

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Derby

Course approval: BA (Hons) Applied Social Work
and
MA Social Work

Inspection dates: 21/06/22 – 24/06/22

Report date:	20/09/2022
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	09 January 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	24 July 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	7
Meetings with students	7
Meetings with course staff.....	7
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	7
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	7
Findings	8
Standard one: Admissions.....	8
Standard two: Learning environment	11
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	14
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	20
Standard five: Supporting students	25
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	28
Proposed outcome.....	29
Conditions	29
Recommendations	33
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary.....	36
Regulator decision	49
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	50
Findings	54

Introduction

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

What we do

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

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

9. During this time a draft plan for the inspection is developed and shared with the education provider, to make sure it is achievable at the point of inspection.
10. Once the inspectors and officer are satisfied that an inspection can take place, this is usually undertaken over a three to four day visit to the education provider. We then draft a report setting out what we found during the inspection and if and how our findings demonstrate that the course meets our standards. As a result of the COVID 19 pandemic, inspections are currently being carried out via remote virtual arrangements, and typically last three to four days.
11. The inspectors may recommend in this report that the course is approved with conditions, approved without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for approval. Where the course has been previously approved we may also decide to withdraw approval.
12. A draft of this report is shared with the education provider, and once we have considered any comments or observations they may wish to provide, we make a final regulatory decision about the approval of the course.
13. The final decisions that we can make are as follows, that the course is approved without conditions, the course is approved with conditions or that the course does not meet the criteria for approval. The decision, and the report, are then published.
14. If the course is approved with conditions, we will write to the education provider setting out how they can demonstrate they have met the conditions, the action we will take once we decide that the conditions are met, and the action we will take if we decide the conditions are not met.

Summary of Inspection

15. The University of Derby 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	UDR1
Course provider	University of Derby
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work MA Social Work
Mode of study	Full Time
Maximum student cohort	BA – 63 MA - 35
Date of inspection	21/06/22 – 24/06/22
Inspection team	Naomi Barrett - Education Quality Assurance Officer Lyn Westcott - (Lay Inspector) Anne MacKay - (Registrant Inspector) Sarah Sanderson - Education Quality Assurance Officer
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions that will require follow up inspection activity.
Approval outcome	TO BE ADDED

Language

16. In this document we describe University of Derby as ‘the education provider’ or ‘the university’ and we describe the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work or MA Social Work as ‘the course’.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 21 June to 24 June 2022. 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 six BA (Hons) Applied Social Work students, one in their first year, four in their second year and one in their final year of study. They also met with seven MA students, four in year one and three in year two. Discussions included, but were not limited to, their experiences of the university admissions processes, student support services and practice placements.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course team, senior management team and central support teams including the library.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with one person with lived experience of social work, who had been involved in the delivery of the course and interview process for applicants for the BA (Hons) Applied Social Work and MA Social Work course.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Framework, Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. In later meetings the inspection team also met with two practice educators who engage with University of Derby's BA and MA students as placement supervisors. The inspection team also met with representatives of the D2N2 Teaching Partnership and the external examiners for both courses.

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. Documentary evidence relating to selection, interview activities and scoring were provided, as was a link to the public facing website showing entry requirements. All these elements were reviewed by the inspection team prior to inspection. The process prior to the pandemic was a three-stage process, written test, group task and interview. The pandemic meant that the interviews moved to being held online rather than in person and the group task element was removed. There are some uncertainties as to whether the university will allow the course teams to revert to the pre-pandemic process and whether the course team would wish to revert back. The inspection team agreed that the current process satisfies the requirements of this standard but are recommending a return to the three-stage process, as this was considered by the inspection team to be more robust. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

26. It was noted by the inspection team that the current IELTS required by the university for both the MA Social Work and BA (Hons) Applied Social Work courses is set at 6.5, with no element less than level 6. This does not meet the requirements of this standard which is that IELTS should be set to level 7.

27. In discussions with the university about IELTS, the inspection team were advised that recruitment for the September 2022 intake had already taken place and offers had been made. It was agreed that the university would go back and identify any applicants who had confirmed offers with IELTS under level 7 overall score and would offer additional learning to them to enable them to meet the required level prior to the start of the courses. The university agreed that they would provide evidence of this work to the inspection team.

28. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.1 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 1.2

29. Information and evidence in support of this statement received by the inspection team for both the BA and MA courses was contradictory depending on the source. The websites for both courses specified that there could be no transfer of learning from other institutions, but the MA Course Handbook had information that stated this was possible. The BA website asks for relevant experience in either paid or voluntary capacity, but the inspection team were not provided with information about how this was assessed or what was defined as relevant experience. The MA website asks for awareness of social context, self and potential to develop knowledge and skills. It does not ask for relevant experience.

30. When meeting with the course teams for both courses, the inspectors discussed the conflicting information that had been provided and asked them to clarify the requirements. The inspection team were told that there was an expectation of prior relevant experience, and this was made clear on the website for both courses. The inspection team were able to provide examples from the evidence and websites showing the differing information and how this was confusing for potential applicants.

31. The inspectors agreed that due to a lack of clarity on what is required for entry on to the courses and what is defined as relevant experience for each course that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.2 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 1.3

32. The inspection team met with placement partners, practice educators and a person with lived experience of social work, all of whom confirmed and discussed their involvement in the admissions process. Activities discussed included interviewing and scoring candidates.

33. The inspection team also spoke with students from both courses who were able to reflect on their experience of engaging with people with lived experience of social work, and other external interview panel members as part of their application and interview experience. The inspection team therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.4

34. The university demonstrated the process to assess suitability of an applicant's character, conduct and health through evidence submitted, and during the inspection meetings. This included support available during the process for applicants who may have particular health

or learning needs, and a suitability process. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.5

35. Prior to inspection, the inspection team were directed to the university's Admissions Policy and were told in the narrative from the university that they are able to make reasonable adjustments to support applicants through admissions. The inspection team explored the reasonable adjustments that could be offered with the admissions team and were satisfied that these were inclusive.

