

Inspection Report

Course provider: University of Hull

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work, BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Inspection dates: 09 May 2023 – 12 May 2023

Report date:	17 July 2023
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	13 December 2023
Date conditions met and approved:	10 September 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
What we do.....	3
Summary of Inspection	5
Language	5
Inspection.....	6
Meetings with students	6
Meetings with course staff.....	6
Meeting with people with lived experience of social work	6
Meetings with external stakeholders.....	6
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	13
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality.....	19
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	27
Standard five: Supporting students	35
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	41
Proposed outcome.....	42
Conditions	42
Recommendations	45
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	47
BA (Hons) Social Work	47
Annex 2: Education and training standards summary.....	54
BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	54
Regulator decision	61
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions.....	62
Findings	64
Regulator decision	67

Introduction

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

What we do

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

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

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

Summary of Inspection

15. The University of Hull 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. During the same week the MA Social Work course and PG Dip Social Work (Exit Route) courses were also inspected by a separate inspection team. Some online meetings across the week were held jointly. Details of this inspection are covered in a separate report.

Inspection ID	UHULR1
Course provider	University of Hull
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of study	Full Time
Maximum student cohort	BA (Hons) Social Work: 60 BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship: 25
Date of inspection	9 May 2023 – 12 May 2023
Inspection team	Nikki Steel-Bryan - Education Quality Assurance Officer Jane Jones - (Lay Inspector) Louise Robson - (Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Approval outcome	Approved with conditions

Language

16. In this document we describe the University of Hull as ‘the education provider’, ‘the course provider’ or ‘the University’ and we describe the BA (Hons) Social Work as ‘the BA course’, and the BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship as ‘the apprenticeship’. When discussing the courses as a group we will describe them as ‘the

courses'. We describe students on the BA course as 'students' and on the apprenticeship as 'learners'.

Inspection

17. A remote inspection took place from 9 May 2023 – 12 May 2023. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students, course staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

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

Conflict of interest

19. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

20. The inspection team met with seven students, of which four were student representatives, one was a student ambassador and two were apprentices. Discussions included placement experiences, student support and availability of staff, the curriculum, attendance, assessment and feedback.

Meetings with course staff

21. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with University staff members from the course team, those involved in selection and admissions, the senior leadership team, staff involved in placement based learning and central student support services.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

22. The inspection team met with five people with lived experience of social work who have been involved in the University Lived Experience Group and the User / Carer Coordinator. Discussions included admissions, curriculum development and training and development.

Meetings with external stakeholders

23. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership, North East Lincolnshire Council, North

Lincolnshire Council, Hull City Council, the Humber Teaching NHS Trust and PVI Partners including Mind and Vulcan.

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. Evidence submitted in support of this standard for the BA course and the apprenticeship included the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership Admissions Pack which detailed entry criteria that included a grade C / 4 in GCSE Maths and English, and an ICT self-declaration form and the outline for the selection day that included a written test, group discussion, case study exercise and an interview.

26. For the BA course the university also supplied narrative evidence that reported that applicants were required to complete the online UCAS form to apply to the programme, and that it was necessary to engage with the university's internal interview booking processes to book an online interview requiring applicants to demonstrate suitable ICT skills. For the apprenticeship the university also supplied an Admissions Process Map which detailed the application, suitability and assessment steps, and where the responsibility lay for these steps between the university and the Employer.

27. Through discussions with staff involved in admission and selection the inspection team heard that the university works closely with employer partners and other stakeholders. They discussed supporting employer partners with the initial sift of applications for the apprenticeship as well as providing staff to deliver information sessions to potential applicants. The inspection team were keen to better understand the make-up of the interview panels as they noted that there was some evidence that a member of the Lived Experience Group (LEG) had not sat on the apprenticeship interview panels and it was explained that in the most recent round of interviews the lead for the Social Work Academy at Hull City Council had sat on the interview panel as both employer representative, and as a person with lived experience of social work in her capacity as a carer. However, it was confirmed that going forward a person with lived experience, either from the university or council LEG group, would be on the interview panel for apprentices. The students met by the inspection team, who were interviewed outside of Covid-19 pandemic regulations, reported an interview experience that included a variety of assessed activities.

28. The inspection team were concerned that there was evidence of significant attrition from the BA course (7 withdrawals and 2 suspensions) and queried with the staff involved in recruitment and selection if, and how, any learning from this had been applied to the admissions process. The staff reported that, as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic practices the university had made a shift to a less involved admissions process whereby the standard was to recruit remotely. The course team noted that the students who had exited the programme were recruited under these circumstances, and that, since then, the selection day had been reinstated. Through discussion with the course team the inspection team understood that, in the same year, there had been an increase in applications that was felt to be an unusual situation as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and had been noted as a trend across the university and not isolated to social work.

29. The inspection team concluded that they were reassured that there was a holistic assessment of applicants for entry to the programme and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.2

30. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed, for both programmes, the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership Admissions Pack submitted as evidence against this standard. The pack included details on the written exam undertaken by applicants during the selection day and provided the inspection team with the time parameters and sample questions, one of which was *what life experiences have encouraged you to train to become a social worker?* The Admissions Pack also contained the interview questions, one of which was *has any one person or life event motivated you to become a social worker?* and the interview panel marking sheet detailed the requirement that interviewers document how any relevant experience had been considered during decision making.

31. In addition, for the apprenticeship, the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IfATE) Social Worker standard, required that applicants completed a pre-programme Documented Discussion and Skills Scan which was based on the applicants' prior experiences. This provided an additional opportunity for apprentices to have their prior relevant experience considered as part of the admissions process.

32. Through discussion with the staff involved in admissions and selection, the inspection team heard that interview panel members were required to document and submit an assessment around candidate's response to questions relating to previous experiences. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

33. Documentary evidence supplied in support of this standard for both courses included the minutes of the Annual Social Work Recruitment Event which reported attendees from the university, LEG and practising social workers and recorded discussions relating to what

had gone well and what could be improved in the next cycle. An Admissions Action Plan summary and LEG Meeting minutes discussing Equality and Diversity Training for those involved in admission activities were also submitted, and, the mapping document detailed that each admission stage was marked by a different group of stakeholders.

34. Through discussions with employer partners the inspection team heard that they were involved in the admissions processes for both courses including scoring the group discussion, sitting on interview panels and in the preparation of interview questions. Similarly, members of the LEG group reported that they were involved in all aspects of the admissions process for the BA programme, including sitting on interview panels, leading on the case scenario on the selection day, developing interview questions and providing feedback on candidates. It was clear that LEG group members felt they were a valued part of the interview team for the BA, however, reported that they were not involved in apprenticeship admissions processes at the time of inspection.

35. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met for the BA course however, following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against 1.3 in relation to the reapproval of the apprenticeship. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the apprenticeship would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the apprenticeship would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 1.4

36. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection for the BA course included the *Suitability for Social Work: Self Declaration* form which applicants were required to complete following interview and covered historic events that may impact their ability to undertake an offer as well as any lived experiences of social work. The university also submitted an *Occupational Health Screening Questionnaire* which was completed after the applicant accepted an offer alongside the Enhanced Disclosure and Barring (DBS) screening and the Support and Suitability Panel: *Terms of Reference* and *Standard Operating Procedure* that detailed the process undertaken if a student made a declaration, or if matters arose from the enhanced DBS report on both courses.

37. Documentary evidence submitted for the apprenticeship included a link to the Social Work Apprenticeship web page, and a link to the university *Application for Admissions to an Apprenticeship Programme* form which included an initial disclosure for criminal convictions. In addition, applicants were required to complete the *Suitability for Social Work: Self Declaration* form. As with the BA course, once an offer had been accepted

apprentices were required to complete the Enhanced Disclosure and Barring (DBS) screening and the *Occupational Health Screening Questionnaire*.

38. Through discussion the inspection team heard from the staff involved in admissions and selection that if an applicant makes a declaration, or an entry is returned on the DBS, the admission lead would undertake the initial review and contact the applicant for more details. If appropriate, it would be discussed with the chair of the Support and Suitability Panel who would seek candidates consent to corroborate information with relevant third parties. The suitability panel consisted of the programme director, admissions lead, a representative from central university services and a partner representative from a local employer. The course team explained that practice representatives are usually senior managers and can be sourced from either the statutory or PVI sector. The Support and Suitability Panel was held at least once per month, however, during August and September additional panels were scheduled to support the increase in admissions activity to support timely outcomes for applicants. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met for both programmes.

Standard 1.5

39. The inspection team were provided with the university's *Inclusive Education Framework*, the university's *Diversity and Inclusion Policy*, a university handout entitled *Designing for Diverse Learners* and a link to the University Code of Practice on *Equal Opportunities: Admissions of Students*. The inspection team noted that the university's *Diversity and Inclusion Policy* was dated 2016/2017, and that, it was reported by the course team on the evidence mapping document as under review.

40. A list of the university mandatory e-learning and the associated schedule was also provided, which detailed equality and diversity awareness training was required every 3 years. The narrative submitted by the course team in advance of the inspection detailed that the LEG members involved in admission were required to complete the mandatory Equality and Inclusion e-learning package before being involved in interview panels. Through discussion with people with lived experience, and staff involved in admissions and selection, the inspection team heard confirmation that interview panel members were required to have completed the mandatory training in GDPR, EDI and Fire Safety in order to undertake responsibilities on an interview panel.

41. In advance of the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the test booklet used for the admissions exam and acknowledged that it included a self-declaration on the front cover that invited applicants to report if they had a specific learning difference with space to provide details. In addition, the information provided in the mapping document detailed examples of the types of reasonable adjustments made to the admission process including providing transcripts for the group discussion video, additional time for the exam, providing print materials in different formats, providing sign language interpreters and the use of

computer equipment to complete the exam. Furthermore, during the inspection, the inspection team heard from staff involved in admissions and selection that reasonable adjustments for candidates were accommodated and examples were provided. The inspection team acknowledged that although staff involved in admissions and selection appeared to be mindful of EDI, and could articulate the processes, and the types of support and adjustment available to applicants, the institutional EDI policy was out of date, and it was unclear to inspectors when the new policy would be implemented. The inspection team reported that as the EDI policy predated a number of changes in legislation and guidance they were unable to be confident on the currency of the internal training provided.

