

# Inspection Report

<b>Inspection ID</b>	BUR1_ACP16_ACP17 CPP16, CPP17
<b>Course provider</b>	Bournemouth University
<b>Validating body (if different)</b>	
<b>Course inspected</b>	MA Advanced Mental Health Practice PG Dip Advanced Mental Health Practice
<b>Mode of study</b>	
<b>Maximum student cohort</b>	The maximum number of students per cohort, for each course is 25.
<b>Date of inspection</b>	17 – 18 March 2026
<b>Inspection team</b>	Caroline Reynolds and Sam Jameson (Education Quality Assurance Officers) Helen Franklin (Lay Inspector) Jane Hutchison (AMHP registrant Inspector)
<b>Inspector recommendation</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Regulator decision:</b>	Approved with conditions
<b>Date of Regulator decision:</b>	10 June 2026
<b>Conditions</b>	Standard 1.6
<b>Date conditions met and approved:</b>	

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Summary of Inspection.....	3
Inspection Findings .....	4
Outcome .....	16
<b>Conditions</b> .....	16
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	17
Meeting of Conditions.....	18
Findings .....	18

## Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses. Inspections form part of our process to make sure that courses meet our education and training approval standards for Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) courses. We approve courses against these standards to ensure that students who successfully complete an AMHP course can meet the requirements set out in the Mental Health (Approved Mental Health Professionals) (Approval) (England) Regulations 2008.
2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. This will include a registered inspector who will be a qualified AMHP, and a lay inspector who is not AMHP qualified.
3. These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review documentary information and evidence, and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, placements, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.
4. The process we undertake is described in our legislation: The Children and Social Work Act 2017, [The Social Workers Regulations 2018 - Social Work England](#) , and our [Education and Training Rules 2019](#).
5. In this document we describe Bournemouth University as ‘the course provider’ and we describe the MA Advanced Mental Health Practice and PgDip Advanced Mental Health Practice as ‘the courses’ and/or ‘the programmes’.

## Summary of Inspection

5. Bournemouth University and the MA Advanced Mental Health Practice and PgDip Advanced Mental Health Practice courses were inspected as part of Social Work England’s reapproval cycle, whereby all course providers with AMHP courses will be inspected against the new education and training approval standards for AMHP courses.
6. A remote inspection took place from 17 – 18 March 2026.
7. As part of this process the inspection team gathered feedback from key stakeholders through meetings on inspection. This included current and former students, employers

and teaching staff. Written feedback was also gathered from a person with lived experience during the inspection.

## **Inspection Findings**

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

<b>Standard 1. Admissions</b>	<b>Met or not met.</b>
<p>1.1 Confirm on entry to the course that applicants have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the potential to acquire and demonstrate the competences set out in the relevant legislation governing AMHP practice;</li> <li>ii. the capability to meet the academic requirements of the course; and</li> <li>iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes</li> </ul>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.2 Confirm that applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.3 Ensure that the admissions processes assess the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes appropriate criminal conviction checks</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.4 Ensure that applicants have suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental health, mental capacity and human rights legislation</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.5 Ensure that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.6 Ensure that employers, placement providers, people with lived experience of social work, and carers are involved in student admissions</p>	<p><b>Not met</b></p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.7 Ensure that there are equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.8 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a course. This will include information about the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modes, location of study, assessment methods, duration, and observation requirements including the expectations around arranging or securing placements</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>1.9 Ensure that the admissions process allows candidates from any eligible profession to demonstrate their suitability to join the course</p>	<b>Met</b>

## Key observations for standard 1

9. We learned from the documentary evidence that entry to the course required applicants to hold a Bachelor's Honours degree at 2:2 classification or equivalent, and typically to have at least one year of relevant professional or management experience and have completed level seven study. Employer partners were required to provide nomination and reference forms to evidence applicants' professional competence, capacity, and ability to undertake and successfully complete the AMHP training course. Applicants' competence, academic, and IT entry requirements were subsequently checked and explored further through the interview process, which included a structured set of questions mapped to the statutory AMHP competencies (1.1).