36. When meeting with the admissions staff, course teams and registrar the inspection team asked for information relating to the monitoring of EDI policies, any trends identified, actions taken or goals set. The inspection team were told that the university looks at admissions across the board but this is not done at a course specific level so there is no information about anyone who is not offered a place, meaning that the course teams or admissions teams cannot say if there are any themes or trends here that need to be addressed. The inspection team were told of a widening participation team that is going out to schools and trying to encourage more children to consider going to university in their future but again, this is university wide and not specific to the social work provision.

37. As there is currently no monitoring of the admissions policy provided to ensure that it is implemented and there is no monitoring of applicants who are and are not offered a place on the courses the inspectors agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.5 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 1.6

38. This standard has links to standard 1.2 and the lack of clarity on what applicants are required to have in terms of relevant experience. The inspection team also ascertained that the website is not clear about the DBS and that it is an enhanced DBS check that is required, meaning that some applicants may be unsure what they should and shouldn't disclose, or what impact this may have on their application.

39. The website for both courses also states that there is a minimum number required for the course to run, but does not provide any detail regarding this, what the numbers are, when they will be advised if the course is able to run and the timelines involved. When discussing this with the senior management staff, the inspection team were told that they have to be very clear about managing applicants' expectations due to Competitions and

Markets Authority (CMA) rules but thought that it might not apply to social work provision so were not sure why it was on the website.

40. The inspection team agreed that as the requirements and information provided to applicants was not clear and may be incorrect in some cases such as minimum numbers, that applicants could not be in a position to make an informed decision as to whether to take up an offer of a place on the course and therefore agreed this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.6 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

41. The inspection team agreed that based on the documentary evidence provided, and from discussions with the course team and placement partners that students would be able to access suitable contrasting placements that would meet the requirements of this standard. The inspection team were also provided with mapping of the skills days for each course during the inspection. These are not currently shared with students and the inspection team are recommending that they are shared to enable student to see how and where skills will be learned. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

42. The inspection team were made aware that whilst each student had the placement opportunities they should, there have been issues with the university ensuring that students are able to access these on time due to not meeting the required deadlines for submitting student profiles to some partners. This will be picked up and detailed further under standard 3.2 below. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.2

43. The university provided documentary evidence relating to practice learning opportunities. Discussions were also held with the course teams, practice leads and students. During the meeting with representatives from placement partners, we discussed the types of placements on offer, along with associated tasks and how students are matched to them. Students' comments also echoed those of placement partners. Students voiced that they were happy with their experiences and reasonable adjustments that had been put in place where necessary.

44. The inspection team concluded that they were provided with sufficient evidence that students have appropriate and wide-ranging placement experiences. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

45. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included Module Specifications, Midway Review, Learning Agreement and Concerns Meeting, which covered the processes for induction, supervision and quality assurance. The inspection team were told how the processes were used by both the course team and placement partners.

46. Students told the inspection team of how the reasonable adjustments and personal support they needed was positively met by the placement provider, who were able to implement the adjustments. The students said they were happy with the support they had.

47. Student support was also explored with a practice educator, who was able to provide examples of how they had supported students with reasonable adjustments or mitigating circumstances whilst on placement. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

48. The inspection team reviewed the documentary evidence and processes related to the level of placement and matching of students to placement and discussed this with the course teams. Placement partners are provided with student profiles the university believe will be a good fit. The partners review these profiles, enabling the provider to ensure that they can meet the learning needs of the students and support the students with any reasonable adjustments should they be disclosed at this stage.

49. When meeting with placement partners, students from both courses and the practice educator, they were all able to discuss this in detail and gave clear examples of these processes working effectively. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

50. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence provided in relation to students' assessed preparation for practice through the preparation for practice modules on both courses, which was reviewed prior to the inspection.

51. The inspection team discussed students' readiness to practice with the practice educator, who knew of the modules and found them to be robust in their methods for preparing students for practice and had no concerns to raise. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

52. The only documentary evidence submitted in support of the university meeting this standard was a link from the D2N2 partnership website to the Nottinghamshire County Council web page explaining the role of the practice educator and how to become one. There was no reference to ensuring that practice educators are on the register or maintaining their current knowledge, skills and qualifications in relation to the University of Derby.

53. The narrative from the university prior to inspection was that their D2N2 partners would provide practice educators in their setting and therefore the responsibility of checking registration and qualification status lies with them. The university did not provide information about how the university checks that partners have carried this out. When discussing this with the course teams and practice lead, they could not provide any information or evidence about any checks they undertake with placement partners to ensure this has happened and that they rely on the long-standing good partnership working arrangements rather than ensure this happens.

54. The narrative provided about the university working with independent practice educators or non-teaching partnership placement providers was that the practice lead would check the register. However, when discussing this part of the process with the placement lead the inspection team were told that practice educators are expected to submit their qualifications and registration details, but they could not confirm that full checks are carried out on each of these.

55. The inspectors agreed that as the university was unable to demonstrate how they ensure the registration status and relevant knowledge and skills of practice educators they agreed this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 2.6 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 2.7

56. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection for the BA included a Concerns Meeting document, module specifications and the Programme Handbook. The documents reviewed outline whistleblowing and raising concerns processes and include a flowchart to aid students in these situations. When meeting with BA students they were aware of what they needed to do to raise a concern.

57. The documentary evidence reviewed for the MA, however, did not include a whistleblowing policy, just the Concerns Meeting document and modules. When meeting

with students they advised they knew how to raise a concern, but this was via tutors or practice educators, there was no reference to a whistleblowing policy or process.