42. The inspection team noted that interviews were pass or fail and were keen to understand how the course team understood this system to align with principles of inclusivity. The course team explained that the department had used scoring systems in the past and had found them unsatisfactory. The move to pass / fail emerged from the LEG group and had been trialled in the current cycle and would be reviewed before the following intake. The inspection team further queried how an applicant who may not have access to technology, or the internet, could be supported to apply. The inspection team heard from staff involved in selection and admissions that all applications are received online and that staff would provide advice and support, including on open days, or during clearing calls, to complete the necessary forms. However, the process did rely on applicants being able to access subsequent emails.

43. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition and a recommendation is set against 1.5 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [Conditions](#) and [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 1.6

44. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included a link to the BA (Hons) Social Work course page that provided detail about the course structure, entry requirements, placement opportunities and linked to the research interests of staff and graduate future prospects. Additionally, the university submitted an open day presentation, dated 2023, which included slides on course structure and an introduction to Social Work England requirements and suitability for social work including a statement explaining that *'having a criminal conviction and / or disability is not necessarily a bar to entry onto the course'*. A further presentation was provided from the Selection Day that covered an

introduction to Social Work England, information on fees, loans and grants, placements and what to expect following the selection day process.

45. A link was also provided to the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship page that provided information about the course structure, entry requirements, brief information about future prospects and some information about fees and funding. The university noted within the evidence mapping documentation that apprentices were provided with employer communications which enabled them to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place and that offer holders were invited to a pre-induction day where applicants were provided with information about the programme and that event details are included within the applicant's PebblePad. However, through discussions with students the inspection team heard that the apprentices received the timetable quite late in the admissions process, which made organising other priorities difficult.

46. As previously reported, the inspection team noted that there had been some significant attrition from the programme (c.f. [para 28](#)) and in addition to the increase in applications and the change to interview processes, the course team further explained that the students within that cohort entered the programme with less experience and as a result commenced the programme without a clear sense of the role of the social worker. The inspection team were keen to better understand if students felt that they had received enough information to make an informed decision and raised this as a discussion point with students. The inspectors heard from students that they felt that they were given a large amount of information at the open day, that the selection day provided them with an insight into the intensity of the programme and that they were given time to ask questions. The apprentices further noted that they were additionally provided with information from their employers. The inspection team considered the evidence and concluded that students were provided with enough information to make an informed choice and that there was an annual process to review admissions where any issues could be considered.

47. However, the webpage for the BA course noted that the course was accredited by Social Work England which was reported as being incorrect terminology, as the regulator *approved* and did not *accredit* programmes. Additionally, the webpage for the apprenticeship stated that the course would make a student '*eligible to register with Social Work England*' and the correct phrasing was '*eligible to apply to register with Social Work England*'. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition, and a recommendation, is set against Standard 1.6 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition and recommendation, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [Conditions](#) and [recommendations sections](#) of this report.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

48. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard for the BA course included the BA / MA Placement Handbook which outlined the distribution of placement days as 70 days for the first placement, 100 days for the second placement and 30 practice skills days. The university also supplied the Last Placement Application form, a redacted Statutory Placement Audit Form, an Anonymous Placement Learning Agreement and the *Becoming a Professional* Teaching Session Plan showing the 12 skills days in this module. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard for the apprenticeship included the SWA Handbook for Assessed Practice 1 and 2 which outlined the distribution of placement days as 100 days for the first placement, 80 days for the second placement, and 20 skills days. Both handbooks made reference to the Social Work England standards detailing that placements would take place in contrasting settings, that a minimum of one placement would be within a statutory setting and that students must seek consent from people with lived experience where students would be involved in their care.

49. Through discussions with the course team the inspection team heard that skills days were weighted towards the beginning of the programme and that attendance was mandatory and monitored through the university standard card swipe attendance system, SEATS, for both programmes of study. Skills day absences had to be made up through a written piece of work. The students reported that they understood which days were skills days, and discussed having this communicated via email, Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) announcements and notifications during lessons.

50. No students who attended the meeting with inspectors had undertaken two placements so they were unable to comment on whether placements had been contrasting. The staff involved in practice learning noted that they explain to students that they will undertake contrasting placements during their readiness to practice days and confirmed that apprentices would not complete the placement application form as the local authority assign the placements for apprentices. During the inspection the university provided a redacted document demonstrating that the Level 6 students on the BA course had undertaken contrasting placements.

51. The inspection team were keen to better understand what the contributing factors were to the apprenticeship placement being longer at Level 5 and shorter at Level 6. The inspectors heard from staff involved in practice learning that the rationale was to have a shorter placement in the final year, allowing apprentices to move more swiftly into practice, and that the longer placement in Year 2 meant that students were better embedded into the organisation earlier. The inspection team further queried whether learners were able to fulfil the final year PCFs in 80 days. Employer partners reported that students undertook complexity of work in both placements and the inspection team did not receive, or hear, any

evidence that suggested learners did not meet the requirements at the end of the second placement. The inspection team agreed that this standard is met with a recommendation. Full details of the recommendations can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 2.2

52. Evidence submitted in support of this standard for both courses included a redacted Statutory Placement Audit Form, an anonymised Learning Agreement and a role descriptor for the link lecturer which the course provider reported was responsible for acting as a bridge between placement and the university for both students and practice educators. In addition, for the apprenticeship, the university also supplied an anonymised interim review.

53. Throughout the inspection stakeholders discussed a range of available placements and the mechanisms within which students were supported, learning opportunities were identified and progress was recorded. During the inspection, the inspection team were given a demonstration of the PebblePad system where students and practice educators could report on placement learning. Apprentices undertook quarterly meetings to review individual learning plans and record progress towards the Professional Capabilities Framework (the PCFs). Practice experiences on both courses were considered to be satisfactory.

54. Through discussions with the practice educators the inspection team heard that students had a good theoretical knowledge, and, that they used the PCFs to structure support meetings and were mindful of ensuring that experiences for students on placement were safe and appropriate. The employer partners reported putting 'student needs before organisational needs' when considering placement opportunities and apprentices were able to raise issues within the organisation if they felt the placement allocation wasn't right for them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.3

55. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the presentation given to students to introduce the last placement entitled the *BA Last Placement Induction* and the BA / MA Placement Handbook. Similarly, for the apprenticeship, the university submitted the SWA Handbook for Assessed Practice which provided student facing information on placement induction, supervision, the learning agreement and the roles and responsibilities of the practice educator which included ensuring that the induction to placement took place.

56. For both programmes the team submitted an anonymised Learning Agreement which detailed the supervision arrangements and expectations, a redacted placement audit form and a Health, Safety and Agency Policies / Procedures Checklist detailing the placement

organisation's internal policies and processes that should be covered in the student induction to placement.

57. Through discussion with staff involved in practice-based learning, the inspection team heard that the induction to placement for the BA course and the apprenticeship were the same and recorded as part of the health and safety checklist on PebblePad. Employer partners confirmed that they were aware of the health and safety checklist and explained that, for apprentices, they tailor the induction to the experience the student has had in their existing team. Although apprentices were unlikely to do the full corporate induction that a BA course student may do, employer partners were keen to ensure apprentices had a fair opportunity to be inducted into their placement team.

58. Students discussed having good inductions onto placement highlighting multi-day inductions that covered a number of topics. The inspection team felt that the university relied heavily on the local authority induction procedures and that some oversight of induction could be useful for the course team.

59. The inspection team were keen to understand how students were supported with reasonable adjustments whilst on placement and staff involved in practice-based learning reported that the link lecturer was key to ensuring students had a positive experience. The course team described a number of examples of reasonable adjustments provided on placement including, for example, steps taken to support students suffering with anxiety and those on an intercalated year following ill health.

60. Employer partners reported that they had a good relationship with the link lecturers at the university and discussed working well together to ensure reasonable adjustments. However, they noted that, where students suffered ill health whilst studying, the employer was required to raise a cause for concern with the university which, in their experience caused anxiety for the students. The employer partners were clear that the process was helpful, however the language of raising a 'cause for concern' under these circumstances did not feel as supportive as it could be.

61. The inspection team noted that the university had a number of roles involved in providing support to students and asked the staff involved in practice-based learning to give a clear explanation of each role. Staff reported that practice educators with the first line of support and assessor. They could be on site or off site, and, where the practice educator was off site students were allocated an onsite named supervisor. In this situation students would alternate supervision between their onsite supervisor and the practice educator. In addition to the practice educator the university also had link lecturers and personal supervisors. Link lecturers provided a link between the placement provider the university and the student and personal supervisors were first line pastoral support. It was clear from discussions with all stakeholders that students were supported on placement, and practice

educators shared examples of supporting students when the work was emotive or upsetting.

62. Students reported a mix of experiences of supervision whilst on placement. The inspection team heard examples where placement supervision was good and practice educators were described by students as 'excellent'. However, they also heard that some students reported receiving no supervision and that they had to raise this with the employer partner to resolve themselves. In addition, the inspection team also heard that some Year 1 apprentices had experienced some difficulty with consistency of their workplace mentors with one learner reporting that they had received more than one change of mentor in the first year. Having considered the evidence the inspection team concluded that this standard was met with three recommendations. Full details of the recommendations can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

Standard 2.4

63. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included a presentation given to students during induction that covered information on registration with Social Work England. Also presented was an example of a student profile, an interim review, a placement learning agreement that included an outline of student learning and the placement learning outcomes and an anonymous *Student Summary of Reflective Learning* where concerns could be raised. The university also provided, for the BA course, the skills day plan from the module *Becoming a Professional*, a *Last Placement Application* form and noted within the mapping document that monitoring occurred within direct observation, interim review and in the final report. In support of the apprenticeship programme the university also submitted a direct observation form.