10. From discussions with the course team and employer partners, we were satisfied that the course provider had a process in place to confirm that applicants were, and remained, fully registered with a relevant regulatory body (1.2).

11. We heard that DBS checks were carried out and signed off by employers via the nomination and reference forms and therefore we were assured that appropriate checks were in place to ensure the suitability of applicants. However, we identified that the process could be strengthened by embedding applicants DBS numbers and dates within the applicant nomination documentation. As a result, the inspection team made a recommendation in relation to standard 1.3. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

12. We were satisfied from the documentary evidence submitted that applicants' prior relevant experience and legal literacy were suitably checked and verified within the admissions process. Employer partners' nomination and reference forms supported this sharing of evidence. We also heard that applicants were required to submit a pre-interview portfolio, which included a written critical analysis of a Mental Health Act assessment they had observed. This evidence was tested and explored further within the employer's internal interview process, which was conducted by a panel comprising a senior AMHP and local authority representatives utilising a structured set of questions mapped to the statutory AMHP competencies. A subsequent further interview was conducted by the course provider's programme lead and another academic member of staff (1.4, 1.5).

13. Documentary evidence and discussions with employers demonstrated that they were involved in the admissions process, through internal nomination, interview, and assessment processes. During the inspection, the programme lead reported that there was an intention to increase employer involvement in the course provider's admissions processes and that related discussions were ongoing (1.6).

14. We were unclear how people with lived experience were consistently involved in admissions. While some previous involvement was reported, it was unclear how recent or consistent this had been. This was discussed with staff involved in admissions and selection, and the programme lead confirmed that involvement had been more extensive several years earlier but had been less regular

for recent cohorts. As a result, the inspection team set a condition against standard 1.6. Full details of this condition can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

15. We reviewed the University Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy and Annual Report. The mapping form included links that identified where and how these were applied at a course level and aligned to wider university-level processes. We heard from course provider staff involved in admissions and selection that they sought to identify individual support needs through information provided by applicants and employers, including details of reasonable adjustments or referrals to the Student Support Team where appropriate. While we were assured that applicants had opportunities to request reasonable adjustments, we felt the course provider could consider adapting the applicant nomination form with employer partners to identify reasonable adjustment needs at an earlier stage. As a result, the inspection team made a recommendation in relation to standard 1.7. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

16. Information available on the course provider’s website provided applicants with the details required to make an informed decision about whether to accept a place on the course. This information complemented the discussions and processes in place with employer partners, ensuring applicants were informed of the course expectations and able to meet its requirements. Student representatives we met with confirmed that they had access to the information needed to make an informed decision. However, feedback from the most recent cohort indicated that it would have been helpful to have clearer information regarding the specific days and dates on which the course commenced, including introductory sessions. As a result, the inspection team made a recommendation in relation to standard 1.8. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

17. As identified earlier in this report, the course entry criteria focused on competence, readiness, and potential rather than an individual’s professional background. This approach ensured equitable consideration for social workers, nurses, occupational therapists, and psychologists who met the entry requirements (1.9).

<b>Standard 2. Course governance, management and quality.</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
2.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivery, resourcing and quality management of the course	<b>Met</b>
2.2 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with lived experience including carers, and students	<b>Met</b>
2.3 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of:	<b>Met</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. local and regional placement capacity; and</li> <li>1. the availability of part-time or other flexible course arrangements to widen access wherever possible.</li> </ul>	
<p>2.4 Ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course is a relevant qualified professional with appropriate experience</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>2.5 Ensure that there is adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise</p>	<b>Met</b>
<p>2.6 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice</p>	<b>Met</b>

### Key observations for standard 2.

18. Our meetings with the course lead and course team outlined the course’s organisational structure, including its governance and quality assurance processes. These meetings enabled us to identify roles, responsibilities, and lines of accountability at both course and wider institutional levels. We were satisfied that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course was a suitably qualified professional with appropriate and relevant experience. We were provided with examples of how their knowledge and experience as a qualified AMHP were embedded within the teaching, operational delivery, and quality management of the course (2.1, 2.4).

