (in association with Teesside University) as ‘the course provider’ and we describe the Best Interests Assessor as ‘the course’.

## Summary of Inspection

5. Bond Solon (in association with Teesside University) and their Best Interest Assessor course was inspected as part of Social Work England’s reapproval cycle, whereby all course providers with BIA courses will be inspected against the new education and training approval standards for BIA courses.

6. A remote inspection took place from 25 to 26 November 2025.

7. As part of this process the inspection team gathered feedback from key stakeholders through meetings on inspection. This included two former students who had

undertaken the course, and two employer leads from Essex Social Care Authority, and Manchester Local Care organisation.

## **Inspection Findings**

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

<b>Standard 1. Admissions</b>	<b>Met or not met.</b>
<p>1.1 Confirm that applicants have:</p> <p>i. the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the 6 BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards.</p> <p>ii. the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice.</p> <p>iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.2 Confirm that applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations.</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></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><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.4 Confirm that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.5 Ensure that employers, providers of observation opportunities, people with lived experience, and carers are involved in admissions processes.</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></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>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.7 Ensure that there are equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.8 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place. This will include information about the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modes, location of study, assessment methods, duration, and</p>	<b>Met</b>

observation requirements including the expectations around arranging or securing observation opportunities.

### **Key observations for standard 1**

9. There were several application routes for entry onto the course. These included the completion of a multiple-choice test, with a pass mark of 70%, and the submission of a personal statement, both of which were completed and submitted online. There were also employer sponsored routes onto the programme; refer to paragraphs 13 and 14 (1.1, 1.3, 1.4).

10. The candidate nomination form, which all applicants completed, included confirmation that they had the required information and communication technology (ICT) skills (1.1).

11. Applicants were asked to provide a copy of their enhanced DBS; this information was captured on the application form. We heard that if a DBS is not supplied, the applicant would not be accepted onto the course (1.6).

12. Applicants had to provide their professional registration details for their relevant professional body; this was then manually checked by a member of staff. Applicants were informed via the joining instructions and confirmation email that they must notify the course provider if anything changed regarding their professional status whilst undertaking the course. Prior to marks being released, the course provider checked each student's professional registration information for any changes (1.2, 5.3).

13. We heard about the differing admissions processes depending on which employer partner was sponsoring programmes or places on the course; this was clearly evident during discussions with employers and the course team (1.2, 1.3, 1.4).

14. There were three routes onto the programme: one route required candidates to complete a multiple-choice test and attend a half day pre-BIA course; the other two routes were employer certification of eligibility, or completion of a multiple-choice test and submission of a personal statement (1.1, 1.3, 1.4).

15. Due to the differing processes with employer partners and self-funding applicants, and the absence of internal quality assurance mechanisms and oversight by the course provider, we concluded that standards 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 were not met. Full details of the conditions can be found in the proposed outcome section.

16. It was unclear from the evidence what the level of involvement of employers, providers of observation opportunities, people with lived experience, and carers had been within the admissions processes. We were unable to hear from people with lived experience during the inspection, and the two employers we met had differing experiences of working with the course provider on admissions activities. Whilst some members of course team spoke of their own lived experience

and involvement in admissions and the course itself, the engagement of external stakeholders was not sufficiently evidenced to meet the education and training requirements. We concluded that standard 1.5 was therefore not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the proposed outcome section.

17. The course provider outlined that members of the service user and carer group from Teesside University were reviewing the admissions process and, together with employer partners, they would be involved in the annual review of the course at the end of 2025/early 2026 (1.5).

18. We reviewed Teesside University’s EDI policy which had been adopted for students on this course. Applicants were signposted to the policy within the admissions information. Reasonable adjustment requests were handled in line with the university’s disability support and student support plan and associated processes. During the inspection, the course team outlined some examples of reasonable adjustments that had been provided (1.6).

19. It was evident that the course provider had limited oversight of EDI, including the absence of overarching EDI policies and/or robust checks of EDI procedures, as this was part of Teesside University’s remit. We heard there was a reliance on employer partners to undertake EDI training within their own organisations; the two employer partners we met stated that EDI was covered as part of their mandatory training. We were satisfied that standard 1.7 was met but made a recommendation to strengthen the course provider’s oversight of EDI. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the proposed outcome section.