64. Through discussion with practice educators the inspection team heard that providing students with safe and appropriate learning opportunities was a key focus for them. Those working in the PVI sector discussed being mindful of ensuring that they could provide experiences at the right level for students who were already knowledgeable and skilled from previous roles. They undertook a number of pre-meetings with the university to ensure that they were the right placement environment for the students they accepted. Nevertheless, practice educators acknowledged that they worked in unpredictable circumstances and provided an example of a home visit, that had been pre-assessed at an appropriate level for an accompanying student, which turned into a Section 47 situation involving the police. They noted that part of their role was to provide appropriate support to students in such a changing environment.

65. The inspection team were keen to better understand how the university ensured that placements for the apprenticeship programme provided learning opportunities that were appropriate for the stage of education and training of the apprentice as the placements were organised and allocated by the local authority. They heard, through discussions with

the course team, that the Social Work Academy at the partner employer had a placement form which helped to inform the discussion with apprentices about their placement learning opportunities. The course team acknowledged that the Social Work Academy supported children and young people's services, and as a result, for adult focussed apprentices, the link lecturer was involved in discussing placements with the principal social worker through a monthly meeting.

66. Throughout the inspection, the inspection team heard from stakeholders that placements were quality managed via the placement audit form, the practice learning agreement and the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) process and noted that there was a Quality Assurance Panel for the end of placement reports. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

67. Documentary evidence supplied against this standard for the BA included the BA / Handbook which indicated that the placement requirements were that students must, hold a satisfactory DBS certificate, have passed the Readiness for Practice Panel Interview and the written task, have successfully completed all Level 4 modules and have met their personal supervisor on at least two occasions. No evidence was received in advance of the inspection that demonstrated that student readiness for practice was assessed within the apprenticeship programme.

68. Through discussions with students the inspection team heard that, students on the BA course had felt that the student experience was not included in the readiness to practice preparation module. They further explained that, as undertaking placements was a challenging and anxious time for students, they suggested they could give a presentation to the current Year 1s, an idea that had been welcomed by course staff. This presentation had been delivered by student representatives the week prior to inspection. The inspection agreed that this standard had been met for the BA course.

69. The inspection team queried how readiness for practice was assessed on the apprenticeship and through discussions with the course team heard that readiness for practice was continuously monitored, but not assessed. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 2.5 in relation to the reapproval of the apprenticeship. Consideration was given as to whether the finding identified would mean that the apprenticeship would not be suitable for approval. However, it is deemed that a condition is appropriate to ensure that the apprenticeship would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the apprenticeship would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 2.6

70. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the BA / MA Placement Handbook for the BA course and the SWA Handbook for Assessed Practice 1 and 2 for the apprenticeship programme, both of which detailed that the university would ensure that practice educators had the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experiences to support safe and effective learning.

71. Through discussion with the practice educators the inspection team heard that they were not clear on when or where the university asked for, or corroborated, their registration numbers, qualifications, or currency, with many of them describing 'assuming' it was communicated via their employer, or the link lecturer. It was noted by practice educators that once they accepted a student, the application form requested registration information and the course team confirmed that this was checked by the link lecturer. However, the inspection team did not see, or receive, any evidence of an audit, policy or process to ensure that checking, or other oversight of practice educator qualifications or currency, occurred consistently.

72. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 2.6 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 2.7

73. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the BA / MA Handbook and the SWA Handbook for Assessed Practice, both of which included a section entitled *Dealing with Placement Difficulties and Concerns Resolution*. The university also supplied a link to the University of Hull *Whistleblowing procedures* however, the link directed the inspection team to a retired page. During the inspection the university provided the inspection team with a copy of the university's *Policy and Procedure on Disclosures in the Public Interest (Whistle-blowing)*.

74. The inspection team noted that the practice learning handbooks, for both programmes, provided student facing information on whistleblowing that detailed how students would be supported by the university in the event that they need to blow the whistle, and who to contact in the first instance. The students that the inspection team met were very clear about what to do should they have a concern naming a range of support such as their personal tutor, a module leader, the Social Work Academy or their practice educator. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

75. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection for both courses included a visual representation of the committee structure, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work Governance Chart, the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference, the Education Committee Terms of Reference, a link to the university's Quality and Standards regulations, the Professional Lead Social Work role description, the programme director role descriptor and a link to the university's Code of Practice for the *Continual Monitoring Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) Journal*.

76. In addition, for the BA course, the university also submitted the programme CMEE journal. For the apprenticeship the university also submitted a diagram of the Governance Structure for the apprenticeship, the Apprenticeship Governance Board Terms of Reference, university Apprenticeship Quality and Compliance Committee Terms of Reference, a document detailing the *Senior Leadership Expectations for Apprenticeship Programmes*, the Apprenticeship Programme Director role descriptor and the courses CMEE journal.

77. The inspection team were unable to ascertain a clear understanding of the governance and management structures from the evidence and asked a series of questions about the course governance structure throughout the inspection. Through discussions with the course team and the senior leadership team, the inspection team heard that the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee met four times per year and included Faculty Programme Directors, the Senior Leadership team, a university library representative and a university quality representative. In addition, staff outlined the university processes for curriculum development and a programme director forum which met monthly to discuss live issues however, acknowledged that this did not feed into the wider governance of programmes, or to the institutional committee structure.

78. In addition, the faculty had recognised that the committee reporting line for student feedback up to institutional level committees had not been as robust as it could have been. As a result, a student voice item had been added to the faculty leadership meeting, however this had yet to be implemented at the time of inspection. The Senior Leadership Team also reported that annual programme review had been halted due to the Covid-19 pandemic and that this would be reinstated in the current academic year.

79. The inspection team reported that it was difficult to triangulate evidence of the governance structure and it was unclear to them how course related issues and quality assurance functions fed into the wider university committee structure. They further noted that they had little understanding of which staff were involved in which committees, what the responsibility of the committee or meeting was, and how often meetings were held. Moreover, inspectors felt that the evidence heard during the inspection did not correlate with the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection.

80. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.1 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.2

81. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the Link Lecturer role descriptor, a link to the university's regulation on *The Investigation and Determination of Concerns about Fitness to Practice* and a link to the university's code of practice for *Academic Appeal*. In addition, for the BA course, the university also supplied the learning agreement, the Health and Safety Checklist, a redacted statutory placement audit form, the BA / MA Placement Handbook and the induction presentation given to Practice Educators and Online Supervisors dated 2023 which signposted the concern processes. For the apprenticeship programme, a template for the apprenticeship agreement, an apprenticeship training plan, a placement learning agreement, a link to the government information on ESFA: funding rules, rates and formula, the SWA Handbook for Assessed Practice and an anonymous Practice Educator Assessment Report was also supplied. However, the inspection team reflected that they did not receive any formal, written agreements that the university has with placement partners required by the standard.

82. Through discussions with staff involved in practice-based learning, the employer partners, practice educators and students, the inspection team heard that, in the event of a placement breakdown, there was a three-step concerns resolution process in place to manage concerns dependant on severity. Practice educators reported being aware of the university concerns resolution process which they described as supportive. Moreover, they noted that the link lecturer details were provided in the PebblePad and that the concerns resolution process was available in the practice educator handbook. Students reported that in the event of a placement breakdown they had a number of avenues of support, including staff at the university, their practice educator or the Social Work Academy within the local authority. Students also discussed the responsiveness of the academic staff noting that lecturers were clear regarding their availability and working days and that they replied to email usually within 24 hours.

83. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.2 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident

that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.3

84. Evidence submitted in support of this standard for both courses included a link to the university code of practice for *Assessment Procedures*, the Social Work Support and Suitability Panel Terms of reference, the university's *Student Pregnancy and New Parent Policy*, the template of the *Pregnancy Support Plan* that included a section on students on placement and an anonymous Health and Safety checklist. For the BA course, in addition, the university supplied, the BA / MA Placement Handbook which detailed the no fault interruptions to placement process and for the apprenticeship the university also supplied, the SWA admission process map.

85. The inspection team heard, through discussion with staff involved in placement learning that the university undertook a number of checks on placement providers to ensure that they were suitable to provide placements including the new placement audit. The Health and Safety checklist provided a record that each student had been provided with organisational policies in relation to student's health, wellbeing and risk (including lone working and working with difficult behaviour). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

86. Through discussions with the course team, and employer partners, the inspection team heard that employers were involved in reviewing admissions processes, trimester reviews of the programme and the Placement Quality Assurance Panel (PQAP) where placement portfolios were considered following purposeful sampling (all first-time practice educators and a cross section of portfolios). It was noted by employer partners that a university representative sits on the teaching partnership groups and that they were involved in practitioner teaching and had received train the trainer sessions to help with this. Employers also highlighted being involved in careers events and fitness to practice panels.

87. For the apprenticeship, the course team noted that they worked with employers across the recruitment and selection cycle as the employer and university admissions processes dovetailed. In addition, employers were involved in the tripartite meetings for students and were invited to consult on the curriculum development which was being undertaken at the time of the inspection.

88. The inspection team noted that there was a variety of ways in which employers were involved with the courses of study. They acknowledged that the university was part of the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership alongside eight employer partners and one other

university, however, remained unclear how employers could feedback on institutional processes in a formalised way.

89. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against Standard 3.4 in relation to the reapproval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the findings 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, and we are confident that once these standards are met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the conditions, the monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.5

90. Documentary evidence reviewed in advance of the inspection included a link to the university's code of practice on *Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement* (CMEE) of taught programmes, a link to the university's code of practice on *External Examining*, document entitled *Ten Top Tips: Important things Student Social Workers should bear in mind when carrying out their supportive practice*, a set of minutes from the business team meeting dated 2022, the Faculty's Service user and Carer Co-production Strategy for Teaching and Learning (2020 – 2025) and the university's *Diversity and Inclusion policy*. In addition, the university also submitted the CMEE journal for the BA course and the CMEE journal and a link to the government webpage on the *Learner and employer satisfaction survey* for the apprenticeship.