19. We met with key stakeholders and triangulated documentary evidence to understand the monitoring, evaluation, and improvement systems in place for the course. Management meeting minutes demonstrated that representatives from employers, people with lived experience, and student representatives contributed to the monitoring and evaluation of the course, supported by student/learner/staff forums, programme boards, and placement reviews. However, our review of these minutes indicated that attendance by some key stakeholders was not consistent. We therefore questioned whether greater consistency of attendance could be achieved to support regular and effective monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of the course. As a result, the inspection team made a recommendation in relation to standard 2.2. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

20. We considered the evidence across the inspection and were satisfied that the course provider appropriately considered the number of students admitted to the course. This included the resources and working relationships with sponsoring bodies and employer partners required to deliver an effective and sustainable course (2.3).

21. During discussions, we heard about the work undertaken by the course team with employer partners to ensure sufficient placement availability and capacity for all students enrolled on the

course. We heard that cohort numbers may vary slightly between regions depending on placement capacity and workforce planning agreements (2.3).

22. Documentary evidence and discussions with the course lead and team confirmed that there was adequate provision of appropriately experienced and qualified staff, and that the course team was supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to AMHP practice (2.5, 2.6).

<b>Standard 3. Curriculum</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
3.1 The views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of mental health services are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum	<b>Met</b>
3.2 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, including around cross-national border issues in relation to practice in Wales, where this is appropriate	<b>Met</b>
3.3 The course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, human rights and legislative frameworks	<b>Met</b>
3.4 Course content is routinely updated as a result of developments in legislation, research, government policy, and best practice	<b>Met</b>
3.5 The integration of theory and practice is central to the course	<b>Met</b>
3.6 Students understand how the standards of the student's own professional regulator(s), apply to their specialist practice	<b>Met</b>
3.7 The course is designed to enable students to demonstrate an evidence-informed approach to AMHP practice, underpinned by skills, knowledge and understanding in relation to research and evaluation	<b>Met</b>

### **Key observations for standard 3.**

23. Documentary evidence, including management meeting minutes for London and Wessex, provided assurance that people with lived experience, students, and employer partners were involved in developing and reviewing the curriculum. Course timetables highlighted programme contributors. We heard that employer partners were regularly engaged, and although we were unable to meet with a person with lived experience during the inspection, one supplied detailed written information on their involvement. This included offering authentic perspectives through teaching sessions - such as group activities and case studies - and contributing feedback during

---

management meetings. We heard that feedback was reviewed through programme boards and monitoring processes, and that collective engagement informed ongoing curriculum development and quality assurance to ensure the course remained current, evidence-based, and grounded in present practice (3.1).

24. The Programme Handbook, unit specifications and the Practice Assessment Guide clearly mapped the curriculum content and learning outcomes to each AMHP competency. Documentation showed how teaching provided ethical, legal and rights-based foundations through case law analysis, applied workshops and lived-experience input. The 45-day placement enabled students to apply this learning through supervised Mental Health Act assessments, reflective supervision, direct observations and portfolio evidence. Human rights, social justice and social perspectives were embedded throughout the programme. We heard that the course supported students to understand inclusion through teaching on intersectionality, cultural competence, structural inequalities and contemporary issues (3.2).

25. Content in the Programme Handbook outlined additional learning services, links to university-wide support provisions, and the allocation of a personal tutor for wellbeing and academic support. We reviewed information on the course provider's EDI policies and heard about the accessibility of teaching and assessment methods. We heard that applicants were encouraged to disclose relevant information during admissions and selection. Overall, students were positive about the range of support available, and we heard examples of reasonable adjustments that had been put in place for those who required them (3.3).