20. Evidence, together with information contained on the course provider’s website, provided clear information about the course, including the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modules, assessment methods, observation requirements, duration, and location of study (1.8).

<b>Standard 2. Course governance, management and quality.</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
2.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivering, resourcing and managing the quality of the course.	<b>Met</b>
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.	<b>Not met</b> <i>See key observations for standard 2 for further information.</i>
2.3 Ensure that admissions are aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of: i. wherever appropriate, local and regional capacity for	<b>Met</b>

<p>observation opportunities; and ii. the availability of part-time or other flexible course arrangements to widen access wherever possible.</p>	
<p>2.4 Ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course is a relevant qualified professional (social worker, occupational therapist, psychologist or nurse) with appropriate experience of BIA practice.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>2.5 Ensure that there is adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>2.6 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation and policy, including recent developments, and the practical application of this via the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, including giving support to undertake continuing professional development relevant to their role.</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Not met</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>See key observations for standard 2 for further information.</i></p>
<p><b><u>Key observations for standard 2.</u></b></p> <p>21. We reviewed the management and governance plan, which clearly set out the structure, oversight, quality assurance information, and roles and responsibilities of those delivering, resourcing, and managing the quality of the course. The course team outlined how the management and governance of the course worked in practice, including the trainer’s proximity to BIA practice (2.1).</p> <p>22. There was one member of the course team who had sole professional responsibility for the course, and they delivered some of the teaching. We were uncertain what contingency plans were in place if this person was no longer able to teach on the course, given that they were the only practicing BIA. Clarification was provided regarding who taught on the course; there were three teaching staff, one of whom was a consultant who held professional responsibility for the course. We heard that the course provider was in the process of onboarding another qualified and practicing BIA onto the teaching team. In relation to our concerns around the wider access to a BIA, and contingency plans we agreed that recommendations on standards 2.1 and 2.5 were appropriate. Full details of the recommendations can be found in the <u>proposed outcome</u> section</p> <p>23. It was clear within the evidence that students were given the opportunity to provide feedback about the course. However, it was unclear what the level of involvement of employer partners and people with lived experience had been in the effective monitoring, evaluation, and improvement systems of the course. We were unable to meet with any members of the people with lived</p>	

experience group, and no minutes of meetings were supplied to evidence their involvement. The employers we met did not provide any clarification as to how they fed back. We therefore agreed that standard 2.2 was not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the proposed outcome section.

24. We agreed that admissions onto the course were aligned to a clear strategy and that the design of the course provided flexibility to students and employers. Clear guidance was provided about the expectations of the course, including the observation requirements. (2.3)

25. We were satisfied that the person with overall responsibility for the course was a relevant, qualified professional with appropriate experience of BIA practice (2.4).

26. We heard that teaching staff and representatives, including consultants, maintained current and up-to-date knowledge, including legal knowledge and the skills required of a trainer and facilitator. Teaching staff had access to a range of online legal forums that provided information on current cases, legislation, journals, books, news and materials on current and proposed legislation changes. Trainers spent at least one day per month undertaking formal readings and research, including judgements and case law (2.6).

27. It was unclear what the process and approach had been for analysing and sharing student feedback with employers and others involved in commissioning places on the course. Examples of changes made to the course as a result of student feedback were not clearly evidenced, including how feedback was used to inform the management and development of the course, and how it was shared with employers.

28. We concluded that standard 2.7 was not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the proposed outcome section.

**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:

- i. enables the student to shadow a BIA or community DoLS assessment.
- ii. provide practice experience that can be applied to a variety of settings and types of supervisory body.
- 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.

