

Inspection Report

Inspection ID	UHR1_BCP325
Course provider	University of Hertfordshire
Validating body (if different)	
Course inspected	Best Interests Assessor course
Mode of study	Part time
Maximum student cohort	10
Date of inspection	6 th – 7 th January 2026
Inspection team	Sam Jameson and Tom Eaton (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Luke Tibbits (Lay Inspector) Julia Leitch (BIA Registrant Inspector)
Inspector recommendation	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	15 th April 2026
<u>Conditions</u>	1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4
Date conditions met and approved:	

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of Inspection.....	3
Inspection Findings.....	4
Outcome	16
Conditions	17
Recommendations	18
Meeting of Conditions.....	20
Findings	20

Introduction

1. Social Work England completes inspections as part of our statutory requirement to approve and monitor courses. Inspections form part of our process to make sure that courses meet our education and training approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses. We approve courses against these standards to ensure that students who successfully complete a BIA course can meet the requirements set out in the Mental Capacity Act 2005, Schedule A1 and 1A, the Mental Capacity (Deprivation of Liberty: Standard Authorisations, Assessments and Ordinary Residence) Regulations 2008 and the 6 BIA capabilities as described in Annex 1 to the education and training approval standards for Best Interests Assessor (BIA) courses.

2. During the approval process, we appoint partner inspectors. This will include a registered inspector who will be a qualified BIA, and a lay inspector who is not BIA qualified.

These inspectors, along with an officer from the education quality assurance team, undertake activity to review documentary information and evidence, and carry out an inspection. This activity could include observing and asking questions about teaching, observations, facilities and learning resources; asking questions based on the evidence submitted; and meeting with staff, people with lived experience and students. The inspectors then make recommendations to us about whether a course should be approved.

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

4. In this document we describe the University of Hertfordshire as ‘the course provider’ and we describe the Best Interests Assessor programme as ‘the course’.

Summary of Inspection

5. University of Hertfordshire and their Best Interests Assessor course was inspected as part of Social Work England’s reapproval cycle, whereby all course providers with BIA courses will be inspected against the new education and training approval standards for BIA courses.

6. A remote inspection took place from 6th – 7th January 2026.

7. As part of this process the inspection team gathered feedback from key stakeholders through meetings on inspection. This included a member of the people with lived

experience group at the course provider and one current student on the course. Written feedback was also gathered from one employer partner in advance of 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 BIA courses. We describe the inspection team in this section as 'we'.

Standard 1. Admissions	Met or not met.
<p>1.1 Confirm that applicants have:</p> <p>i. the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the 6 BIA capabilities set out in Annex 1 of these standards.</p> <p>ii. the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice.</p> <p>iii. the capability to use information and communication technology (ICT) methods and techniques to achieve course outcomes.</p>	<p>Not Met.</p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.2 Confirm that applicants are and remain fully registered with a relevant regulatory body in line with the relevant regulations.</p>	<p>Not Met.</p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.3 Confirm that applicants have, and can demonstrate, suitable prior experience of the practical application of appropriate legislation and policy, specifically including but not limited to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation, and demonstrable experience of understanding risk in relation to these.</p>	<p>Not Met.</p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.4 Confirm that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas.</p>	<p>Not Met.</p> <p><i>See key observations for standard 1 for further information.</i></p>
<p>1.5 Ensure that employers, providers of observation opportunities, people with lived experience, and carers are involved in admissions processes.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>1.6 Ensure that the admissions processes include assessment of the suitability of applicants, including in relation to their conduct, health and character. This includes appropriate criminal conviction checks.</p>	<p>Met.</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>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>1.8 Ensure that the admissions process gives applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place. This will include information about the award level and professional qualification, course content, teaching modes, location of study, assessment methods, duration, and</p>	<p>Met.</p>