58. The inspection team were satisfied that the BA course team were able to evidence that they meet this standard, but the MA had not adequately done so, and therefore for the MA this standard is not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 2.7 in relation to the approval of the MA course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

59. The inspection team were able to review some course team members CVs. During the inspection visit, we were also advised that the university's Centre for Quality Assurance and the Student Policy and Regulations teams are responsible for ensuring that systems for management and governance are in place, including roles, responsibilities, lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.

60. The university was unable to provide any of the written documentation in relation to governance matters prior to inspection, due to this being held on secure internal sites. However, the inspection team were able to discuss this with the course teams and senior management. The inspection team were told that there were a number of interim positions at senior levels and that the university was in the process of making some of these permanent and assessing the situation of remainder positions. The inspection team agreed that the university was able to evidence the current roles and responsibilities and therefore agreed the standard was met. However, the inspection team took the view that it would be beneficial for the smooth running of both courses for the posts and structures to be firmed up as soon as is possible and recommend that the university makes these clear with updated structure charts to ensure a smooth transition in roles and responsibilities. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.2

61. Information and evidence provided in support of this standard prior to inspection by the university was not specific to showing how and where agreements with partners are in place, or how capacity has been determined. When asked for additional evidence of this prior to inspection the university's response was there was nothing else they could submit as their agreements with partners are not written down and are verbal only.

62. During the inspection, when meeting with placement partners from the D2N2 teaching partnership, the inspection asked about the nature of the verbal agreements and how these were managed. The inspection team were told that there is a memorandum of understanding (MOU) document which partners within the teaching partnership have all signed up to and they do not operate through verbal agreements. The current MOU was currently under review by the partnership but offered approximately 200 placements shared between the three universities in the partnership. Derby is an additional member of the teaching partnership, not an original member and this means that those placement opportunities have been impacted by their joining the partnership and regionally there is now placement capacity issues, which the partnership is addressing.

63. The inspection team were made aware that the university had not always been able to access their full quota of allocated placements due to the university not providing student profiles within agreed timescales, meaning the placements were offered elsewhere and leaving the university to source additional placements.

64. When meeting with the course teams, the inspection team asked about how and where other placement opportunities were sourced and were told of a project currently being undertaken by the placement lead to grow their provision. When asked for further information and evidence about the project and the numbers this was not forthcoming during the inspection.

65. In discussions with students from both the BA and MA courses regarding their experience of placement and the allocation of placements, the inspection team heard of many placements starting late, and some arriving for their first day to be told they were not expected. The inspection team heard the impact this had on some students' lives, who had changed their working patterns or childcare in preparation for placement. The communication they received regarding the delays was inconsistent, meaning they could not adequately amend their arrangements as they did not have the information they required.

66. The inspection team agreed that the university was not able to provide adequate evidence of their agreements with placement partners, ensuring that they have enough placements for their cohorts for both courses and therefore agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.2 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.3

67. Information and evidence provided in support of this standard prior to inspection by the university was not specific to ensuring that the placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures, but more focussed on the information shared between the university and placement partners or practice educators.

68. Discussions were held with the course teams and practice lead about ongoing quality assurance mechanisms, such as audits of placement partners to ensure consistency across them all. The inspection team were told that there are no formal audits currently being undertaken. Partners in local authorities are all in the teaching partnership and so they rely on their longstanding working relationships to flag any issues or concerns. There is also the QAPL that can flag issues at the end of placement. When asked about PVI partners and audits, the inspection team were advised again there is no ongoing audit once initial assessment of suitability is conducted. The placement lead is fairly new to post and advised that they would be looking at auditing placements going forward, but currently there is no process.

69. As the university was unable to adequately evidence that they have ensured partners have the necessary policies and procedures relating to this standard, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.3 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.4

70. The inspection team, through the review of evidence alongside meetings held with practice placement partners, were assured of working relationships between the university and placement providers. Placement partners are involved in the Programme Committee Meetings, and some of the placement partners and practice educators the inspection team met with also spoke of being involved in interviewing applicants and being asked to take part in teaching. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.5

71. Documentation provided by the course team about how placement partners, students and people with lived experience of social work are engaged in monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems were templates such as Internal Moderation Form, Moderation Flow Chart and other templates. Prior to inspection, the inspection team asked the university for additional evidence, in particular minutes from the programme committee meetings (PCM)s. These were supplied but were more than a year old and therefore not reflective of

current working arrangements and attendance uptake. The university advised they were unable to supply more recent minutes due to these being held on an internal quality system that could not extract them.

72. The inspection team were able to meet with some people from the aforementioned groups to hear how they are involved in practice and what impact they felt they had on evaluation and improvement. The feedback from each group was varied, for example students could only talk of being involved in module evaluation. As they were only able to meet with one person of lived experience who had no recent involvement in any of these types of activities the inspection team were not able to pursue this topic further.

73. The inspection team agreed that as the university had been unable to clearly demonstrate how all parties are involved in regular and effective monitoring and evaluation processes, this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.5 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.6

74. As discussed in standard 3.2 and 3.3 the university has been unable to demonstrate they have the required level of placement opportunities and the mechanisms to ensure that placements commence on time. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that the university were not able to demonstrate that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity.

75. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.6 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.7

76. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the CVs for the course leaders and confirmed they are registered social workers. The interim Head of School is also a registered social worker.

77. It was evident from discussions with the course leaders and team that they had recent and relevant knowledge of contemporary social work practice and had been supported by

the university to grow this knowledge. The inspection team was satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

78. Evidence submitted prior to inspection related to the university recruitment process such as Social Work Lecturer Job Description and Social Work Lecturer Interview Questions. No evidence was provided demonstrating an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in post. The inspection team heard through the inspection that there have been changes regarding staffing with some leaving and retiring. Some staff have been appointed but they are also still recruiting. There have also been interim management changes.