91. Throughout the inspection stakeholders discussed quality assurance processes in relation to placement learning that demonstrated that there were mechanisms in place to govern the practice elements of the programme. Key processes included the placement audit form, the QAPL and the placement Quality Assurance Panel which included practitioners. However, the inspection team were unable to ascertain a strong sense of governance from other areas of the programme. It was clear that all stakeholder groups felt valued and felt that they could provide feedback and instigate change. In each stakeholder group there were clear examples of engagement and co- production (c.f. [para 34](#), [68](#) and [125](#)) however, this did not seem to occur within a regular, consistent or formally recorded manner.

92. The inspection team heard from course staff that external examiner reports were considered at a modular level. However, it was unclear which governance process ensured that external feedback was considered holistically across a programme. Moreover, the CMEE journals considered by the inspection team appeared to have incomplete action dates and although the inspection team acknowledged that trimester and annual reviews would be reinstated (c.f. [para 124](#)) there was no indication when this would occur.

93. The inspection team did acknowledge that work to map the apprenticeship End Point Assessment (EPA) was ongoing and that a review meeting of the apprenticeship had taken place. However, it was noted that it was unclear from the minutes how actions had been assigned or what the timeframes were for completion. In addition, the inspection team were unable to tell from the minutes which documents, data or other information had been reviewed, and there did not appear to have been any people with lived experience or students present at the review.

94. The inspection team felt that the lack of a strong governance structure was evident in the paperwork submitted and highlighted that they had received module specifications with out-of-date assessments detailed within them, and that the programme specification document was out of date (c.f. [paras 119, 120](#) and [170](#)).

95. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.5 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.6

96. The inspection team reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding from the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership, the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership Workforce Labour Market Plan, a leaflet for the Social Work Academy #seeyourfuture campaign which targeted 16 – 19 year-olds for recruitment into a career as a social worker, a development plan and a post event report for the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership.

97. The staff involved in admissions and selection reported that application numbers had been low across the university, and that the region was experiencing a shortage in Social Workers. They further explained that, to address this, there was an ongoing programme of outreach activities within local schools and 6th form colleges. The university had been trialling some Masterclasses as part of a campaign to attract 16 – 19 year-olds to the profession and that the apprenticeship supported the 'the grow your own' approach to workforce development.

98. Staff reported that the admissions strategy was linked to the number of quality placements they could offer. It was highlighted that the course team specialisms in domestic abuse, and in loss and dying made placements in some key providers popular with students and the inspection team received no evidence that placement availability was an issue. Placement staff reported that providers were willing to accommodate, and match,

placements to student interest and that, they had more offers of statutory placements than they required at the point of inspection. However, the inspection team noted that, as the course team acted as the practice educators for the apprenticeship, the number of learners that could be admitted was limited by the availability of academic staff to undertake the practice educator role.

99. The inspection team noted that the reapproval included an increase to student numbers however, they were unclear how these numbers were developed as the workforce labour plan was not specific to the university, did not indicate other resulting practicalities, for example the volume of practice educators required and the course team reported that they were already stretched with the current apprenticeship numbers (c.f. [para 116](#)).

100. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.6 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.7

101. The evidence provided to support this standard included a mini-CV for the lead social worker, which detailed relevant qualifications and experience. The inspection team noted that the lead social worker was the same for both courses, that the register had been checked, and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

102. Documentary evidence submitted in support of this standard included mini-CVs for each academic staff member, the programme director role descriptor, a presentation on academic misconduct, placement lead role descriptor, link lecturer role descriptor, an overview of the teaching partnership and a document on academic workload planning.

103. Through discussions with the senior leadership team, the inspection team heard that staff numbers were reviewed annually, and that social work had the lowest Staff Student Ratio (SSR) within the faculty (1:16). Additionally it was noted that the Senior Leadership Team recognised the demands of the apprenticeship and that they were aware that should apprenticeship numbers increase, staff numbers would need to be reviewed.

104. The inspection team asked a series of questions around the workforce plan for social work to better understand how the faculty planned for staff absences, or other gaps. The Senior Leadership team noted that there had been some staff turnover, and that, succession

planning had historically been reactive. However, they were working towards a stronger model where single points of failure would be minimised by ensuring that early career staff were supported to develop a wider understanding of the leadership roles within the team.

105. The inspection team noted from the documentary evidence that students had felt that there was a bias towards supporting children and families on the BA course and were keen to explore whether the course team had recognised this. The inspection team heard that the course team had taken steps to rebalance the content of the Readiness to Practice module including the introduction of an *All About Adults* day. There was some heard evidence that the team felt that they were not strong in the area of adult safeguarding however, it was acknowledged that a new colleague was now in post and was working on developing the adult focus across the course.

106. The documentation submitted prior to inspection detailed that there were 13 members of academic staff (FTE equivalent) supporting the BA course and 16 members of academic staff (FTE equivalent) supporting the apprenticeship and the inspection team were keen to better understand how staff were distributed across the two programmes. The Senior Leadership team explained that staff were allocated by expertise rather than by programme. For example, mental health was taught by the same member of academic staff across the complete portfolio of taught programmes.

107. The inspection team noted that the reported SSR was satisfactory for the student numbers at the time of the inspection and that staff were appropriately qualified. However, concluded that without a clear strategy for the development of student numbers it was not possible as part of this inspection to consider the potential for a student number increase. Moreover, the inspection team noted that it was unclear in which forum staff numbers were considered on an annual basis, and where that sat within the course, faculty or institutional governance structures.

108. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that two conditions are set against Standard 3.8 in relation to the reapproval of both courses. Consideration was given as to whether the findings 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.9

109. The inspection team reviewed the CMEE journal for each programme which was understood to be the mechanism through which a range of module, programme and faculty level data was considered. The university also submitted a module review guidance

document developed for the CMEE journal, the university's *Access and Participation Plan 20/21 – 24/25*, an *Assessment, Teaching and Learning Strategy for each course*, a link to the university's *Data Protection Policy*, a link to HESA's data protection policy, a training presentation on the Hull University Management Information Database (HUMID) and Data Access in relation to the CMEE journal, the university's *Inclusive Education Framework* and for the apprenticeship the university also supplied notes from a Social Work Apprenticeship Student Consultation held in 2022 for the transforming programmes initiative.

110. Through discussion with the Senior Leadership team the inspection team heard that the central institutional ED&I governance structure had changed and that, at the time of inspection, attainment data was collected separately to EDI data. There was an acknowledgement that the information provided by the centre in this area needed development and that moving forward the central services were confident that they would have stronger datasets they could draw upon. The central services also reported that previously there had been a gap in the integrity of the EDI data and that work has been undertaken to improve participation by ensuring that students felt confident to declare protected characteristics.

111. The course team reported that the programme director was responsible for completing the CMEE journal using data that could be taken from HUMID. The training presentation provided in evidence noted that *'it is essential that programme directors exercise ownership of CMEE journals; that they proactively seek relevant data; and that they engage in a constructive way with the colleagues who deliver the modules from which the programme is built, with the students who follow the programme, and with relevant services and directorates of the wider University community'*. The inspection team were unable to identify at what point in the year this activity was undertaken or which forums, or committees, fed into, or reviewed, the CMEE journal, or how this fed into the wider governance structures within the faculty and institution.

112. The course team discussed several activities that had been undertaken to decrease awarding gaps for global majority students, including the development and use of a toolkit for module leaders to examine their own modules and identification of a new role to undertake external engagement in underrepresented communities. However, it was not clear to the inspection team that the university had a clear sense of what the awarding gaps were, whether that was supported by any data, or that initiatives had a clear goal or timeframe.

113. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.9 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required.

Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 3.10

114. The inspection team reviewed the mini-CVs, the Social Work Publications and Research document and a brochure for the CPD opportunities offered by the university to social work practitioners provided as evidence in support of this standard.

115. Through discussion with the senior leadership team, the inspection team heard that, due to a new course leadership team, there was to be a focus on leadership training. A number of staff members had undertaken the AdvanceHE Aurora programme and new academics were being supported to undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (the PGCap) leading to Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (FHEA). The practice educators reported being aware of the brochure for CPD opportunities and noted that the university provided a number of ways for practitioners to maintain their CPD, including attending portfolio reading, or being involved in academic delivery.

116. The senior leadership team reported that staff had an allocated amount of time for CPD within the workload model. However, the inspection team heard from the course team that that they understood that there was a protected amount of time within the workload model, but they were unable to verify as they had never seen their own workload models. They reported that CPD was not discussed in appraisals and that they maintained their professional registration by undertaking CPD activities within their own time. Staff noted that historically time was created for staff development, and CPD activities, however, a marked transformation had occurred with the start of the apprenticeship programme which staff described as a very labour-intensive mode of delivery.

117. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 3.10 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

118. Documentary evidence submitted to support this standard included the programme specification documents (PSDs) for both courses, the BA / MA Placement Handbook and a student facing document explaining the Professional Learning Teams. As part of a second

submission of evidence the university also provided all module outlines for each programme.

119. The PSDs for both courses clearly showed all modules were non-condonable and non-compensatable, ensuring that, all modules had to be passed in good standing to achieve either the BA (Hons) Social Work qualifying degree or the integrated apprenticeship. However, the PSDs looked to be mapped to out of date frameworks using the QAA Benchmark Statement for Social Work (2016) which was replaced in 2019 and referenced the 2019 Social Work England Education and Training standards which were replaced in 2021.