<p>observation requirements including the expectations around arranging or securing observation opportunities.</p>	
<p><u>Key observations for standard 1</u></p> <p>9. We met with university staff involved in the admissions and selections processes to discuss how the course provider ensured that the admissions process assessed an applicant’s capability and potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to become a BIA.</p> <p>10. As result of these discussions, we were unclear of how consistent and fair the admissions process was for all applicants, or how this process explores their level of legal literacy and knowledge or suitable prior experience.</p> <p>11. We identified inconsistencies with the admissions assessments and heard about a variety of interview methods including formal interviews, discussions with the course lead, and an inconsistent approach to the inclusion of people with lived experience. We were not assured that applicants were being fairly and equally assessed. We also understood that the course lead, who was not BIA qualified, made the overall decision about an applicant’s suitability to join the course and as a result we concluded that standards 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 were not met. Please see the conditions table for further information.</p> <p>12. During our discussions with the staff involved in selection and admissions, we were able to explore how the course ensured that applicants were, and remained, fully registered with a relevant regulatory body. The course team confirmed that they double checked, during the application and admissions stages, that an applicant was appropriately registered. The course handbook mentioned students’ conduct, character and health, and provided a link to student administration and support. However, there was no clear guidance or information to ensure students were aware, and reminded, that if their registration status changed then they must immediately inform the course provider. We concluded that standard 1.2 was therefore not met. Please see the conditions table for further information.</p> <p>13. In our meeting with a person with lived experience, they were able to confirm their involvement in the admissions process and review of the admissions assessment form. We were satisfied that documentary evidence identified employer partners and providers of observations were also involved in the overall admissions process. However, there was not always a clear and consistent approach to their involvement and input to this area of the course, such as the review and involvement in adapting admissions materials/procedures or</p>	

<p>representation during interviews from these stakeholders. Therefore, we concluded that a recommendation on standard 1.5 was appropriate.</p> <p>14. The course provider confirmed that all applicants must provide a copy of their current DBS check. They were also required to provide a reference from their current line manager, which commented on their professional conduct, capability, health, and character in relation to the demands of the BIA role. (1.6)</p> <p>15. Following the review of documentary evidence, we were assured that there were equality, diversity and inclusion policies in relation to applicants. Discussions with a student representative and staff involved in selection and admissions provided insight into how these are applied within the course, including reasonable adjustments that an applicant may require during the admissions process. (1.7)</p> <p>16. Evidence submitted prior to the inspection detailed the information that applicants are provided with to support them in their decision to accept or confirm their enrolment on the course. As a result of this review and discussions with the course team and wider university staff, we considered whether the cost of the course could be more readily available and clear on the university website and course materials. Therefore, we concluded that a recommendation on standard 1.8 was appropriate.</p>	
<p>Standard 2. Course governance, management and quality.</p>	<p>Met or not met</p>
<p>2.1 Ensure courses are supported by a management and governance plan that includes the roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability of individuals and governing groups in the delivering, resourcing and managing the quality of the course.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>2.2 Ensure that effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with relevant lived experience including carers, and students.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>2.3 Ensure that admissions are aligned to a clear strategy, which includes consideration of: i. wherever appropriate, local and regional capacity for observation opportunities; and ii. the availability of part-time or other flexible course arrangements to widen access wherever possible.</p>	<p>Met.</p>

<p>2.4 Ensure that the person with overall professional responsibility for the course is a relevant qualified professional (social worker, occupational therapist, psychologist or nurse) with appropriate experience of BIA practice.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>2.5 Ensure that there is adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>2.6 Ensure that educators are supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to mental capacity, mental health and human rights legislation and policy, including recent developments, and the practical application of this via the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, including giving support to undertake continuing professional development relevant to their role.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>2.7 Ensure that students have the opportunity to provide feedback about the course and that this feedback is analysed, shared with employers and others involved in commissioning places on the course, and used to inform the management and development of the course.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p><u>Key observations for standard 2.</u></p> <p>17. Information in the documentary evidence submission outlined the course organisational structure, including its governance and quality processes. Discussions with the course team and course lead helped to identify the course, and wider institutional level, roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability. As a result of the documentary evidence review and inspection meetings, we were unsure how the Professional Lead (who was a qualified and experienced BIA, and the person with overall professional responsibility for the course) supports and provides this knowledge and expertise into the running and quality management of the course. We were unable to meet with the Professional Lead but after the inspection we asked for and received follow up documentary evidence and information to support standards 2.1 and 2.4, therefore meeting the requirements. (2.1, 2.4)</p> <p>18. We learnt from discussions with the course team and wider university services of the Academic Experience Group (AEG). This group had involvement and representation from employer partners and people with relevant lived experience, with the aim of monitoring and evaluating the course’s quality and effectiveness. The group also fed into the Continuous Enhancement Planning at the university, to support ongoing monitoring, evaluation and improvement regarding the BIA course. Student feedback was gathered through online questionnaires during teaching sessions, as well as student feedback forms at the end of the course. We were provided with examples of feedback from</p>	