79. The inspection team were told of a new work loading tool that is being used to aid in ensuring adequate workloads, but the inspection team had concerns about the effectiveness of the tool when the course lead for the MA has now also been appointed as the placement co-ordinator and a module lead. To counter this, the inspection team were told that this member of staff would not be a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) and that the subject lead would be in regular contact to have oversight of the workload.

80. When meeting with external examiners for both courses the inspection team were told that contact and communication experiences were not consistent between both external examiners. This has resulted in information about assessment boards not being passed on correctly, meaning the examiners could not attend as they were not informed in a timely way when these meetings were happening. Some module leads were very proactive, and others did not communicate at all. They were not made aware of module lead changes. The university did not follow the process of sharing documents with them and there have been multiple issues with being unable to access the range of materials such as recordings. They reported they have received the wrong documentation and sometimes received documentation prior to internal moderation. The examiners also explained a number of issues raised with the university around assessments and marking.

81. Taking this into account and the conditions being recommended relating to standards 3.2 and 3.6, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.8 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.9

82. Information and evidence provided in support of this standard prior to inspection by the university was not specific to how the university evaluates performance and progression, or any analysis undertaken and actions as a result. There was a link to a PAT tuition website and a PAT Tuition Policy. The narrative informed the inspection team that the university use a data platform called Tableau that collates the data gathered. This is an internal university data source so could not be shared prior to inspection but a demonstration was made during inspection.

83. The inspection team were told that the course teams use the data to inform curriculum updates and to aid them in closing the awarding gaps where they have been identified. When the inspection team met with external examiners, one explained that they had fed back to the university that they had identified that Black students were at the lower end of the marking scale, and they advised that they had had no clear response from the university about what steps were being taken to address this issue.

84. When the inspection team asked further questions about what the university had themselves identified from the data and what steps were being taken the university were unable to go into any detail about the analysis, trends and outcomes at course level. Whilst the inspectors agreed that data is being collected, they agreed that the university had been unable to demonstrate the analysis of that data. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met.

85. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.9 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 3.10

86. The inspection team were provided information and evidence about the support available for the course team to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice, which they were able to discuss with the course teams and senior management.

87. The university is keen to support staff to take on MA and PhD opportunities, which the university will part fund. Staff are allocated 200 hours for research or staff development opportunities and there is a budget in place to support activities. They also work with D2N2 on CPD opportunities for the team. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

88. Prior to the inspection, the discipline lead contacted the EQA officer to advise them that documentary evidence that would be submitted around this standard, and applied to some previous standards also, was not up to date. The Programme Specification and Module Specification documents were dated from 2015, they had the previous regulator's frameworks mapped and did not include mapping to Social Work England's Professional Standards. The EQA officer was informed that the university was in the process of updating the documentation. The EQA officer made the inspectors aware of this information prior to their review of evidence.

89. During the inspection, the inspection team received updated programme specifications for both courses that have now been changed to include mapping modules to the Professional Standards, but the inspection team had not seen updated course handbooks which are student facing. There were inconsistencies with the module descriptors from both courses in terms of information and style and some links were missing. None had any information about how these modules aid students' understanding or knowledge of how and where these modules and learning outcomes enable their progression through the various frameworks and support them in developing their knowledge and skills.

90. When the inspection team met with the course teams and discussed this with them, they were told that this was an area identified as needing improvement. As the university was unable to adequately demonstrate that the content structure and delivery was in accordance with the relevant frameworks the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met.

91. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.1 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 4.2

92. As noted in standard 3.5 above, the PCM minutes submitted were more than a year old and the university had advised the EQA officer prior to inspection that the more up to date minutes were held electronically and were not able to be shared prior to inspection. No other documents were submitted in evidence of how the university meets this standard.

93. As only one person with lived experience was able to meet with the inspection team and they had no recent experiences of being involved in the ongoing review of the curriculum,

the inspection team were unable to gather examples of this working in practice. Outside of the teaching partnership, the practice educators and placement partners were unable to provide examples of where they had been invited by the university to take part in other activities.

94. When meeting the course teams, the examples provided where people with lived experience took part were encouraging, such as being a part in the delivery of a module. However, the course teams were not able to demonstrate that people with lived experience were involved in the development of the courses. The involvement described was a reactive one, such as a person assisting in the delivery of a module, as opposed to being consulted and involved in the ongoing review and design. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met.

95. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.2 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses 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. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

96. The inspection team would also recommend that the university considers appointing a lead person to engage in a more formalised way with people with lived experience of social work. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.3

97. The inspection team, having reviewed the university's Equality Diversity and Inclusion website and module descriptors, were satisfied that the course had been designed in accordance with those policies and that the university had the necessary support mechanisms in place to ensure inclusion and reasonable adjustments in all settings. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

98. As part of the inspection, the inspection team were asked to consider proposed changes to the BA course. Two new modules, Domestic Abuse and Contemporary Issues in Social Work have been developed and approved by the university. The domestic abuse module will replace an existing module. The Independent Study module has had a reduction in credits from 40 to 20 to reflect an assessment word count change from 10,000 to 5000. The remaining 20 credits will be taken up by the Contemporary Issues module. The inspection team were satisfied with the changes and agreed this provided evidence of the university updating their courses and were therefore satisfied that this standard was met.