120. The BA course was clearly mapped to the Social Work England Professional Standards within the PSD at the modular level demonstrating that regardless of the combination of Level 6 optional modules students chose, they would fulfil all professional standards. However, the apprenticeship PSD did not include a similar appendix. A further anomaly was identified in the module assessment for *Social Work with Children and Families* as the module descriptor detailed an assessment of a 3,000 word essay and a role play. The course team presented a creative assessment for this module requiring students to develop a direct work tool that captured the voice of children in safeguarding cases. Through discussion with the course team it became clear that the essay and role play assessment combination had not been used for some time in this module.

121. Through discussions with employer partners the inspection team heard that they felt that students were of a high standard, that they progressed in line with the professional standards and that they did not have any concerns employing graduates of these programmes.

122. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that one condition set against Standard 4.1 in relation to the reapproval of both courses and one condition is set against Standard 4.1 in relation to reapproval of the apprenticeship. 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.2

123. The *Keep Calm and Become a Professional* day presentation submitted prior to the inspection provided an example of key stakeholder involvement in teaching and learning activities on the BA course clearly including a member of the university LEG group and had two practitioners from different services in attendance. The Readiness for Practice

Interview Document dated 2023 contained a description of the interview panel consisting of an academic staff member, a member of the LEG group and a Social Work Practitioner.

124. Social work practitioners acted as partners in the Professional Learning Team activities, and, the Development Plan detailed an action point to reinstate multi-stakeholder annual review boards in the academic year 2022/23. The End Point Assessment, Independent Assessor Handbook detailed that people with lived experience could be involved as part of the panel and the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship Annual Review Online notes dated 2022 showed three redacted employer partner attendees, and one student attendee.

125. Through discussions with the course team, the inspection team heard that co-production was valued as part of curriculum development, with an example of the law module being updated following insight from a LEG member with experience of being supported by the Mental Health Act. Employer partners identified areas of the curriculum where they had provided feedback and seen resulting change within the programme and practice educators discussed providing feedback via the QAPL on Pebblepad, through monthly meetings with the Social Work academy or via the quarterly reviews for the apprenticeship programme.

126. The inspection team acknowledged that employers and people with lived experience had identified a number of informal methods of feedback, however they were keen to understand whether or not there were any formal methods in place. The course team explained consultations had been held for the transforming programmes process and that they engaged in ongoing dialogue with the teaching partnership, and with LEG members. The inspectors asked which stakeholders were involved in annual review and it was confirmed that the university do not undertake an annual review of programmes.

127. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 4.2 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 4.3

128. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university Diversity and Inclusion Policy (c.f. [para 39](#)), the university Education Strategy 2020 – 2025 that identified ‘to create a truly inclusive University’ was a strategic aim of the institution, a link to the university’s webpages on student support and the university’s Student Experience and

Success Strategy 2022 – 2027. Also included was evidence that the Institution is one of 60 HEI member organisations to have signed up to the national university Mental Health Charter. The Charter is funded by the Office for Students (OfS) and the UPP Foundation, supported by the National Union of Students (NUS), the Department for Education (DfE) and Universities UK (UUK) among others, and is endorsed by the British Psychological Society.

129. Through discussions with university pastoral support teams the inspection team heard that the central team delivered a variety of services (c.f. [paras 155 – 160](#)) that were adaptive and responsive to student wellbeing needs, for example, the service had made funding available to provide care packages to students during the cost of living crisis. Students reported positively on their experience with named personal supervisors and the inspection team heard an example of a supervisor supporting a student with a pastoral matter successfully and employer partners discussed being well supported by the university to provide reasonable adjustments while on placement (c.f. [para 59](#)). However, students reported that there were occasions when the agreed reasonable adjustments were not available for students who required them, they described it as ‘hit and miss’ as to whether equipment was available before the lecture started, and, handouts on coloured paper were not always available for the dyslexic students who needed them.

130. The inspection team reviewed the evidence and concluded that this standard was met as the courses had been developed with the principles of EDI and the feedback from stakeholders on supporting students with reasonable adjustments was generally positive.

Standard 4.4

131. Through review of the documentary evidence the inspection team considered the currency of the programme modules, including the reading lists. They were keen to better understand how the courses were reviewed and updated, with particular reference to reading lists as the external examiner had reported that reading lists were slim and that they needed to be updated on the VLE. The course team noted that there were a number of places where academics logged learning materials and individual lecturers were responsible for responding to external examiner feedback. The inspection team were provided with a demonstration of the VLE during the inspection. They were shown a collection of modules, with a focus on the module reading lists, and were satisfied with the level of learning resources supplied and their currency.

132. The inspection team were interested in whether or not students were considered to be up to date on law, research and evidence based practice and through discussions with employer partners and practice educators they heard that students had a good theoretical knowledge and were able to apply it when observing practice, and a general understanding of key legislation. The inspection team were satisfied with the evidence supplied relating to staff research activities and noted that the course team highlighted social work research as

a key component in the approach to embedding current evidence-led practice into the courses. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.5

133. As a secondary submission the university provided the module specification documents (MSDs) which the inspection team reviewed in advance of the inspection. Students on the BA course were introduced to the integration of theory and practice from the start of the programme in the Level 4 module *Social Work and Society* which had learning outcomes that covered '*demonstrat[ing] an initial understanding of key sociological concepts, theory and knowledge from sociology*' and '*describ[ing] the relevance of sociology to social work practice*'. Similarly students on the apprenticeship undertook the Level 4 module *Theoretical Models and Practical Applications* which included learning outcomes that covered '*describ[ing] key theories, methods and models of intervention and examine how they apply in practice*'.

134. The team also considered the programme specification for both courses and noted that 'centralising theory and practice connections throughout the programme' was a programme aim in both the BA course and in the apprenticeship.

135. Through discussions with stakeholders the inspection team heard that practice educators felt students started placement with a good general understanding of theory and some knowledge of key legislation. There was a suggestion from practice educators that students arrived at placement with some lack of knowledge around 'working together to safeguard children' and how this applies to practice and assessment. However, they also recognised that some students needed more support to link the theory to practice, and apply the lecture material and reported that they use theories as part of the supervision process. Students reported that they understood the integration of theory to practice as a self-led proactive activity, however, they felt supported by their practice educators, who brought their attention to theories over the course of supervision. The inspection team noted that students were required to complete ten reflective journals in the PebblePad and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

136. Evidence submitted in support of this standard for the BA course included an Inter-professional Learning Workshop schedule dated 2021 and a summary report of Interprofessional Schwartz Rounds with Healthcare Students taking place between 2019 – 2022 which were available to social work students. Schwartz Rounds are a structured forum where clinical and non-clinical staff can explore and discuss the social and emotional demands of working in healthcare. The inspection team noted that a member of the social work team was trained to lead Schwartz rounds and that social work students were registered as having attended two of the rounds. In addition, the Level 4 module *Social*

Work and the Law included an observational trip to criminal court. Court skills were further developed in Year 2 with a skills day designed around court craft facilitated by a CAFCASS Guardian and Barrister. At Level 6, the module *Domestic Abuse* includes a DASH risk assessment with input from specialist domestic violence practitioners and during the module *Loss, Dying and Bereavement* students are able to visit a hospice and learn more about the Palliative Care Social Work Team.

137. Similarly on the apprenticeship programme students undertake a visit to observe court during the Level 4 *Law, Social Policy and Society* module. Apprentices also undertook the Level 4 module *Interprofessional / Interagency Working*, where learners were required to identify agencies where they felt they had limited knowledge, or there were barriers to, interagency working, organise a visit and then submit reflections on what they had learned from the experience.

138. Through discussions with a variety of stakeholders the inspection team heard that students were able to recognise interprofessional learning within the programme and spoke positively about guest lecturers as well as specific module learning, highlighting a shared session held recently with education students. The course team explained that interdisciplinary working was a strand within the Faculty Strategic Plan and that they had recently piloted a session with a case study written by a social worker and a midwife for the students of those disciplines, and noted that during readiness for practice they held an interdisciplinary day with education students to consider a safeguarding case study regarding keeping children safe in education.

139. The inspection team acknowledged that the course team reported, both in the mapping documents, and within the development plan that they intended to develop further in this area and agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

140. The inspection team reviewed the programme specification documents and the university's procedure on the Academic Framework which confirmed an honours degree should be made up of 360 – 480 credits, of which, not fewer than 100 credits should be at FHEQ Level 6. The inspection team reported that there was a good balance of learning opportunities and the module specification documents were clear regarding nominal learning hours and credit values. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

141. Prior to inspection, the inspection team reviewed the university codes of practice on Modifications to Programmes of Study, Assessment Procedures, Requests for Extension and Additional Consideration, External Examining, Boards of Examiners, and Academic Appeals, regulation on Honours Degrees, policy on Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback (awaiting university Senate Approval but available at the time of inspection in a draft form),

and the university's Regulation and Procedures for the investigation and determination of complaints by students. The university also submitted an Assessment Strategy for each programme and for the BA Social Work, the Programme Handbook was also mapped to this standard.

142. Assessment was considered to be varied and through discussion with employer partners the inspection team heard that there were no concerns over employing graduates from the university, indicating that the assessment strategy ensured that graduates of the courses were suitable to enter the profession. The assessment strategy submitted was mapped to both courses and included an appendix mapping module learning outcomes to Social Work England Professional Standards for the BA course. However, a similar appendix was not included within the apprenticeship assessment strategy.

143. Students reported that they were generally satisfied with the spacing of assessment, however, highlighted a recent concern where there was some slight bunching and they were not provided with the assessment guidance in sufficient time to be able to manage their time effectively. The inspection team considered the evidence, and concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 4.9

144. The inspection team considered the university's code of practice on Assessment Procedures which required module leaders to appropriately map assessments, so that, students could benefit from feedback in subsequent assessments. Mapping was provided in the Assessment Strategies for each programme demonstrating that the assessments were appropriately matched to student progression through the courses. The inspection team concluded that the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection was able to demonstrate that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

145. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university's code of practice on Assessment Procedures, and, a link to the university's quality and standards guidance. The central quality support provided information which covered a number of regulatory topics that set out the institutions approach to assessment.