<p>students as well as actions taken by the course team and implemented into the course.</p> <p>19. One example was that a previous version of the course was taught as 5 consecutive days. Feedback from students highlighted that this was intensive and did not provide time to reflect on their learning. Following this feedback the course structure and teaching pattern was changed, and since then, students have expressed this was more workable and able to support their learning and development for the BIA role. (2.2, 2.7)</p> <p>20. We considered evidence across the inspection and were satisfied that the course provider considered the number of students they admit on to the course and took account of the resources and relationships required to run an effective and sustainable course. During these discussions we heard of the work being done by the course provider with their main local authority, where a teaching partnership is already in place but not a specific work group for BIA. (2.3)</p> <p>21. Documentary evidence and discussions with the course team confirmed that there was an adequate provision of appropriately qualified and experienced staff, and that the course team was supported to maintain their knowledge and understanding in relation to BIA practice. (2.5, 2.6).</p>	
<p>Standard 3. Observation opportunities.</p>	<p>Met or not met</p>
<p>3.1 Ensure that each student has the opportunity to undertake a minimum of 2 practice observation opportunities which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. enables the student to shadow a BIA or community DoLS assessment. ii. provide practice experience that can be applied to a variety of settings and types of supervisory body. iii. enables the student to observe a suitably qualified and experienced relevant qualified professional who has relevant and current knowledge, skills and experience to demonstrate safe and effective practice. iv. enables the student to produce a detailed analysis of relevant practice issues which forms part of the student’s overall assessment. 	<p>Met.</p>
<p>3.2 Ensure that the number, duration and range of observation opportunities is appropriate to support the delivery of the course and the achievement of the learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Met.</p>

<p>3.3 Maintain clear collaborative arrangements for planning and communication with providers including a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all observation opportunities.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>Key observations for standard 3.</p> <p>22. Information contained within the mapping form and evidence submitted prior to the inspection confirmed that one of the prerequisites for admission to the course is that applicants must have their employer’s guarantee of two observation opportunities, ideally in different settings, to enable students to observe suitably qualified and experienced professionals in practice. Observations would have to relate to the application of the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards, either in a care home or hospital setting. This requirement was clearly stated in the course flyer, the course website, and was reinforced during the admissions process. There were clear and separate documents for self-funding students on the course regarding observations and this was clearly identified as a requirement, discussed and checked within the admissions process.</p> <p>23. All students were required to complete both observations within the course timeframe. One observation would be carried out during the seven-week training period, allowing students to bring their observations into discussions within sessions, while adhering to ethical considerations such as data protection and confidentiality. Both observations were documented using a standard template provided by the course team during its teaching. The document was verified by the professionals they had observed, and forms part of the final assessment of the course. The other component of the final assessment was a 2,000-word reflective essay, in which students produce a detailed analysis of relevant practice issues informed by their observations. (3.1).</p> <p>24. We were able to learn from the course handbook that once the first observation is recorded using the standard template, it must be submitted to the module tutors for monitoring. This allows the teaching team to review the duration and focus of the observation, provide guidance for the second observation, and ensured that requirements are being met, while recognising that opportunities may vary according to local circumstances. (3.2).</p> <p>25. The course provider had collaborative arrangements in place with observation providers, the sharing of course documentation, the observation template, and course handbook supported this. However, the inspectors considered whether there could be a more robust process for this, such as through an overarching BIA course agreement or procedure with its employer partners and observation</p>	

providers. Therefore, we concluded that a recommendation on standard 3.3 was appropriate.	
Standard 4. Curriculum and assessment	Met or not met
4.1 Ensure that the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks and is designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the requirements of the role as set out in the 6 BIA capabilities set out at Annex 1, as well as a sound understanding of cross-national border issues in relation to practice in Wales, where this is appropriate.	Met.
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners, people with lived experience of social work and carers are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	Met.
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion principles, and, human rights and legislative frameworks.	Met.
4.4 Ensure that the course is continually updated as a result of developments in research, legislation, government policy, best practice, and case law.	Met.
4.5 Ensure that the integration of policy, legal literacy and practice is central to the course.	Met.
4.6 Ensure that the number of hours spent in structured academic learning under the direction of an educator is sufficient to ensure that students meet the required level of competence.	Met.
4.7 Provide staff involved in leading and delivering the training with sufficient protected training time to keep their own practice and knowledge up to date in line with statutory and regulatory requirements.	Met.
4.8 Ensure that assessments are robust, fair, reliable and valid, and that those who successfully complete the course have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to make robust, independent and well-evidenced assessments in the best interests of the person. This should include regular monitoring and evaluation of assessment standards to ensure that they remain robust and reliable.	Met.
4.9 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	Met.
4.10 Ensure that the course is designed to enable students to develop an evidence-informed approach to assessment and evaluation, underpinned by	Met.