99. However, during the inspection a discussion was held around the reading lists for modules and a lack of consistency in the updating of these with new editions and/or updated research. Reading lists are the responsibility of the module lead and some were very good examples with essential and further reading identified, and others less populated and up to date. When asked about this, some module leaders felt that directing students to weekly resources was better as students were less inclined to look at reading lists. The weekly resources again varied depending on the module lead. The inspection team is recommending a more streamlined and consistent approach across all modules within both courses to the provision of reading lists and the approach taken to directing students to further resources. Reading lists and resources should be kept up to date and checked on a regular basis. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.5

100. The inspection team reviewed the individual module descriptors that track across the course how theory and practice would be explored. It was clearly demonstrated where theory and practice linked to assessment and the associated learning outcomes and therefore the inspection team agreed this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

101. The only documentary evidence submitted for this standard were the practice placement modules. The narrative provided informed the inspection team that skills days were used to support interprofessional learning. When meeting with the course teams the inspection team were told of events such as a conference which would allow students to meet with and learn with other students from other professions. When asking students for their experiences of this none were able to provide any information.

102. The course teams acknowledged that these are not mandatory events and may well be running at times that social work students are on placement, so students may have limited availability to join. Whilst there is evidence enough to demonstrate that the university meets this standard, as agreed by the inspection team, they do recommend a more formalised, fair and consistent approach to interprofessional learning to enable all students the same opportunities. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report

Standard 4.7

103. The inspection team were able to review both the Course Specification and individual module descriptors, detailing the course structure with the required hours along with the university's Academic Regulations. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

104. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included module descriptors, various marking grids for modules, module handbooks and various other rubrics. There are several different assessment types but there are inconsistencies with the number of learning outcomes and assessment in some cases. The university needs to demonstrate how the professional standards are mapped and how the particular assessment will enable the students to have the necessary skills and knowledge to progress through all relevant frameworks, which was not clear from documentation submitted or demonstrated through discussions with the course teams and students.

105. In discussions with practice educators, students and external examiners, a number of issues were raised such as practice educators not having sufficient training and confidence in grading placement activity, rubrics not being used correctly, and assessment types used not being wholly accurate. An example was given whereby the assessment method was described as being a viva. The inspection team agreed that, theoretically, this could be an appropriate and helpful method of assessment. However, they were informed that what happened in practice was that students read out scripts word for word and were instantly given a pass/fail, which would not meet the requirements for a robust assessment process that allowed a discursive approach to professional discussion and questioning.

106. The inspection team therefore agreed that there was not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid and that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.8 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the courses would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the conditions, their monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 4.9

107. The inspection team have reviewed documents in relation to assessment and progression. The inspection team agreed that the evidence reviewed demonstrated that assessments are carried out at appropriate stages during the course and did not cause undue stress for students. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

108. No documentary evidence was submitted in support of this standard, again the inspection team were told that this could be shown during the inspection as the evidence was online. The narrative listed the ways students might get feedback.

109. When looking at evidence submitted in support of standard 5.7, which has close links to 4.10, the inspection team were able to determine policy around feedback and a marking policy. From conversations with the course team, students, practice educators and external examiners the inspection team were satisfied that feedback happens for the MA course, but this was less clear for the BA course, and this will again be picked up under standard 5.7 below.

110. Whilst the inspection team takes the view that for the MA this standard is met, they recommend that the university ensures a consistent approach to feedback, with a guide on length and content around feedback to ensure it is meaningful and enables students to progress in their work. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

111. Conversations with students and external examiners highlighted that student feedback regarding their performance and progression for the BA was patchy and the university had not adequately demonstrated this standard to inspectors during the inspection. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard is not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.10 in relation to the approval of the BA course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the course would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the courses would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the conditions, their monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 4.11

112. No evidence was supplied initially to demonstrate how this standard was met, and prior to the inspection the inspection team requested evidence and were provided with external examiner reports. The inspection team also met with the external examiners and were able to discuss their experience and the application process they went through to become the external examiners for each course. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

113. No documentary evidence was submitted to evidence how this standard was met prior to inspection as the university was unable to share the online content as mentioned in previous standards. During the inspection the university was able to demonstrate where a range of people were able to provide comment and impact on student progression. This was discussed with placement partners and the practice educators as the practice educators are asked to grade the placement module assessments. The inspection team agreed that this was met.

Standard 4.13

114. The inspection team concluded that evidence-informed thinking and practice could be clearly demonstrated throughout the courses through the module descriptors, discussions with the practice educators and students. At the start of the inspection, the course team gave a presentation which described how integrating theory and practice as being integral components of both courses. In addition, both courses have specific modules that focus on the importance of research and students are encouraged throughout to develop critical thinking. The inspection team were satisfied that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

115. Prior to inspection, the inspection team were provided with links to a range of advice and support services designed to meet both the academic and pastoral needs of all students. Such services include confidential counselling services, careers advice, student well-being and student finance and funding.

116. When discussing the support mechanisms with students they were able to share their knowledge and positive experiences of using these services from the university. Those who had not needed to access any of these services knew of them and where to go should they find themselves in need. The inspection team therefore agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

117. Students are allocated a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) to support them throughout their studies and who can refer students to further specialist support within the university. The inspection team were told by the students that some had experienced issues in the allocation and continuity of the PAT. Some students were allocated one who went off sick and therefore were reliant on others stepping in and covering for staff absences. There was also an issue of staff turnover meaning some students were allocated someone who then left. Other students spoke positively about all aspects of support from their PAT. The course team were open that there had been previous staffing issues that had impacted on the availability of PATs and that they had taken steps to address this.

118. When discussing access to resources with placement partners, the inspection team were given examples of reasonable adjustments and how these were managed in conjunction with the university. The inspection team agreed that student support in relation to academic development was clearly demonstrated, and the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

119. The inspection team reviewed the documentary evidence submitted prior to inspection, which included the Professional Conduct and Professional Suitability Procedure and Practice Learning handbook and were satisfied that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.4

120. The university was able to demonstrate that they are supportive of any reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments which was echoed by the placement partners the inspection team met with. When meeting with representatives from specialist support teams, the inspection team were given examples of support available and of how this is continued for the duration of the student's studies including placements. When discussing support with the students, those who had accessed services gave positive feedback about their experiences. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

121. The university submitted the programme handbook as evidence against this standard for the BA and the MA did not submit any documentary evidence prior to the inspection. Again, the reason given was that it could not be extracted from the university systems. There was no commentary provided as to where inspectors were to find the relevant information in the programme handbook, and they were unable to locate the information they thought relevant.