26. The integration of theory and practice was clearly demonstrated within the module design and the placement expectations set out in the Practice Assessment Guidance. The Programme Handbook stated that taught days were mandatory and that students were required to complete a minimum of 45 placement days. We reviewed the timetable for taught sessions and the placement to understand the programme structure and how integrated teaching and theory were linked to practice throughout the course, ensuring students were prepared to justify decisions using statutory criteria and evidential reasoning (3.5).

27. The course content and learning outcomes were clearly set out, along with the list of resources for each unit and detailed reading and journal lists that evidenced the currency of research and the signposted reading for the course. We heard how students used evidence from research and other sources to inform and critically evaluate their practice and written assessment tasks. Course staff also outlined the frequency with which they reviewed reading materials and curriculum content to ensure that students engaged with the most recent research, changes in legislation, government policy and current best practice in relation to the course content and assignments (3.4, 3.7).

28. The programme regulations were clearly outlined within the Programme Handbook. During the inspection, we explored with social workers and other regulated professionals about the opportunities they had to examine the relationships between their AMHP role and their professional backgrounds (3.6).

---

<b>Standard 4. Practice Placements</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
4.1 Ensure practice placements are integral to the course	<b>Met</b>
4.2 Ensure that the number, duration and range of practice placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes	<b>Met</b>
<p>4.3 Ensure that students, practice placement providers and educators are prepared for each placement, which will include information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the learning outcomes to be met</li> <li>ii. the timing and duration of any placement experience</li> <li>iii. the records to be maintained</li> <li>iv. expectations of professional conduct</li> <li>v. assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure to progress</li> <li>vi. communication and lines of responsibility</li> </ul>	<b>Met</b>
<p>4.4 Maintain clear collaborative arrangements for planning and communication with placement providers including a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements, in order jointly to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment</li> <li>ii. that placement providers have equality, diversity and inclusion policies in place which will apply to students, and which they will implement and monitor</li> <li>iii. that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, with relevant specialist subject knowledge and expertise, at the practice placement setting</li> <li>iv. that practice placement providers support their placement staff to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to professional practice, including appropriate practice placement educator training</li> <li>v. that a range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of people with lived experience of social work and colleagues must be in place throughout all practice placements</li> </ul>	<b>Met</b>

---

#### **Key observations for standard 4.**

29. Placements were fully integrated into the course as a core assessed component. Typically, the 45-day placement was arranged by students' local authority employers, who also played a key role in admissions. The Programme Handbook and Practice Assessment Guide provided clear information on placement expectations and requirements. A structured learning agreement, regular supervision at least every five days, a midway review, observed practice and a final portfolio ensured students met the required learning outcomes. Students submitted a full practice portfolio, including evidence sheets, competency mapping, reflective accounts and a final assessor report. We heard how assessors and supervisors used the learning agreement to monitor progress and allocate work, how students used it to guide their learning, and how placement extensions were offered where necessary (4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

30. The Practice Assessment Guidance clearly outlined the process for preparing students, practice placement providers and educators for each placement. The practice learning agreement set out responsibilities, supervision arrangements, evidence requirements and accountability lines, ensuring all parties understood the required learning outcomes. Induction was supported by employers and practice assessors and this covered orientation to the AMHP service, policy frameworks, documentation systems and workplace expectations. Procedures for placement breakdown, including escalation routes and remedial actions, were also detailed in the guidance (4.3).

31. We heard that collaborative arrangements with placement providers were maintained, there was regular communication and joint quality assurance processes ensuring that the settings offered supportive, well-supervised environments, with clear responsibilities outlined in the practice learning agreement. We heard that each provider ensured the suitability of qualified AMHPs and experienced practitioners with the specialist knowledge required to support learning. Providers were also expected to ensure their staff maintained up-to-date professional practice through CPD and AMHP practice currency. Employers also had to demonstrate that active equality, diversity and inclusion policies were in place and routinely monitored (4.4).