**Not met**

*See key observations for standard 3 for further information.*

<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>3.2 Ensure that the number, duration and range of observation opportunities is appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 3 for further information.</i></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><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 3 for further information.</i></p>
<p><b>Key observations for standard 3.</b></p> <p>29. We heard that self-funding students had to certify on the application booking form that they have completed at least two observations, or that they had arranged to undertake them. For sponsored students, employers were required to complete the nomination form, which recorded that they had arranged two observations (3.1, 3.2).</p> <p>30. The course team outlined that, if a shadowing opportunity fell through, there was an established precedent within Teesside University that an extension to the submission time would be granted (3.1, 3.2).</p> <p>31. Following the review of evidence, including the nomination and booking forms, and through discussions with the course team, it was unclear what the process of governance and monitoring had been in relation to the two practice observation opportunities (3.1, 3.2).</p> <p>32. No clear evidence was provided as to how the course provider ensured and checked that two observations had been completed. No clear evidence was provided regarding collaborative planning and communication with providers in the approving and monitoring of all observation opportunities (3.1, 3.2, 3.3).</p> <p>33. It was evidenced that the course had strong legal content. However, the assessments used to ensure that students could apply the social perspectives of mental disorders, and the embedding of social perspectives of mental disorders and mental health needs, were not evidenced (3.1).</p> <p>34. The inspectors heard that, within the final assessment of the course, students undertook an exercise involving completing a Form 3 and producing a reflection on a BIA completing a DoLS assessment, to ensure students applied their learning from practice within the observations (3.1, 3.2).</p>	

35. We concluded that standards 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 were not met. Full details of the conditions can be found in the <u>proposed outcome</u> section.	
<b>Standard 4. Curriculum and assessment</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to 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.	<b>Met</b>
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>See key observations for standard 4 for further information.</i>
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and, human rights and legislative frameworks.	<b>Met</b>
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law.	<b>Met</b>
4.5 Ensure that the integration of policy, legal literacy and practice is central to the course.	<b>Met</b>
4.6 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	<b>Met</b>
4.7 Provide staff involved in leading and delivering the training with sufficient protected training time to keep their own practice and knowledge up to date in line with statutory and regulatory requirements.	<b>Met</b>
4.8 Ensure that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to make robust, independent and well-evidenced assessments in the best interests of the person. This should include regular monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards to ensure that they remain robust and reliable.	<b>Not met</b>  <i>See key observations for standard 4 for further information.</i>
4.9 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	<b>Met</b>

4.10 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation, underpinned by skills, knowledge and an ability to interpret and respond appropriately to legislative and policy change and case law.	<b>Met</b>
4.11 Ensure that the course equips students with knowledge and skills in relation to identifying and anticipating areas of conflict arising from DoLS processes and outcomes, and supporting individuals, families, carers and agencies to understand the checks and balances of the DoLS system, to support a robust, independent and well-evidenced determination in the best interests of the person.	<b>Met</b>
4.12 Clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the course.	<b>Met</b>
4.13 Clearly specify that any equivalent award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as a BIA.	<b>Met</b>
4.14 Clearly specify a process for the appointment of at least 1 external examiner who must be an appropriately experienced and relevant qualified professional.	<b>Met</b>
<p><b><u>Key observations for standard 4.</u></b></p> <p>36. Evidence submitted during the inspection provided greater insight into the course content and teaching materials, including links to relevant guidance and frameworks. We were assured that students who completed the course were able to demonstrate that they could meet the BIA capabilities by the end of their training (4.1).</p> <p>37. We were provided with insight into how the course integrated relevant legal literacy and policy into its teaching, but we considered that there could be strengthening in relation to relevant social and theoretical approaches to working with people, which are integral to the BIA role. Therefore, we set a recommendation against standard 4.1. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the <u>proposed outcome</u> section.</p> <p>38. We were made aware of the planning, including future meetings and reviews, with employers and people with lived experience to support the design, ongoing development, and review of the curriculum. However, at the time of the inspection we were not assured that there was clear evidence of this process currently in place, nor clear input and actions from these key stakeholders into the course. We therefore agreed that standard 4.2 was not met. Full details of the condition can be found in the <u>proposed outcome</u> section.</p> <p>39. We were assured from the evidence that the course was designed in accordance with equality, diversity, and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks (4.3).</p>	

40. We heard from members of the course team about how they ensured that the course was continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law. Members of the course team provided examples of how they had allocated time for research and continuous professional development. We heard how the team share any changes and updates with colleagues, and how they conducted a formal review every three months to implement any relevant changes. We were assured that educators were supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to BIA practice (4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.10).

41. Evidence identified how the course team ensured the integration of policy, legal literacy and practice. Discussions with alumni representatives highlighted that they had the opportunity to learn, understand, and apply legal frameworks and legal reasoning to underpin their decision making for future BIA practice (4.5, 4.10).

