



Inspection Report

Course provider: Anglia Ruskin University,
Peterborough

Course approval: BA (Hons) Social Work, MA
Social Work, PGDip Social Work and BA (Hons)
Social Work Degree Apprenticeship

Inspection dates: 3rd – 6th September 2024

Report date:	28.10.24
Inspector recommendation:	Approved with conditions
Regulator decision:	Approved with conditions
Date of Regulator decision:	23.05.25
Date conditions met and approved:	TO BE ADDED

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.....	7
Meetings with external stakeholders	7
Findings	7
Standard one: Admissions.....	7
Standard two: Learning environment	11
Standard three: Course governance, management and quality	17
Standard four: Curriculum assessment.....	22
Standard five: Supporting students	29
Standard six: Level of qualification to apply for entry onto the register	32
Proposed outcome.....	33
Conditions.....	33
Recommendations	35
Annex 1: Education and training standards summary	38
Regulator decision	45
Annex 2: Meeting of conditions	45
Findings	45
Regulator decision	46

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, new course 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 appearance of bias in the approval process.
8. The inspectors complete an assessment of the evidence provided and advise the

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

officer if they have any queries that may be able to be addressed in advance of the inspection.

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- or 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, without conditions or that it does not meet the criteria for 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 decision about the approval of the course.

13. The 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. Course details: Anglia Ruskin University wish to run four new site-specific courses at their Peterborough campus. These are a BA (Hons) Social Work degree, an MA Social Work and PGDip course, and a BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship.

Inspection ID	ARU Peterborough
Course provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Validating body (if different)	N/A
Courses inspected	BA (Hons) Social Work MA Social Work PGDip Social Work BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship
Mode of Study	Full time
Maximum student cohort	BA (Hons) Social Work - 25 MA Social Work and PGDip Social Work - 25 BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship - 35
Proposed first intake	September 2025
Date of inspection	3 rd – 6 th September 2024
Inspection team	Daisy Bragadini (Education Quality Assurance Officer) Sally Gosling (Lay Inspector) Stephen Stericker (Registrant Inspector)

Language

16. In this document we describe Anglia Ruskin University as ‘the education provider’ or ‘the university’ and we describe the BA (Hons) Social Work, MA Social Work, PGDip Social Work, and the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship, as ‘the courses’.

Inspection

17. An onsite inspection took place from 3rd to 6th September 2024 at University House, Anglia Ruskin University's main campus site in Peterborough. The course provider, based at Peterborough, currently delivers a BA (Hons) Social Work and MA Social Work course in line with those delivered at the Chelmsford and Cambridge campus sites. In addition, it also delivers a BA (Hons) Social Work (part time) course, which is due to close in August 2025.

18. As part of a longer-term plan for development, Anglia Ruskin University Peterborough aims to deliver its own newly designed social work courses, increasing autonomy as a provider, and enabling an enhanced response to local demographic and workforce needs.

19. As part of this process the inspection team planned to meet with key stakeholders including students studying on the current courses, university staff, employers and people with lived experience of social work.

20. 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

21. No parties disclosed a conflict of interest.

Meetings with students

22. The inspection team met with students from the current BA and MA courses, who were at various points of their training, and included student representatives. Discussions included their experience of practice placements, feedback they provided on the courses and received on their work, support and preparation for placements and their curriculum.

Meetings with course staff

23. Over the course of the inspection, the inspection team met with university staff members from the course team involved in teaching and assessment, the senior managers, staff involved in the delivery and quality assurance of placements, the admissions lead, staff from the central apprenticeship team, and professional support services.

Meeting with people with lived experience of social work

24. The inspection team met with the Service User Participation and Advice group (SUPA) who have been involved in interviewing and assessing applicants on the courses, assessing preparation for direct practice, and delivering sessions for students. Discussions included how they worked with the course team, how they were supported to carry out their work, and ways in which they felt able to provide feedback on the courses.

Meetings with external stakeholders

25. The inspection team met with representatives from placement partners including Peterborough City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, housing and support charities, the Child and Family Courts Advisory Support Service (CAFCASS), local schools, and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust.

Findings

26. 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

27. Prior to the inspection the course provider submitted evidence which illustrated the different stages of the holistic assessment at the application stage for the courses. This process, along with the entry criteria for the courses, outlined how the applicants' potential to develop the knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards, their command of English, and capability to meet academic standards would be assessed. Applicants would be required to submit a written activity in response to a video or article, attend an interview, and engage in an observed group discussion. The

inspection team heard that the course team plan to change this from online delivery to in person. As a result, the course team will need to plan how the written activity will be managed, and how applicants' ICT skills will be assessed. Consequently, although able to review the core component parts of the application process which will be followed, the inspection team recommend a condition be applied to this standard. The course team will need to demonstrate how the written task will be administered and how ICT skills will be assessed through an in-person event.