122. When meeting with students, their experiences of being provided information varied. As mentioned in standards above, information about placement activity and when it would commence was often delayed and on occasion not wholly correct.

123. The inspection team were also unable to locate where information is provided to students about the professional standards, or the transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.

124. Therefore, the inspection team agreed that this standard was not met for either course. The inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against standard 5.5 in relation to the approval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the courses would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full details of the conditions, their monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 5.6

125. The inspection team reviewed the attendance policies, the academic regulations link, and complaints policies. During the inspection, the course team were able to demonstrate the way attendance is monitored and where the trigger points are for investigation and intervention. When meeting with students they were clear on the attendance requirements and potential consequences. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.7

126. Evidence reviewed that was submitted in support of this standard included a link to the Assessment and Feedback Strategy 2017-2020 and an Anonymous Marking Policy for Supportive Marking and Feedback document. The narrative explained how the course team aims to meet the university policy, and if they cannot meet this then students are informed via email through Blackboard announcements with a new timeframe.

127. When meeting with students about their feedback and how meaningful this was, students, particularly from the MA course, said they were often given the feedback that their work needs to be at level 7 but that no specific examples or explanations were given for them to understand how and where they needed to apply themselves. Feedback from BA students was that feedback received at the start was very useful at helping them improve their grades, but this dropped off as the course went on. One student mentioned that they had hit a grade wall and despite raising the issue of their feedback not being meaningful enough to allow them to develop their grades further, it did not improve.

128. When meeting with the external examiners, they commented that some modules demonstrate good feedback but not all. Where two markers have done the marking then one might put details and comments and the other had not, meaning no consistent approach between markers on occasions which they felt impacted students. The external examiner for the MA was able to provide examples of feedback seen but the examiner for the BA advised that they had seen inconsistent marking and feedback with some work having no guidance about how students can get better.

129. The inspection team agreed that this standard has been met for the MA but agreed that the recommendation being made under 4.10 for the MA course regarding a consistent approach to providing student feedback would apply here also. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

130. The inspection team agreed that this standard had not been clearly demonstrated for the BA course and therefore agreed that this standard was not met. The inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 5.7 in relation to the approval of the course. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the courses would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that conditions are appropriate to ensure that the courses would be able to meet the relevant standard. Full

details of the conditions, their monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions table](#).

Standard 5.8

131. The inspection team were provided links to the Students Union and Complaints procedure, which is not the academic appeals procedure. The inspection team were able to find the academic appeals link on the university website which satisfies the inspection team that this standard is met. The inspection team are recommending that the course team check links provided to students to ensure they are going to the correct policy. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

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

Standard 6.1

As the qualifying courses are a BA (Hons) Applied Social Work and a MA Social Work, the inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Proposed outcome

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

Conditions

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

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 1.1	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that they are recruiting to the correct IELTS level, level 7 overall and where this information is made clear to applicants. The university must also provide evidence that anyone already offered a place on the 2022 intake below level 7 has been able to reach level 7 capability prior to the start of the course.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 28
2	Standard 1.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA of their entry requirements about applicants' previous relevant experience, including a definition of what they classify as relevant experience and show where this information is made clear to applicants.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 31
3	Standard 1.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates their admissions policy being implemented and monitored,	20/03/2023	Paragraph 37

		detailing any training that anyone involved in admissions undertakes in support of the monitoring and implementation of the policy.		
4	Standard 1.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates accurate information provided to students throughout the admissions process regarding the need for an enhanced DBS check, previous experience requirements and clarification on whether minimum numbers are required. If the minimum numbers are required, then evidence is needed to show how this process is communicated to students to manage their expectations and allow them to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the course.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 40
5	Standard 2.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates a robust process for checking and ensuring that practice educators are on the register and have the relevant qualifications and experience, regardless of who is supplying the practice educator.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 55
6	Standard 2.7	The education provider will provide evidence for the MA that demonstrates how and where information about the university whistleblowing policy is shared with students.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 58
7	Standard 3.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates their agreements with placement partners detailing that they have sufficient placement capacity for their cohorts for both courses. This should include evidence that placements are taking place when they are scheduled to do so. The evidence can include any work currently being	20/03/2023	Paragraph 66

		undertaken to grow capacity with new or existing partners.		
8	Standard 3.3	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates quality assurance mechanisms whereby the university is routinely checking partners' suitability as both new and ongoing placement providers and that they have all the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 69
9	Standard 3.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how and where employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students are regularly and effectively involved in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 73
10	Standard 3.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity. This evidence needs to show how they are recruiting cohorts with sizes they can demonstrate they can ensure placements for. This relates to the condition set against standard 3.2.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 75
11	Standard 3.8	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that they have an appropriate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for both courses, meaning they are able to meet the demands of the courses, such as teaching, the timely sourcing and allocation of placements, internal processes and quality assurance mechanisms. This links to the conditions set against 3.2 and 3.6.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 81