42. The evidence provided assurance that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator was sufficient to ensure that students met the required level of competence (4.6).

43. We explored with the course team how they ensured that assessments were robust, fair, reliable, and valid, and that those who successfully completed the course had developed the knowledge and skills necessary to make robust, independent, and well-evidenced assessments in the best interests of the person. Additional evidence of the course assessment methods and its moderation process was reviewed (4.8, 4.10).

44. We noted that no concerns had been identified by the external examiner regarding the course assessment processes. Employer partners we met confirmed that alumni from the course were able to meet the demands of the BIA role (4.8).

45. As identified within standard area 2, it was unclear what the level of involvement of people with lived experience had been in the effective monitoring, evaluation, and improvement systems of the course. We were unable to meet with any members of the people with lived experience group, and there were no minutes of meetings supplied to evidence their involvement. We were unsure how the course maintained the regular monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards to ensure that they remained robust and reliable. Therefore, we set a condition against standard 4.8. Full details of the condition can be found in the [proposed outcome](#) section.

46. Discussions with alumni representatives confirmed that there had been a process in place for them to receive feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing learning and development. We were assured from the evidence, including the scheme of learning and lesson plans, that the course was designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation, underpinned by skills, knowledge, and an ability to interpret and respond appropriately to legislative and policy change and case law (4.9).

47. Course materials identified how the course equipped students with relevant knowledge and skills relating to identifying and anticipating areas of conflict arising from DoLS processes and outcomes. We were satisfied, from discussions with the course team and employer partners, that alumni from the course would be able to support individuals, families, carers and agencies to understand the checks and balances of the DoLS system, enabling a robust, independent and well-evidenced determination made in the best interests of the person (4.10, 4.11).

48. The module guide outlined how students' progressed through the course, together with information on marking and appeals processes. The course provider confirmed that there was no equivalent award (4.12, 4.13).

49. We were satisfied that an appropriately experienced and suitably qualified professional had been appointed as the external examiner for the course and that there was a clear process for their appointment through Teesside University's human resources department (4.14).

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

5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	<b>Met</b>
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	<b>Met</b>
5.9 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.	<b>Met</b>

**Key observations for standard 5.**

50. Teesside University had a policy that the course provider had adopted as part of their partnership agreement (5.4).

51. We were provided with a link to the student services information offered by Teesside University. The university provided comprehensive, confidential health and wellbeing services through their Student Life Hub, which included mental health support, counselling, disability advice, and access to 24/7 wellbeing resources (5.1).

52. BIA students were informed of the support available to them at their induction, and details were included within the module guide. This information was reiterated within the course handbook and welcome emails (5.1, 5.2).

53. We heard that tutors and the client services team provided flexible support through one-to-one tutorials, and that the module guide contained clear information about the course, including the module overview, the reading list, and assessment information. The two former students we spoke to were aware of the access routes and the availability of student support services. We were satisfied that students had access to a system of academic and pastoral support for their progression, development, and welfare (5.1, 5.2).

54. Feedback was provided to students following the exercises on days four and five, as well as their post-course assessment. We reviewed the lesson day plans, which provided assurance on the progression and assessments (5.5, 5.7).

55. Requests for reasonable adjustments were managed through Teesside University's student support plan. Students were asked to make disclosures to the university's disability services team. Where students were employer-sponsored, the course provider liaised with both the employer and the university's disability services team to ensure that adjustments were implemented across academic and workplace contexts. Additional evidence, including the extenuating circumstances application form that students completed to request additional time, was reviewed (5.4).

56. Students had to provide a copy of their enhanced DBS, and further checks were carried out towards the end of the course to identify any changes to a student's professional status. We

reviewed evidence which clearly stated that students must inform the course provider if their registration status changed for any reason, or if they were subject to any investigation or action by any professional regulator or employer. If a suitability issue arose, course continuation and withdrawal were governed by Teesside University's assessment regulations and partnership provision operations manual and processes. We heard that all decisions were documented and reviewed to ensure fairness and transparency (1.2, 5.3).

57. Evidence of the information sent to students before and during the course, including the module guide and emails, were reviewed, together with information on the university's website. These sources provided information about the curriculum, observation requirements, assessments and the implications of students continuing their practice. The course provider reminded successful students that they should request for the register to be annotated to reflect their qualification, as well as the requirements for drawing links between the completion of the course, ongoing refresher training, and continuing professional development (5.6).