32. Employers and the course team described how they quality assured placements for suitability and supported students while on placement. We were assured that there was an effective system for approving placements; however, we felt that the course provider could strengthen the evidence trail by capturing agreements on employer partners' nomination forms. This would ensure that employer accountability and expectations were clearly evidenced. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#) (4.4).

33. Employers spoke positively about the open communication with the course provider and the wide range of student support available at the university. We also heard about how placement opportunities and settings were evaluated, including the gathering of feedback from students and others involved in supporting, supervising, and assessing students during placements (4.4).

---

<b>Standard 5. Supporting students.</b>	<b>Met or not met</b>
5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. confidential counselling services</li> <li>ii. occupational health services, where appropriate</li> </ul>	<b>Met</b>
5.2 Ensure that students have access to a system of academic and pastoral student support for their progression, development, wellbeing and welfare	<b>Met</b>
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health	<b>Met</b>
5.4 Make reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the relevant standards, in accordance with relevant legislation	<b>Met</b>
5.5 Provide timely information to students about parts of the course where attendance is mandatory and have associated monitoring mechanisms in place	<b>Met</b>
5.6 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments	<b>Met</b>
5.7 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	<b>Met</b>

### **Key observations for standard 5.**

34. We heard from the course team about the range of university student support services available to support both students' educational and pastoral needs, including support from personal tutors. From our discussions, we were satisfied that there was a process in place for the course provider to ensure the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character, and health. Discussions with student representatives and the course team enabled us to triangulate the documentary evidence relating to the support mechanisms and processes in place to support any reasonable adjustments a student may require in order to progress through the course (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4).

35. We were unclear about the level of information provided to practice assessors regarding student support for those who required reasonable adjustments. We were satisfied that standard 5.4 was met; however, we made a recommendation to strengthen links between the course provider and practice assessors to ensure that reasonable adjustments were understood, adhered

to, and incorporated during placements. Full details of this recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

36. Information and guidance were available on Brightspace, the course provider’s e-learning platform, and within the course handbook, which outlined students’ attendance requirements. The student representatives we met with were clear about the attendance requirements, how attendance would be monitored, and the process for reporting any absences (5.5).

37. We were assured that student feedback was provided in line with the course provider’s feedback regulations. External examiner reports that we reviewed identified that feedback included areas for development and that the overall quality of feedback was high (5.6).

38. The course provider’s whistleblowing, safeguarding, and fitness-to-practise procedures provided protected routes for reporting concerns, while placement providers maintained equivalent policies within statutory practice environments. Students were informed of these processes during induction, through programme handbooks, and at the practice learning agreement (PLA) meeting (5.7).

<b><u>Standard 6. Assessments</u></b>	<b><u>Met or not met</u></b>
6.1 Ensure that the assessment strategy and design demonstrate that the assessments are robust, fair and consistent, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the competencies set out in the relevant legislation and rules as set out in the guidance that accompanies these standards	<b>Met</b>
6.2 Ensure that professional aspects of practice are integral to assessments	<b>Met</b>
6.3 Use objective measures of student performance which ensure safe and effective practice as an AMHP	<b>Met</b>
6.4 Regularly monitor and evaluate assessment standards	<b>Met</b>
6.5 Clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the course	<b>Met</b>
6.6 Clearly specify that any aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP	<b>Met</b>
6.7 Clearly specify the procedure for the right of appeal for students	<b>Met</b>
6.8 Clearly specify a process for the appointment of at least 1 external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register	<b>Met</b>

---

### **Key observations for standard 6.**

39. Documentary evidence provided assurance that all assessments were mapped to the AMHP competencies. During the inspection, we explored the rationale for all assignments being written, including how assessment methods and requirements were reviewed and modified over time, as well as the arrangements for students requiring reasonable adjustments. Submission information was clearly evidenced within the Programme Handbook, together with the pass mark, and we reviewed the marking criteria. We also reviewed evidence of the moderation process. The maximum time to complete the course was two years, as indicated within the Standard Assessment Regulations (6.1, 6.2, 6.3).