skills, knowledge and an ability to interpret and respond appropriately to legislative and policy change and case law.	
4.11 Ensure that the course equips students with knowledge and skills in relation to identifying and anticipating areas of conflict arising from DoLS processes and outcomes, and supporting individuals, families, carers and agencies to understand the checks and balances of the DoLS system, to support a robust, independent and well-evidenced determination in the best interests of the person.	Met.
4.12 Clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the course.	Met.
4.13 Clearly specify that any equivalent award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as a BIA.	Met.
4.14 Clearly specify a process for the appointment of at least 1 external examiner who must be an appropriately experienced and relevant qualified professional.	Met.
<p><u>Key observations for standard 4.</u></p> <p>26. Information shared by the course provider prior to the inspection provided insight into how the content, structure and delivery of the training is in accordance with relevant guidance and frameworks. Discussions with student representative, person with relevant lived experience and written feedback from an employer partner assured us that students can demonstrate that they can meet the BIA capabilities by the end of their training. (4.1)</p> <p>27. We learnt from discussions with the course team and wider university services of the AEG. The AEG had involvement and representation from employer partners and people with relevant lived experience, with the aim of monitoring and evaluating the course's quality and effectiveness. The group also feeds into the Continuous Enhancement Planning at the university, to support ongoing monitoring, evaluation and improvement regarding the BIA course. These key stakeholders were involved in the consultation and planning for the BIA course following the new standards and guidance being released. We heard from the course team of plans for greater and wider involvement from those people with relevant lived experience regarding the course and its ongoing development and review. (4.2)</p> <p>28. We heard how the course is designed and delivered in accordance with the wider university equality and diversity policies, there are a wide range of student support services to help with any reasonable adjustments or individual learning</p>	

needs. The course team spoke of the robust level of pastoral support they offer and can provide to students that link in with the wider university services. (4.3)

29. The AEG supports the annual review of the course and its materials. The teaching team, with a current practicing BIA and those with direct experience and knowledge of BIA and DoLS, ensure that the course is continually updated and the curriculum reflects these changes in legislation, best practice and case law. We were satisfied that the course learning outcomes, materials, and assessments reflect relevant policy, legal literacy, and professional practice. We heard how the course content and teaching seek to enable students to understand and apply key legislation to underpin and justify their decision-making in relation to BIA practice. (4.4, 4.5)

30. We were satisfied that the number of hours and course structure would provide students with opportunities to develop their knowledge, apply legal frameworks and policy, and practice decision-making skills in alignment with the six BIA capabilities. The summative assessment is a 2,000-word reflective essay, which requires students to integrate legal frameworks, policy guidance, and observation experiences to demonstrate competence across the six BIA capabilities. We heard of internal and external moderation which is carried out to ensure that assessments are robust, fair and valid. (4.6, 4.8)

31. The course team have allocated scholarly days each year to engage with continuing professional development activities, including attending training, conferences, workshops and webinars. The course team spoke of the access to resources that they have to ensure their own practice and knowledge regarding BIA and DoLS is upheld, including a practicing BIA within the team and wider teaching staff who are involved in local DoLS teams and services. (4.7)

32. Information submitted by the course provider identified that a formative assignment prepares students for the final reflective essay, with feedback from both peers and tutors. In addition, students receive feedback on the record of their first observation, which feeds into their second observation. The summative assessment is also supported by detailed written feedback against marking criteria, with opportunities for students to seek clarification and discussion where needed. (4.9)

33. The university was able to demonstrate that the approach of a formative assessment through class discussions, including the direct observations and the course timetable shows that the course takes an evidence-based approach. This is further strengthened by the summative assignment which incorporates the person's feelings and thoughts alongside relevant legislation, case law and values. The presentation on the first day from the course team confirmed that

<p>teaching includes capacity assessment, best-interest decision-making, values and ethics, safeguarding, and the impact of coercion and power imbalances. We heard of how students learn to recognise the tensions that may emerge between individuals, families, carers, and agencies. The curriculum covers the checks and balances within the DoLS system, including the statutory roles of the BIA, IMCA, and MH Assessor, so that students can explain and apply these to practice. (4.10, 4.11)</p> <p>34. We were satisfied that information contained within the BIA Course Handbook clearly identifies the requirements for student progression and achievement within the course. Guidance for students is explicit that only successful completion of the full course leads to eligibility to be approved as a Best Interests Assessor, there is no alternative or equivalent award. (4.12, 4.13)</p> <p>35. We received initial and additional evidence from the course provider regarding the process for recruiting an external examiner for the course, confirming the current person in place, their experience and Social Work England registration. During discussions with the course team, we spoke through and explored the external examiner process supported by the university wide policy and procedure for external examiner recruitment. We considered whether this could be made more applicable to the BIA course and provide guidance/information to applicants regarding their recruitment and bringing appropriate knowledge and experience of the BIA role to the course. Therefore, we concluded that a recommendation on standard 4.14 was appropriate.</p>	
<p><u>Standard 5. Supporting students.</u></p>	<p><u>Met or not met</u></p>
<p>5.1 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their health and wellbeing including confidential counselling services. The course must also equip students to understand the potential impact of BIA practice on their own emotional and mental wellbeing, and the importance of identifying ways to handle this impact.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.2 Ensure that students have access to a system of academic and pastoral support for their progression, development and welfare.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.</p>	<p>Met.</p>