146. For the BA course the university also provided the external examiner report, dated 2022 noting that feedback was 'extremely good and detailed'. However, the examiner noted that there was some inconsistency with the use of the marking rubric. Through discussions with course staff, and as part of the demonstration of the VLE, the inspection team understood that the rubric had now been incorporated into all modules, and that it was to be made available to students, in advance of the assessment submission date, by September 2023. The university also provided the external examiner report for the

apprenticeship, dated 2022, where the external examiner similarly reported that markers provide 'good, detailed feedback.

147. Students reported that they receive their feedback within the published deadlines. They discussed assignment feedback positively specifically describing it as 'good' or 'fair' highlighting that it included points for development. Students also noted that they were aware some colleagues had contacted a lecturer when seeking advice for their grade, and, that they felt confident should they have questions the staff would be happy to book a 1-2-1 to discuss it with them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

148. The inspection team reviewed the staff mini-CVs, external examiner reports and the external examiner CVs. The inspection team noted that staff had appropriate expertise to undertake assessment for social work and that the external examiners were suitably qualified and on the register. The university code of practice on External Examining defined the roles and responsibilities for External Examiners, and the policy detailed that the appointment of an External Examiner must be approved by the university Education Committee (UEC) exercising powers from the university Senate. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.12

149. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the university's regulations on Honours Degrees which set out the institutional approach to the recording of module marks, progression, attainment and classification. The university used a sector standard student records management system to record, store and manage student progression data, including degree classifications and the inspection team confirmed with course staff that the data was available to personal supervisors if necessary.

150. The course PSDs, for both the BA and the apprenticeship, determined that the programme had the appropriate derogation from the regulations to prevent any automatic compensation or condonement within modules, or across the programmes (c.f. [para 119](#)). On placement, within the BA course, there were interim and final reviews where progression was monitored, and direct supervision of practice was satisfactory with a minimum of three direct observations taking place in the first placement, and four in the final placement. Apprentices also undertook interim and final reviews, however, were required to undertake a minimum of four direct observations of practice in each placement, with at least two of those observed by the practice educator.

151. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met for the BA course however, noted that as Readiness for Practice was considered a crucial progression point for students and was unassessed on the apprenticeship programme (c.f. [para 69](#)) the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 4.12 in relation to the reapproval of

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

Standard 4.13

152. The PSDs submitted in support of this standard included ‘developing independent critical thinkers with strong analytical and problem-solving skills’ as an aim of both courses which emerged in the BA course through the Level 4 module *Becoming a Research Minded Practitioner* and on the apprenticeship through the Level 6 module *Research and Practice*. Integration of theory and practice was embedded within the courses and support for these skills on placement was evident (c.f. [para 133-135](#)).

153. Through discussion with the course team, the inspection team heard, a number of examples where an evidence-informed approach was delivered within the curriculum, including within the Level 5, BA course, module *Social Work with Adults*, where students spent the first weeks of the modules exploring research and assessing the quality of it.

154. Throughout the inspection, the inspection team ascertained that research was a fundamental part of the culture within the team. During the demonstration they noted university academic staff research was included within module pages on the VLE and heard from students that staff used their own research within the classroom where it was relevant. They understood from the Senior Leadership team that staff could be engaged on a research trajectory which provided them with some dedicated time for research, and some of the course team confirmed that they had time protected for scholarly activity. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

155. The inspection team found that, throughout the inspection, student support was articulated clearly within the documentary evidence submitted prior to inspection and through discussions with stakeholders. Central wellbeing support services clearly reported on the forms of support on offer to students which included counselling (through a partner provider), occupational health and careers services. The university provided a staffed central student hub which acted as a ‘one stop shop’ to enable ease of access to the variety of support available.

156. The inspection team heard from pastoral and academic support staff that eight student support and administration services are available from the student hub. The pastoral

support team explained that the staff who were the first point of contact for students were trained to be able to identify where self-help strategies would be appropriate and where students should be referred into other services. It was made clear to inspectors that students were not turned away from the hub, they were either given support directly by the front desk support team, or they were booked into a specialist service and that first point of contact staff were given regular training on relevant skills, such as how to speak to students, and how to escalate student needs.

157. In addition to the first point of contact staff the mental health and wellbeing team provided a duty advisor to be available in the hub throughout the week. The role of the duty officer was to manage emerging incidents and provide support to students presenting in distress and they could be contacted by any staff member to undertake a risk assessment. Other mental health services available to students included supported short-term solution focussed interventions, as, most students who accessed services presented with context specific needs, for example feeling overwhelmed with study deadlines or anxiety around housing. They further noted that the service was represented on the relevant committees considering student appeals and concessions to the regulations. The mental health team also employed a number of registered social workers, who sat on the Support and Suitability Panel for social work students.

158. The central support services included a finance support team who administer a variety of grants, short term loans and other financial assistance. The support teams explained that they proactively look for students to offer this assistance to and that they support home, and international, students in financial need. In addition to the administration of funds, the financial assistance team also provided high street supermarket vouchers and physical care packages worth around £15.00 which included personal care items such as shampoo, soap and washing up liquid.

159. Services were available to students 24/7 via the Hull University and Health Assured Student Assistance programme (SAP) which was a confidential programme to support students experiencing personal challenges. It was available as a telephone helpline, or via an app which included live chat / instant messaging among other self-care features.

160. The Student Futures Service within the university provided careers support and noted that Social Work had a dedicated careers consultant to support Social Work students. Students were able to book 1-2-1 appointments, in person or virtually, and the appointment schedule ran until 6.30pm to offer flexibility to apprentices or students on placements. They also offered workshops that were careers and employability focussed and reported that they were a service for life, and alumni were able to come back to the service throughout their career for advice and support. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

161. The inspection team heard, through discussions with central wellbeing and academic support staff, that the student hub (c.f. [para 156](#)) also signposted to the Learning Support centre services including services provided to students with dyslexia and neurodivergence where students could be screened for Dyslexia and ADHD.

162. The university provided screening and a fully funded (free to students) Dyslexia diagnoses with an Educational Psychologist. Where screening results were borderline students were provided with support to explore the options available to them which included making use of institutional support structures, or, referral to the diagnostic service. Student Services staff held qualifications from the Association of Dyslexia Specialists in Higher Education (ADSHE) that enabled them to provide 1-2-1 support for students that was DSA funded.

163. The wellbeing and support staff noted that they did not provide a full diagnostic service for ADHD however, would provide support for concentration and attention differences whether or not students decided to pursue a diagnosis. The team reported that there are six online modules that students can access without a formal diagnosis that provided training skills and tools to help manage learning differences for students with a neurodiversity and that the university provide support to students whether they screened positively for neurodiversity.

164. The disability support services supported the referral routes for students with disabilities and noted that they attempt to provide that support from the point of application onwards. The team provides support for reasonable adjustments for student accommodation, for teaching and learning and on placement and they reported that they have, where it is valuable, done on site visits to placement providers to make assessments and recommendations on the placement environment. Support is provided for students to make applications for the Disabled Students Allowance (DSA) and where the DSA application is taking a long time, or for items not covered by DSA, campus inclusion assistants are available to reduce any gaps in support.

165. The inspection team heard from the library services that library services were available in some form 24/7 for students to access and that they provided integrated teaching on information literacy within programmes, online webinars and a timetable of training which students could attend that targeted study skills. The library staff reported that they also supported the course team with the provision of resources within the library including advice on how collections could be improved and enhanced, including encouraging course staff to diversify reading materials and increase the number of marginalised voices within the curriculum.

166. The inspection team heard from a variety of stakeholders that there was a personal academic tutor (PAT) system within the university and that PATs were known as personal supervisors. The process was governed by the university's code of practice on *Personal*

Supervision, submitted as evidence in support of this standard, that detailed that the number of structured supervisory meetings students should have access to (minimum of five per year at certificate and at diploma, honours and taught masters level the minimum was three) and provided advice and guidance for supervisors. The inspection team heard positive reports from students about engaging with their personal supervisor, and they understood through discussion with the central support services staff that there was a member of faculty support staff who administrated the personal supervision provision and was responsible for ensuring that academic staff had adequate training to undertake the role. Including, that they understood the supervision policies and had a framework to work to as well as considered the data on retention and whether there were student support issues that had caused course attrition. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

167. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the self-declaration form used during the admission process (c.f. [para 37](#)) and noted that the BA / MA Placement Handbook and the apprenticeship handbook included text which stated that students or learners '*ha[d] a responsibility to inform the university of any changes to their DBS during their period of study*'. The handbooks detailed the process for the Support and Suitability Panel where any concerns raised and reported were initially considered and support granted or escalated. The inspection team were satisfied that there were university regulations in place that detailed the process for the management of *The Investigation and Determination of Concerns about Fitness to Practice*, that low level concerns could be addressed in a supportive manner, and, that suspension or withdrawal from the programme was available in serious cases of misconduct. However, the inspection team noted that there did not appear to be a proactive, formal process in place to ensure the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.

168. Following a review of the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 5.3 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 5.4

169. The inspection team saw evidence within the documentation, and heard from a range of stakeholders, that the university made reasonable adjustments for students to enable them to progress through the courses. During admissions, applicants were encouraged to

disclose any disabilities (c.f. [para 41](#)), reasonable adjustments were made within learning and teaching, and placement settings (c.f. [paras 59 – 60](#)) and the university provided a varied and accessible central student support service (c.f. [para 164](#)). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.5

170. Evidence submitted in support of this standard included the BA programme handbook, the SWA programme handbook, the BA / MA placement handbook and the SWA Handbook for Assessed Placement. The handbooks were comprehensive and covered a number of university, and programme specific regulations, processes and requirements including information on placements. Students reported that they received notice of their placement location and the service in good time. The inspection team also consulted the programme specification documents for both programmes and highlighted that the BA programme specification incorrectly stated that '*frameworks standards throughout their training, leading to eligibility for post-qualification professional registration with Social Work England (SWE)*' and that the correct wording should be 'eligible to apply to register'.