12	Standard 3.9	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates the course team will act on EDI data for improvement of delivery and processes within the courses e.g. working to close the attainment gap for BAME students.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 85
13	Standard 4.1	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks. The university also needs to provide evidence of how and where this information is shared with students to enable them to demonstrate their progression through the relevant frameworks.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 91
14	Standard 4.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that the views of employers, practitioners, and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design, ongoing development, and review of the curriculum but with a particular focus on the people with lived experience. The evidence needs to show beyond just seeking feedback but how the university collaborates with each group.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 95
15	Standard 4.8	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid and how they will enable students' progression through relevant frameworks. The evidence needs to also demonstrate that there is a consistent approach to ensuring assessments are carried out appropriately.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 106
16	Standards 4.10 and 5.7	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates a clear and consistent	20/03/2023	Paragraph 111

		approach to ensuring that feedback is always provided and that it is meaningful and will allow students to progress and improve in their studies.		Paragraph 130
17	Standard 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how and where accurate and timely information relating to placement activity is provided and updated for students, enabling them to be best prepared for practice opportunities.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 124
18	Standard 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how and where information about becoming a professional is communicated to students, with particular reference to the professional standards and preparation for the requirements of CPD.	20/03/2023	Paragraph 124

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	1.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers reverting back to the three-stage recruitment process that was the standard process pre-pandemic. The inspectors feel this is a more robust process and will allow students to demonstrate their potential through a group exercise.	Paragraph 25
2	2.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider sharing the mapping of the skills days to students to aid students in understanding how and	Paragraph 41

		where they will learn the necessary skills and knowledge for practice.	
3.	3.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider confirming posts as quickly as possible to ensure an appropriate person has oversight of the management and quality assurance of the courses as inspectors saw inconsistencies and areas with little oversight. Inspectors are recommending that a time bound action plan be produced to tackle this with clear lines of management, communication and responsibility.	Paragraph 60
4.	4.2	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider appointing a lead person to be a dedicated contact to engage with people with lived experience of social work to build a more co-productive partnership-type relationship. Inspectors feel this will help them to become a more integral part of the ongoing delivery, review and improving of the courses.	Paragraph 96
5.	4.4	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider a more consistent approach and formatting style to modules, that is routinely checked, to ensure learning resources are regularly updated. This should enable students to navigate easily through module sites and access contemporary reading lists, rather than working through different approaches to these areas dependant on the preferences of module leads.	Paragraph 99
6.	4.6	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider a more formalised approach to interprofessional learning, such as making it part of skills days or teaching to ensure a fair and consistent approach to enable all students the same opportunities and are not missing out due to placement requirements.	Paragraph 102
7.	4.10 and 5.7	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider for the MA that they ensure a consistent approach is taken to feedback, providing a guide to module leads to ensure that students are getting meaningful level of comments and feedback to enable them to progress with their studies and aid them in improving grades.	Paragraph 110 Paragraph 129

8.	5.8	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider handbooks and programme specifications are checked to ensure the correct links relating to academic appeals is presented as current links are going to complaints processes and not the university academic appeals process.	Paragraph 131
----	-----	---	-------------------------------

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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 BA (Hons) Social Work	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
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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
BA (Hons) Social Work			
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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
Admissions			
1.1 Confirm on entry to the course, via a holistic/multi-dimensional assessment process, that applicants: v. have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards vi. can demonstrate that they have a good command of English vii. have the capability to meet academic standards; and viii. 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 information about the professional standards, research interests and placement opportunities.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
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: iii) placements in at least two practice settings providing contrasting experiences; and iv) 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.	☐	☒	☐
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
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 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	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
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, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	☐	☒	☐
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
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.	☒	☐	☐
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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
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: IV. confidential counselling services; V. careers advice and support; and VI. 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.	☒	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
MA Social Work			
5.5 Provide information to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.	☐	☒	☐
5.6 Provide information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory.	☒	☐	☐
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	☒	☐	☒
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	☒	☐	☒
Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register			
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor's degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions.

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1	Standard 1.1	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that they are recruiting to the correct IELTS level, level 7 overall and where this information is made clear to applicants. The university must also provide evidence that anyone already offered a place on the 2022 intake below level 7 has been able to reach level 7 capability prior to the start of the course.	Condition met
2	Standard 1.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA of their entry requirements about applicants' previous relevant experience, including a definition of what they classify as relevant experience and show where this information is made clear to applicants.	Condition met
3	Standard 1.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates their admissions policy being implemented and monitored, detailing any training that anyone involved in admissions undertakes in support of the monitoring and implementation of the policy.	Condition met
4	Standard 1.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates accurate information provided to students throughout the	Condition met

		admissions process regarding the need for an enhanced DBS check, previous experience requirements and clarification on whether minimum numbers are required. If the minimum numbers are required, then evidence is needed to show how this process is communicated to students to manage their expectations and allow them to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the course.	
5	Standard 2.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates a robust process for checking and ensuring that practice educators are on the register and have the relevant qualifications and experience, regardless of who is supplying the practice educator.	Condition met
6	Standard 2.7	The education provider will provide evidence for the MA that demonstrates how and where information about the university whistleblowing policy is shared with students.	Condition met
7	Standard 3.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates their agreements with placement partners detailing that they have sufficient placement capacity for their cohorts for both courses. This should include evidence that placements are taking place when they are scheduled to do so. The evidence can include any work currently being undertaken to grow capacity with new or existing partners.	Condition met
8	Standard 3.3	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates quality assurance mechanisms whereby the university is routinely checking partners' suitability	Condition met

		as both new and ongoing placement providers and that they have all the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	
9	Standard 3.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how and where employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students are regularly and effectively involved in the monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems.	Condition met
10	Standard 3.6	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity. This evidence needs to show how they are recruiting cohorts with sizes they can demonstrate they can ensure placements for. This relates to the condition set against standard 3.2.	Condition met
11	Standard 3.8	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that they have an appropriate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff for both courses, meaning they are able to meet the demands of the courses, such as teaching, the timely sourcing and allocation of placements, internal processes and quality assurance mechanisms. This links to the conditions set against 3.2 and 3.6.	Condition met
12	Standard 3.9	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates the course team will act on EDI data for improvement of delivery and processes within the courses e.g. working to close the attainment gap for BAME students.	Condition met