<p>5.4 Make reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the specialist, capabilities in accordance with relevant legislation.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.5 Provide timely information to students about their curriculum, observation requirements, assessments, and implications for their continuing practice, including arrangements for annotation of the register and requirements for periodic refresher training.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.6 Ensure that students are able to draw links between the completion of their BIA course and ongoing refresher training, and the ongoing requirements of their professional registration such as continuing professional development.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.7 Provide timely and meaningful feedback to students on their progression and performance in assessments.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.8 Ensure there is an effective process in place for students to make academic appeals.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p>5.9 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences.</p>	<p>Met.</p>
<p><u>Key observations for standard 5.</u></p> <p>36. We heard from the course team and lead of the robust levels of university student support services available to students on the course, to support both their educational and pastoral support needs, including personal tutors. We were assured from documentary evidence that there was a process in place for the course to ensure the ongoing suitability of students’ conduct, character and health. Discussions with a student representative and the course team enabled us to triangulate documentary evidence regarding the support mechanisms and</p>	

processes in place to support any reasonable adjustments a student may require to progress through the course. (5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

37. The course handbook contained the information that students required for the BIA course, including guidance of refresher training and this is also covered in teaching materials. The student representative that we met confirmed that they had access to this information from the course materials and teaching sessions. They knew where and how to make an academic appeal, and were aware of the need for refresher training, and the ongoing requirements of their professional registration such as continuing professional development. (5.5, 5.6, 5.8)

38. Information submitted by the course provider identified that a formative assignment prepared students for the final reflective essay, with feedback from both peers and tutors. In addition, students received feedback on the record of their first observation, which feeds into their second observation. The summative assessment was also supported by detailed written feedback against marking criteria, with opportunities for students to seek clarification and discussion where needed. (5.7)

39. We considered whether the course provider ensured that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, were in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and organisational wrongdoing, and report concerns openly and safely without fear of adverse consequences. We were able to locate the university Whistleblowing Policy from searching for this and able to confirm this was in place. However, we concluded that the links and guidance for students regarding the policy and support/process could be clearer within the course handbook and/or course materials. Therefore, we concluded that a [recommendation](#) on standard 5.9 was appropriate.

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	1.1, 1.3 and 1.4	<p>The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates that they fairly and consistently assess applicants' experience, regardless of their professional background and confirm that they have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the potential to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the BIA capabilities. • the potential to meet the eligibility criteria for the role set out in the relevant legislation governing BIA practice. • confirm that applicants have, and can demonstrate, suitable prior experience. • confirm that applicants have a robust level of legal literacy in appropriate legislative and policy areas. 	15 th October 2026	Standard 1
2	1.2	The education provider will provide evidence that demonstrates how students are made aware, and reminded, that they must inform the course provider if their registration status changes for any reason, or if they are subject to any investigation	15 th October 2026	Standard 1

		or action by any professional regulator or employer.		
--	--	--	--	--

As conditions have been attached to the approval, the University of Hertfordshire 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	1.5	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider strengthening and providing consistency for all key stakeholder involvement in the admissions process.	Standard 1.5
2	1.8	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider providing more accessible information for applicants regarding the course fee information.	Standard 1.8
3	3.3	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers a more robust process regarding the planning and communications of the course observation opportunities, such as through an overarching BIA course agreement or procedure with its employer partners and observation providers.	Standard 3.3
4	4.14	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers developing the university wide policy and procedure for external examiner recruitment and whether this could be made more applicable to the BIA course. To provide guidance/information to applicants regarding their recruitment and bringing appropriate knowledge and experience of the BIA role to the course.	Standard 4.14

5	5.9	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers making the information and guidance for students regarding reporting and raising their concerns more accessible and clearer within course documents and materials.	Standard 5.9
---	-----	--	------------------------------

Meeting of Conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1			
2			
3			

Findings