171. In addition the university supplied the annual Social Work Careers Fair flyer, and a presentation delivered in the final year entitled the *Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE)* which was delivered by a practice educator and an employer. Through discussion with students, it was clear that students understood the requirements of the transition from social work student to social work practitioner with some noting that they were informed before they enrolled, and others noting that it was a conversation embedded in the programme via personal supervision.

172. Following a review of the documentary evidence provided in advance of the inspection, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 5.5 in relation to the reapproval 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, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the courses would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 5.6

173. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the BA Programme Handbook which provided details on attendance for students on the BA course. The inspection team were not clear on whether the attendance requirement was 70%, or 100%, and felt that there was some disparity between paragraphs within the handbook. It was clear that all skills days, and placement days were mandatory. To better understand the attendance requirements the inspection team queried the volume of attendance with the course team

and heard that there was a general expectation that students attend as much as they can. However, there was some confusion from staff around whether the attendance requirement for course delivery was 70% or 100%. Through discussions with the BA students the inspection team heard that they were unclear what the mandatory attendance requirement was with some students suggesting 80%. All students understood skills days were mandatory and must be attended.

174. The apprenticeship programme required 100% attendance which was mandated within the Apprenticeships Training Plan under the apprenticeship agreement to '*attend all block release seminars, lectures and classes*'. The apprenticeship students reported clearly that attendance was mandatory however, noted that there was confusion over when they could take annual leave, as it was not clear whether they could take it on a university day or not.

175. The inspection team from all stakeholders that attendance was recorded by the university's SEATs system, whereby students tapped their student card on a reader within the learning space. Students knew of, and discussed the SEATs system, and the course team confirmed that they could manually record attendance within the system if some reason it failed for a student.

176. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met for the apprenticeship with a recommendation to clarify the arrangements for annual leave on university days. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendations section](#) of this report.

177. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against Standard 5.6 in relation to the reapproval 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 a condition is appropriate to ensure that the course would be able to meet the relevant standard, and we are confident that once this standard is met, a further inspection of the course would not be required. Full details of the condition, its monitoring and approval can be found in the [conditions section](#) of this report.

Standard 5.7

178. Following a review of documentary evidence provided, and through, discussions with key stakeholders throughout the inspection, the inspection team were assured that students had access to satisfactory points of feedback. Feedback was provided formatively, as well as on summative assessment. Feedback was also provided by practice educators, and for apprenticeships feedback also came in the form of the tripartite meetings. Students reported that feedback was timely and of good quality (c.f. [paras 144](#) and [146 – 147](#) for more information on student feedback). The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

179. Documentary evidence reviewed prior to inspection included the institutional code of practice for Academic Appeals. Through discussion with students the inspection team heard that they would not know how to make an academic appeal however, the inspection team noted that the policy was available and students were signposted to it via the BA Programme Handbook, the BA Integrated Social Work Apprenticeship handbook, and inspectors noted that they saw it was linked as a tile on the VLE during the demonstration of the system. The inspection team considered the evidence and concluded that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

180. The inspection team reviewed the PSDs for both courses and agreed that the awards for the BA (Hons) and the BA (Hons) Integrated Apprenticeship programmes met the standard, noting that other exit awards were clearly distinguished from the registered award.

Proposed outcome

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

Conditions

Conditions for approval are set if there are areas of a course that do not currently meet our standards. Conditions 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	Course/s	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	Standard 1.3	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that people with lived experience would be involved in the recruitment processes moving forward.	20 March 2024	Para 34
2	Standard 1.5	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that all staff involved in admission and selection have undertaken up to date EDI training.	20 March 2024	Para 41
3	Standard 1.6	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will update the webpages for both programmes to ensure that they contain the correct terminology that is consistent with the sector activity of the regulator.	20 March 2024	Para 47
4	Standard 2.5 4.12	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that the apprenticeship programme has undergone curriculum development to provide	20 March 2024	Para 69 151

			assessed readiness for practice.		
5	Standard 2.6	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide documentary evidence that they have developed a robust process to demonstrate that they have oversight of Practice Educator qualifications, currency and registration status.	20 March 2024	Para 71
6	Standard 3.1 3.4	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will supply a clear structure and process chart for the governance functions in use within the programmes from the module level, up to the institutional committee level, and provide terms of reference for each meeting.	20 March 2024	Para 75 – 79 88
7	Standard 3.2	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will supply formal, written agreements in place with placement partners.	20 March 2024	Para 81
8	Standard 3.4 3.5 3.8 3.9 4.2	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that they have clear, robust and regular monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems in place for both programmes at various levels (e.g. module and programme), across the academic year, that include all stakeholders.	20 March 2024	Para 88 91 – 94 107 111 – 112 126
9	Standard 3.6	BA (Hons) Social Work	The education provider will provide a clear strategy on the development of student	20 March 2024	Para 99 107

	Standard 3.8	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	numbers that takes into account regional workforce development, placement availability and practice educator availability.		
10	Standard 3.10	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will develop a clear policy and procedure for staff to undertake CPD activities to enable them to maintain their currency and professional registration and will provide evidence detailing how this will be implemented and monitored.	20 March 2024	Para 116
11	Standard 4.1	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will provide evidence that the apprenticeship has been mapped to the Social Work England Professional Standards.	20 March 2024	Para 120
12	Standard 5.3	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will establish a proactive and formal process to continually reassess student or learner suitability for the programme of study.	20 March 2024	Para 167
13	Standard 4.1 5.5	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will ensure that the course specifications are correct and up to date and include the correct terminology relating the eligibility to apply to register with Social Work England.	20 March 2024	Para 119 170
14	Standard 5.6	BA (Hons) Social Work	That the education provider will update student handbooks to provide clarity around attendance and will ensure that staff and	20 March 2024	Para 173

			students are aware of what is mandatory.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

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	Course/s	Detail	Link
1	Standard 1.5	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider review how accessible the application process is for those applicants experiencing digital poverty, or, who have learning difficulties and how support in these areas are promoted.	Para 42
2	Standard 1.6	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider consider whether an example timetable could be provided to applicants to the apprenticeship earlier in the process.	Para 45
3.	Standard 2.1	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider consider whether a shorter placement at Level 6 / Year 3 of the apprenticeship programme is effective and to collect student feedback on whether this provides the best opportunity for students to thrive.	Para 51
4.	Standard 2.3	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider review the Health and Safety checklist to ensure the purpose of it is clear and that they develop a process to audit the checklists submitted via the PebblePad for consistency.	Para 57 - 58

5.	Standard 2.3	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider consider holding regular briefings for the workplace mentors/supervisors following student feedback concerning the wide variation in experience of this line of support.	Para 62
6.	Standard 2.3	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider consider whether the cause for concern process is the appropriate forum to support students and learners with health or additional learning needs or, to consider the language of the process and whether this could be reframed to be more supportive.	Para 60
7.	Standard 5.6	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The inspectors are recommending that the education provider clarifies arrangements for annual leave, and whether it can be taken on a university day.	Para 174

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

BA (Hons) Social Work

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
Admissions			
1.1 Confirm on entry to the course, via a holistic/multi-dimensional assessment process, that applicants: i. have the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards ii. can demonstrate that they have a good command of English iii. have the capability to meet academic standards; and iv. have the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.	☒	☐	☐
1.2 Ensure that applicants' prior relevant experience is considered as part of the admissions processes.	☒	☐	☐
1.3 Ensure that employers, placement providers and people with lived experience of social work are involved in admissions processes.	☒	☐	☐
1.4 Ensure that the admissions processes assess the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes criminal conviction checks.	☒	☐	☐
1.5 Ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.	☐	☒	☒
1.6 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an	☐	☒	☒

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
offer of a place on a course. This will include information about the professional standards, research interests and placement opportunities.			
Learning environment			
2.1 Ensure that students spend at least 200 days (including up to 30 skills days) gaining different experiences and learning in practice settings. Each student will have: i) placements in at least two practice settings providing contrasting experiences; and ii) a minimum of one placement taking place within a statutory setting, providing experience of sufficient numbers of statutory social work tasks involving high risk decision making and legal interventions.	☒	☐	☒
2.2 Provide practice learning opportunities that enable students to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to develop and meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
2.3 Ensure that while on placements, students have appropriate induction, supervision, support, access to resources and a realistic workload.	☒	☐	☒
2.4 Ensure that on placements, students' responsibilities are appropriate for their stage of education and training.	☒	☐	☐
2.5 Ensure that students undergo assessed preparation for direct practice to make sure they are safe to carry out practice learning in a service delivery setting.	☒	☐	☐
2.6 Ensure that practice educators are on the register and that they have the relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.	☒	☐	☐
Course governance, management and quality			
3.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.	☐	☒	☐
3.2 Ensure that they have agreements with placement providers to provide education and training that meets the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards. This should include necessary consents and ensure placement providers have contingencies in place to deal with practice placement breakdown.	☐	☒	☐
3.3 Ensure that placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 Ensure that employers are involved in elements of the course, including but not limited to the management and monitoring of courses and the allocation of practice education.	☐	☒	☐
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.			
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity.	☐	☒	☐
3.7 Ensure that a lead social worker is in place to hold overall professional responsibility for the course. This person must be appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
3.8 Ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, to deliver an effective course.	☐	☒	☐
3.9 Evaluate information about students' performance, progression and outcomes, such as the results of exams and assessments, by collecting, analysing and using student data, including data on equality and diversity.	☐	☒	☐
3.10 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice.	☐	☒	☐
Curriculum and assessment			
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.	☐	☒	☐
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design,	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
ongoing development and review of the curriculum.			
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.	☒	☐	☐
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.5 Ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.6 Ensure that students are given the opportunity to work with, and learn from, other professions in order to support multidisciplinary working, including in integrated settings.	☒	☐	☐
4.7 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	☒	☐	☐
4.8 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students' progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☒	☐	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
4.12 Ensure that there are systems to manage students' progression, with input from a range of people, to inform decisions about their progression including via direct observation of practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.13 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation.	☒	☐	☐
Supporting students			
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: I. confidential counselling services; II. careers advice and support; and III. occupational health services	☒	☐	☐
5.2 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their academic development including, for example, personal tutors.	☒	☐	☐
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☒	☐	☐
5.5 Provide information to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.	☐	☒	☐
5.6 Provide information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory.	☐	☒	☐
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	☒	☐	☐
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	☒	☐	☐
Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register			
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor's degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Annex 2: Education and training standards summary

BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
Admissions			
1.1 Confirm on entry to the course, via a holistic/multi-dimensional assessment process, that applicants: 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	☐	☒	☒

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
offer of a place on a course. This will include 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: 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.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.	☒	☐	☐
Course governance, management and quality			
3.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course.	☐	☒	☐
3.2 Ensure that they have agreements with placement providers to provide education and training that meets the professional standards and the education and training qualifying standards. This should include necessary consents and ensure placement providers have contingencies in place to deal with practice placement breakdown.	☐	☒	☐
3.3 Ensure that placement providers have the necessary policies and procedures in relation to students' health, wellbeing and risk, and the support systems in place to underpin these.	☒	☐	☐
3.4 Ensure that employers are involved in elements of the course, including but not limited to the management and monitoring of courses and the allocation of practice education.	☐	☒	☐
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.			
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of local/regional placement capacity.	☐	☒	☐
3.7 Ensure that a lead social worker is in place to hold overall professional responsibility for the course. This person must be appropriately qualified and experienced, and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
3.8 Ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, to deliver an effective course.	☐	☒	☐
3.9 Evaluate information about students' performance, progression and outcomes, such as the results of exams and assessments, by collecting, analysing and using student data, including data on equality and diversity.	☐	☒	☐
3.10 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice.	☐	☒	☐
Curriculum and assessment			
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.	☐	☒	☐
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design,	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
ongoing development and review of the curriculum.			
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and human rights and legislative frameworks.	☒	☐	☐
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice.	☒	☐	☐
4.5 Ensure that the integration of theory and practice is central to the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.6 Ensure that students are given the opportunity to work with, and learn from, other professions in order to support multidisciplinary working, including in integrated settings.	☐	☐	☐
4.7 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	☒	☐	☐
4.8 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the professional standards.	☒	☐	☐
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students' progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☒	☐	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are appropriately qualified and experienced and on the register.	☒	☐	☐
4.12 Ensure that there are systems to manage students' progression, with input from a range of people, to inform decisions about their progression including via direct observation of practice.	☐	☒	☐
4.13 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation.	☒	☐	☐
Supporting students			
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: 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.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☐	☒	☐
5.5 Provide information to students about their curriculum, practice placements, assessments and transition to registered social worker including information on requirements for continuing professional development.	☐	☒	☐
5.6 Provide information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory.	☒	☐	☐
5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.	☒	☐	☐
5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.	☒	☐	☐
Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register			
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor's degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

1. If conditions are applied to a course approval, Social Work England completes a conditions review to make sure education providers have complied with the conditions and are meeting all of the [education and training standards](#).
2. A review of the conditions evidence will be undertaken and recommendations will be made to Social Work England's decision maker.
3. This section of the report will be completed when the conditions review is completed.

	Standard not met	Course/s	Condition	Recommendation
1	1.3	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that people with lived experience would be involved in the recruitment processes moving forward.	Met
2	1.5	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that all staff involved in admission and selection have undertaken up to date EDI training.	Met
3	1.6	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will update the webpages for both programmes to ensure that they contain the correct terminology that is consistent with the sector activity of the regulator.	Met
4	2.5 4.12	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that the apprenticeship programme has undergone curriculum development to provide assessed readiness for practice.	Met
5	2.6	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide documentary evidence that they have developed a robust process to demonstrate that they have oversight of Practice Educator qualifications, currency and registration status.	Met

6	3.1 3.4	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will supply a clear structure and process chart for the governance functions in use within the programmes from the module level, up to the institutional committee level, and provide terms of reference for each meeting.	Met
7	3.2	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will supply formal, written agreements in place with placement partners.	Met
8	3.4 3.5 3.8 3.9 4.2	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide evidence that they have clear, robust and regular monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems in place for both programmes at various levels (e.g. module and programme), across the academic year, that include all stakeholders.	Met
9	3.6 3.8	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	The education provider will provide a clear strategy on the development of student numbers that takes into account regional workforce development, placement availability and practice educator availability.	Met
10	3.10	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will develop a clear policy and procedure for staff to undertake CPD activities to enable them to maintain their currency and professional registration and will provide evidence detailing how this will be implemented and monitored.	Met
11	4.1	BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will provide evidence that the apprenticeship has been mapped to the Social Work England Professional Standards.	Met

12	5.3	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will establish a proactive and formal process to continually reassess student or learner suitability for the programme of study.	Met
13	4.1 5.5	BA (Hons) Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship	That the education provider will ensure that the course specifications are correct and up to date and include the correct terminology relating the eligibility to apply to register with Social Work England.	Met
14	5.6	BA (Hons) Social Work	That the education provider will update student handbooks to provide clarity around attendance and will ensure that staff and students are aware of what is mandatory	Met

Findings

4. The conditions review was undertaken as a result of the conditions set during the course approval as outlined in the original inspection report above. The course provider submitted documentary evidence and a mapping document that included narrative evidence relating to each condition (hereafter referred to as the conditions mapping document).

5. In response to condition 1 the course provider submitted an admissions pack, a service user carer involvement recording and monitoring form template, minutes from a lived experience group (LEG) meeting and an admissions review undertaken since the inspection. The mapping document reported that the programme director had worked closely with the LEG group to ensure that LEG members supported the interview and assessment processes for the apprenticeship, and confirmed that LEG members would be involved in all future recruitment activity. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

6. The course provider submitted a log of mandatory training for academic staff, and a chart of training attended for the LEG group which included diversity training and date/s completed in response to condition 2. The mapping document reported that the institution required all staff to complete either diversity in the workplace, diversity in learning and teaching or managing diversity training every 3 years, and that this extended to LEG members. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

7. The course provider submitted screenshots and web links to the course pages in response to condition 3. The inspectors noted that the terminology appeared to have been updated and agreed that this condition was met.

8. In response to condition 4, the course provider reported on the mapping document that a readiness for practice assessment had been internally validated by the university for the apprenticeship. Documentary evidence was provided which detailed the elements that made up the readiness for practice assessment including a summative assessment, mandatory training and reflections covering consent, safeguarding and fire safety and a panel interview. The university further submitted documentary evidence to demonstrate where readiness for practice had been included within the programme structure. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

9. The course provider submitted an updated copy of the placement confirmation form in response to condition 5. The narrative included on the mapping form reported that the Social Work Placement Lead and Placement Team, in consultation with the Humber Social Work Teaching Partnership, had developed a new system for checking the registration number, qualification and currency of all Practice Educators. The inspectors requested some additional information from the course provider to better understand how the forms would be used and implemented. From a review of the evidence the inspectors understood that the updated form was in use on both undergraduate programmes and that the link lecturer was responsible for recording, and auditing, the information from the placement confirmation form into the placement monitoring tracking spreadsheets. The information was updated annually. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

10. In response to condition 6 the university reported that the institution, and the Faculty of Health Sciences, had implemented a new governance structure. A committee structure diagram, a summary of the committees and terms of reference were also provided for both the institutional and faculty level committees. The inspectors requested additional information that illustrated how the quality assurance functions worked in practice from the module level. The course provider submitted 27 additional documents including the continual monitoring evaluation and enhancement (CMEE) journal. The inspectors reported that the CMEE journal summary section made reference to some of the governance functions including, the monitoring of the programme at the module level and agreed that this condition had been met.

11. In response to condition 7 the course provider submitted 2 signed examples of partner agreements and minutes from a meeting of the teaching partnership where agreements were approved. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

12. Comprehensive narrative evidence was provided on the mapping form in response to condition 8, alongside 9 additional documents that included minutes from a review meeting. The review meeting minutes noted that the course provider was working to plan

forthcoming review across the year and as part of a second submission of evidence the inspection team requested a copy of the plan. Following consideration of the programme review timetable, the inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

13. In response to condition 9, the course provider submitted a workforce and development strategy and the inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

14. The course provider submitted 6 pieces of documentary evidence in response to condition 10. The submitted documents clarified that an annual appraisal would take place. In addition, scheduled review points were to take place over the year and the workload planning process included a percentage of time to be used for research, enterprise and scholarship, and there was an additional allocation for other academic activities. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

15. In response to condition 11 the course provider submitted the programme specification proforma for the apprenticeship, which included mapping to the Social Work Professional Standards as an appendix. The inspectors agreed that this standard was met.

16. The course provider submitted 7 pieces of documentary evidence in relation to how suitability was assessed in response to condition 12, including a declaration of good health and good character. The inspection team understood that the form was to be completed as part of the readiness for practice process, prior to placements, or on return to the programme after a period of suspension of studies. The inspectors agreed that this condition was met.

17. The course provider submitted updated documentation for both programmes, including handbooks, module specifications and programme specifications in response to condition 13. The inspectors reported that the terminology had been updated and agreed that the condition was met.

18. The course provider submitted updated documentation for both programmes, including handbooks, module specifications and programme specifications in response to condition 14. The narrative included as evidence on the mapping document reported that handbooks had been updated to clearly indicate attendance, and that module specifications included information on the number of mandatory days within the module and noted that attendance for skills days was mandatory and monitored. The inspectors agreed that this standard was met.

19. Following the review of the documentary evidence submitted the inspection team are satisfied that the conditions set against the approval of the BA (Hons) Social Work and BA (Hons) Integrated Social Work Degree Apprenticeship are met.

Regulator decision

Conditions met.