58. We reviewed the module guide, which included details on the marking criteria for assessments and the appeals process. The lesson plans demonstrated how students' progressed on the course. Teesside University's academic appeal regulations – guide for students, outlined the grounds, stages and submission procedures for appeals. Students were directed to this guide during their course induction and via the module guide (5.7, 5.8).

59. We reviewed the public interest disclosure policy (whistleblowing), which ensured that staff, students, and partners could raise concerns confidentially and without reprisal. We heard that staff involved in the delivery and administration of the course received training on whistleblowing and ethical-related standards through mandatory compliance, induction training, and briefings (5.9).

## Proposed outcome

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

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

## Conditions

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

Having considered whether approval with conditions or a refusal of approval was an appropriate course of action, 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	1.2	The course provider must provide governance documentation and evidence to show how all organisations must conduct their recruitment onto the course, setting out clear expectations relating to checks being proactively made throughout the course duration, to ensure continued compliance to this standard. The course provider should demonstrate that they have a clear process for self-funding applicants which includes the above.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">1.2</a>
2	1.3	Linkage with standard 1.2 and 1.4. The course provider must provide documentary evidence to demonstrate how they have confirmed the robustness of the assessment of applicant's prior relevant experience. This should be through engagement with employer/partner organisations or through their own quality assurance activities.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">1.3</a>
3	1.4	Linkage with standard 1.2 and 1.3. The course provider must provide documentary evidence to demonstrate that they have	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">1.4</a>

		oversight of all admissions processes.		
4	1.5	The course provider must clearly outline how employers and people with lived experience are involved in the employer funded and self-funded applicant admissions processes.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">1.5</a>
5	2.2	The course provider must provide evidence of how employers and people with lived experience are involved in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems of the course.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">2.2</a>
6	2.7	The course provider must provide details of the clear process students have for providing feedback about the course, including how that feedback is analysed, shared with employers and others involved in commissioning places on the course, and acted upon to inform the management and development of the course.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">2.7</a>
7	3.1	The course provider must demonstrate the operation of the new observations shadowing form shared with us during the inspection, including the link to the standards guidance of assessments set within the programme. This should draw upon the student's experience and analysis of practice observations, allowing them to: (a) apply knowledge and understanding of a range of models of mental disorder and (b) apply knowledge and understanding of social,	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">3.1</a>

		physical, environmental and developmental factors which allow demonstration of the application of a social perspective on mental disorder and mental health needs.		
8	3.2	Linkage with standard 3.1 and 3.3. The course provider must provide evidence to ensure that the number, duration, and range of observations is appropriate to support delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">3.2</a>
9	3.3	Linkage with standard 3.1 and 3.2. The course provider must provide evidence of collaborating with providers in the monitoring of all observation opportunities.	11 <sup>th</sup> September 2026	<a href="#">3.3</a>
10	4.2	The course provider must provide evidence of its plans and aspirations for the engagement of employers and people with lived experience being operationalised into the course and actions/records of this.	12 <sup>th</sup> June 2026	<a href="#">4.2</a>
11	4.8	The course provider must provide evidence of the effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement of assessment process for effectiveness and quality. This evidence should include evaluation by people with lived experience.	11 <sup>th</sup> September 2026	<a href="#">4.8</a>

As conditions have been attached to the approval, Bond Solon (in association with Teesside 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.

## Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	1.7	We are recommending that the course provider reviews how they oversee EDI throughout the selection and admission process as a benchmark expectation, create an implementation policy, and evidence trail.	<a href="#">1.7</a>
2	2.1	We are recommending that the course provider carries out contingency planning for the one member of the team who is a practicing BIA should they be unable to deliver the teaching on the course.	<a href="#">2.1</a>
3	2.5	Linkage with standard 2.1. We are recommending that the course provider reviews students' wider access to those who have relevant and current experience of BIA practice whilst undertaking the course.	<a href="#">2.5</a>
4	4.1	We are recommending that the course provider considers strengthening teaching materials to include more focus on relevant social and theoretical approaches to working with people integral to the BIA role.	<a href="#">4.1</a>

## Meeting of Conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation

## Findings