13	Standard 4.1	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks. The university also needs to provide evidence of how and where this information is shared with students to enable them to demonstrate their progression through the relevant frameworks.	Condition met
14	Standard 4.2	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that the views of employers, practitioners, and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design, ongoing development, and review of the curriculum but with a particular focus on the people with lived experience. The evidence needs to show beyond just seeking feedback but how the university collaborates with each group.	Condition met
15	Standard 4.8	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid and how they will enable students' progression through relevant frameworks. The evidence needs to also demonstrate that there is a consistent approach to ensuring assessments are carried out appropriately.	Condition met
16	Standards 4.10 and 5.7	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates a clear and consistent approach to ensuring that feedback is always provided and that it is meaningful and will allow students to progress and improve in their studies.	Condition met
17	Standard 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that	Condition met

		demonstrates how and where accurate and timely information relating to placement activity is provided and updated for students, enabling them to be best prepared for practice opportunities.	
18	Standard 5.5	The education provider will provide evidence for both the BA and MA that demonstrates how and where information about becoming a professional is communicated to students, with particular reference to the professional standards and preparation for the requirements of CPD.	Condition met

Findings

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

After the review of the documentary evidence, the inspection team are satisfied that all of the conditions set against the approval of the BA and MA Social Work courses are now met.

In relation to the condition set against standard 1.1 the education provider directed the inspection team to information on the website that shows that that IELTS 7 overall is required with a minimum of 6.5 in any element. They also confirmed that they do not have any students currently on role that did not meet the threshold requirements.

In relation to the condition set against standard 1.2 the education provider directed the information team to a website that provided some details/examples of what type of experience would be considered relevant when applying for the courses. It also asks applicants to reflect on their suitability, bearing in mind the amount of time spent gaining the relevant experience.

In relation to the condition set against standard 1.5 the education provider submitted evidence that demonstrates training for staff involved in admissions work. The evidence submitted did not cover the element of the condition relating to monitoring and implementation of their admissions policy so additional information was requested. The course provider submitted some narrative outlining processes undertaken particularly with reference to managing specific additional learning requirements and DBS. They also advised of a terms of reference for the DBS panel.

In relation to the condition set against standard 1.6 the education provider sent links to information on their website that includes the requirement for an enhanced DBS check. They also provided additional documentation which evidences the requirement for an enhanced DBS check and detailed information given to students.

In relation to the condition set against standard 2.6 the education provider has submitted evidence, including copies of email correspondence with the Teaching Partnership which outlines their commitment to completing a robust process for checking and ensuring that practice educators are on the register and have the relevant qualifications and experience, regardless of who is supplying the practice educator.

In relation to the condition set against standard 2.7 the education provider submitted the placement learning agreement which requires the student to record they have read the agency and university policy on whistleblowing and the agency are to provide a whistleblowing contact for the placement. There is also a link to the University Whistle blowing process in the placement handbook.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.2 the education provider submitted additional evidence that assured the inspection team that, together with the partnership, they have undertaken a significant piece of work to ensure the adequacy of placement provision. This evidence also links with condition applied to standard 3.6 and the inspectors have recommended both are met.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.3 the education provider provided a placement audit document a statement was given about a programme of fresh audits for new placements and a re-audit programme for existing placements. The inspection team requested additional information in relation to the frequency of the audits going forwards, the education provider submitted information that outlined a plan for a rolling audit under the direction of a new placement lead.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.5 the education provider submitted a range of meeting notes that evidence engagement within both the MA and BA courses with people with lived experience of social work, employers and students.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.8 the education provider submitted evidence of sufficient staffing levels overall.

In relation to the condition set against standard 3.9 the inspection team saw evidence of an EDI awarding gap audit from the university for social work. They requested additional evidence with respect to actions following on from the audit. The response from the education provider provided additional information about research to address the attainment gap. They state they will monitor the outcome of this work on an annual basis, which will audit the outcomes achieved.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.1 the education provider submitted mapping information that shows how both courses meet the relevant professional frameworks. They also provided email evidence showing information provided to current students providing the link to this mapping. The inspection team requested further information to be assured that they would continue to provide this information to students. The education provider provided additional information to show how they would share via their virtual learning platform.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.2 the education provider submitted a range of evidence that shows there is some process for both BA and MA of responding to the views of a range of stakeholders including people with lived experience of social work in terms of collaborative practice. While the inspector's recommendation is that this condition is now met, some of this work is at university level rather than being social work specific.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.8 the education provider provided a range of assessment rubrics, including those used for group presentations and Viva.

In relation to the condition set against standard 4.10 & 5.7 the education provider submitted marking grids that showed the marking criteria, but the inspection team did not feel that there was enough evidence to make a recommendation that the condition was met. A further submission of evidence was requested. The university provided additional commentary about how the marking rubrics are used, alongside additional information about internal and external moderation processes.

In relation to the condition set against standard 5.5 the education provider a timeline document for the BA and an assurance that the MA is the same with the exception of the months within which things occur.

Conclusion

The inspection team is recommending that as the conditions have been met, the course be approved.

Regulator decision

Approved.

The regulatory decision is to approve this course following the review of the conditions evidence provided by the university in response to the outcome of the inspection. It is noted that based on the evidence provided, that the course was able to demonstrate that the conditions were met at a threshold level in order to meet the standard, specifically for standards 3.9 and 4.1. The quality of conditions evidence provided could have been more complete to provide a definitive response to the specific conditions. As such, it is recommended that the university review its internal continuous improvement systems to ensure that it continues to meet the standards.