40. We heard that professional aspects of practice were integral to all assessments across the programme. The written assignments required students to demonstrate legal reasoning, ethical analysis, rights-based decision-making and adherence to professional standards. The 45-day placement further embedded professional capability through observed practice, supervision records, evidence sheets and a competency grid, ensuring that students demonstrated accountability, professional conduct, communication and autonomous AMHP practice. During the inspection, we explored how the programme ensured that students from relevant professions could complete the programme to the same level of competence (6.1, 6.2, 6.3).

41. We heard that assessment standards were regularly monitored and evaluated through established university quality assurance processes, including internal moderation, external examiner review, programme boards, and the annual monitoring report. This was further evidenced by management meeting minutes, which provided clarity on how feedback from students, employers, and people with lived experience was gathered and reviewed. It was clear that external examiner oversight was in place to ensure fairness and consistency (6.1, 6.4, 6.8).

42. We heard from several employers who had raised concerns with the course provider about the robustness of the legal literacy assessment. Some stated that they did not feel confident that students were meeting the required threshold. As a result, we considered it appropriate to make a recommendation under standard 6.1 for the course provider to review the assessment's robustness. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [proposed outcome section](#).

43. Documentary evidence, including the Programme Handbook, unit guides, and placement documentation, clearly set out the requirements for student progression and achievement, including resubmission opportunities for each element of the course. Students were required to pass all level seven academic assessments, complete the mandatory 45-day placement, and successfully evidence all statutory AMHP competencies through their practice portfolio. We heard that progression was dependent on students meeting academic deadlines, maintaining satisfactory conduct and engagement, and achieving pass grades in both taught and practice components. We also heard about the procedure for mitigating circumstances (6.5).

---

44. During the inspection, it was clarified that there was an academic only exit award in Mental Health for partial completion of the programme, and we received confirmation given that this could not lead to an AMHP qualification (6.6).

45. The procedure for the right of appeal for students was clearly evidenced within the Programme Handbook, together with the course provider's student appeals procedure (6.7).

46. We reviewed the course provider's process for the recruitment of external examiners, along with the CV of the current external examiner, which demonstrated that they were suitably experienced and qualified (6.8).

## Outcome

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

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

## Conditions

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

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

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1	1.6	The course provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that people with lived experience are consistently involved in the admissions processes.	10 March 2027	<a href="#">1.6</a>

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

## Recommendations

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

	Standard	Detail	Link
1	1.3	We are recommending that the course provider considers having the applicant's DBS number and date embedded within the applicant nomination form.	<a href="#">1.3</a>
2	1.7	We are recommending that the course provider considers adapting the applicant nomination form with their employer partners to seek to identify any reasonable adjustments required at an earlier stage.	<a href="#">1.7</a>
3	1.8	We are recommending that the course provider considers providing greater clarity to applicants regarding which days/dates the course starts from, including introductory sessions.	<a href="#">1.8</a>
4	2.2	We are recommending that the course provider looks at ways to support the regular involvement from key stakeholders in the effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement of the courses.	<a href="#">2.2</a>
5	4.4	We are recommending that the course provider enhances the evidence trail for approving placements, ensuring that the employer's accountability and expectations are clearly evidenced.	<a href="#">4.4</a>
6	5.4	We are recommending that the course provider considers strengthening the links with practice assessors to ensure they understand, adhere to and incorporate any reasonable adjustments during placements.	<a href="#">5.4</a>
7	6.1	We are recommending that the course provider takes into consideration the feedback from employers on the robustness of the law assessment.	<a href="#">6.1</a>

## Meeting of Conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1			
2			
3			

## Findings