28. As part of these plans to finalise how the course team will manage the admissions process, the inspection team agreed that the course provider would need to demonstrate how they will be administering this in partnership with their employer partners for the degree apprenticeship course. The details of the requirements are contained within the conditions table.

29. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.1 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

30. The inspection team heard that the interview process was identical for applicants applying for both the undergraduate and the postgraduate routes. The inspection team understood that the qualification entry criteria were different for each of the routes. However, they felt that consideration should be given to how applicants demonstrate their ability to meet the academic standards required as part of the MA and PGDip courses and so be differentiated from the undergraduate course application process.

31. As a result, the inspection team are applying a recommendation to this standard. This will be for the course team to consider how the tasks at application stage could reflect courses' respective demands, depending on whether they lead to a level 6 or level 7 award.

32. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 1.1. Full details of the recommendation in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 1.2

33. Preceding the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the individual interview questions and the interview feedback template which would be used as part of the admissions process. These questions were designed to enable the panel to assess prior relevant experience of the applicants. The inspection team were also provided with evidence which outlined how the university manage and apply requests to have accredited prior learning considered as part of their application. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 1.3

34. Through documentary evidence and a meeting with the SUPA group, the inspection team understood how people with lived experience would be involved in the admissions process. They had been involved in designing the interview questions, sitting on the panel during individual interviews and involved in observing the group discussion. During the meeting held with employer partners, the inspection team heard how employers found the questions used at interview clear, the planning organised, and that the environment was accessible. Employer partners had also been involved in the admissions process and had been invited to be part of its review.

35. The inspection team heard that the apprenticeship admissions process would involve representatives from local authorities, and they had produced clear joint working roles and expectations. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

36. The inspection team considered the role of the employer partner within the admissions process for the degree apprenticeship course and whether the representative would also be the prospective apprentice's employer. The inspection team will apply a recommendation to this standard to encourage the admissions team to consider, in relation to this aspect of the process, how they will ensure consistency, equity and fairness for all degree apprenticeship applicants put forward by different employers.

37. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 1.3. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 1.4

38. As part of the initial submission of evidence, additional evidence submission, and meetings held during the inspection, the inspection team explored the processes for assessing suitability. All applicants would be encouraged to subscribe to the enhanced

DBS update service. If they were already registered, they would be required to provide their code as part of the admissions process for the DBS team to verify. If an applicant did not already have an enhanced DBS check this would be required at the point of application. For prospective apprentices already holding an enhanced DBS check, the university would request evidence of review and approval of this check from the employer.

39. A process was outlined within evidence and discussed during the meeting with the admissions team, about the decision-making process followed in the cases where disclosures had been made or DBS checks had identified convictions. The inspection team concluded that developing a set of guidelines to support this process would be beneficial and increase consistency within this process.

40. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 1.4. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

41. Occupational health checks were also carried out as part of the admissions process where this was appropriate.

42. Within the narrative evidence submitted and during the inspection, the inspection team were informed that the course team were redesigning the suitability declaration for the courses. Although an indication of what would be covered within the declaration was provided, this was yet to be finalised.

43. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 1.4 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 1.5

44. Through the initial evidence submission, the inspection team were provided with the Access and Participation plan and the Race Equality Charter, with an associated action plan. Reasonable adjustments would be able to be requested for the application stage and it was made clear to applicants that declaring a health condition or impairment would not impact on decisions taken about offering a place on their course. The inspection team heard that the SUPA group would be involved as part of the regular

review of the admissions process, and the course team planned to offer equality, diversity and inclusion training to all members of the interview panel.

45. During the inspection, the inspection team met with members of the admissions management team. They heard of the proactive channels of support available to applicants, who were responsive to their needs, and provided a service which considered a wide range of support areas and accessibility issues.

46. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met. They are also applying a recommendation to this standard in relation to the development of training for all panel members and the analysis of data collected for apprenticeship applicants.

47. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 1.5. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 1.6

48. Prior to the inspection the inspection team reviewed information provided to applicants through the course websites. Topics covered the structure of the courses, module content, costs and financial support, and staff profiles. Applicants invited for an interview were provided with Admissions Instructions which included information about Social Work England and its role as the regulator. If applicants were successful, they were invited to taster sessions and provided with the contact details for the admissions lead, where there were further opportunities to ask questions about the courses. During the meeting held with students on the current courses the inspection team heard that they had felt well informed about various aspects of the courses, which enabled them to make a decision about whether the course would be right for them. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard two: Learning environment

Standard 2.1

49. Within the course specification, provision of 200 days of learning within practice settings was outlined. Within the BA (Hons) Social Work course, students would complete 10 skills days within Practice Skills 1, 10 skills days and 70 placement days in Practice Skills 2, and 110 placement days within Practice Skills 3.

50. Within the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship course, apprentices would complete 10 skills days within Social Work Apprentice Skills, and 10 skills days in Social

Work Apprentice Skills 2. Practice Placement 1 would provide 70 placement days and Practice Placement 2, would provide 110.

51. For the MA and PGDip Social Work courses Practice Stage 1 and 2 would provide 20 skills days, and 70 placement days, with Practice Stage 3 providing 110 placement days.

52. During the inspection the inspection team explored the processes which were followed to ensure students were provided with contrasting placements and at least one statutory placement. The inspection team were provided with evidence and heard how the quality assurance process completed for all placements determined whether the placement met the requirements to be a statutory placement. Students completed placement profile forms which were updated for preparation purposes and planning of the second placement, as well as aiding matching the student to the placement. The inspection team heard that this was completed 4-5 months prior to the placement starting and that students attended interviews with their intended placement provider. The central placement team held a database of where students completed their placements which supported the team in ensuring contrast was provided.

53. For the degree apprenticeship course, the inspection team heard that the placement profile form would be used if apprentices moved from their employer for a placement elsewhere. Following conversations with the placement team and employer partners, the inspection team considered that ensuring the placement profile form was used for all placements completed by apprentices, would strengthen processes in place. This would support preparation for placement providers, ensure that the placements were contrasting, and were able to meet the required standard.

54. The inspection team were satisfied that attendance recording was robust, and students were clear on what they were required to do to make up missed placement or skills days.

55. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met and are attaching a recommendation to this standard.

56. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 2.1. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

57. During the inspection the inspection team were made aware that a small number of students had been provided with simulated placements as part of a plan for reasonable adjustments. After the inspection, the course provider submitted additional contextual information in relation to how the simulated placements were used, and how the course provider was able to assure themselves that all course learning outcomes were able to be met by the students. Following the provision of this information, clear

guidance was shared with the course provider that the use of wholly simulated placements was not recognised by Social Work England as being able to meet the requirements of the education and training standards. Guidance was provided which explained that although partly simulated placements, which were used as part of a reasonable adjustment plan, may be able to meet the requirements of the standards, Social Work England would recommend that all other alternatives be considered first. The course provider submitted assurances that simulated placements would not be used for students in the future. In relation to standard 5.4, the inspection team are attaching a recommendation which addresses how the individual needs of students are balanced alongside how they are enabled to demonstrate fulfilment of the professional standards.

Standard 2.2

58. Prior to the inspection the inspection team were provided with the Quality Assurance in Practice Learning (QAPL) audit form. For each new placement, the QAPL audit form was completed to determine whether or not a placement would be able to provide learning opportunities which would enable students to meet the professional standards. All placement providers were reviewed annually, and this was carried out more regularly if there were concerns that a placement was not able to provide the required learning opportunities. The inspection team heard examples of where a placement provider within the private, voluntary and independent sector had been unable to provide sufficient learning opportunities. Through discussion, the inspection team heard how the placement team had managed this through an ongoing quality assurance process, and an action plan to make improvements.

59. During the learning agreement, midway and end of placement meetings, the placement's learning opportunities were planned, monitored and reviewed.

60. As part of the additional evidence submission, the inspection team were informed that ARU Peterborough have held autonomy for their placement provision for one year. As part of this, they were developing clear plans to extend and increase the range of placements they were able to offer.

61. Following the conclusion of all placements, practice educators, on site supervisors and students completed QAPL feedback surveys. The inspection team were informed that the Greater Cambridgeshire Social Work Teaching Partnership (GCSWTP) was currently in the process of reviewing how this process could be improved and feedback shared, and the practice lead for the courses had been nominated by the teaching partnership to lead on this project. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

62. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 2.2. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 2.3

63. Preceding the inspection, the course provider submitted the placement handbook, the placement agreement and the QAPL audit form. The placement agreement outlined clear provision for the planning of students' induction, supervision, support and resources. The placement handbook detailed the roles and responsibilities of students, practice educators and on-site supervisors, and clear points throughout placements were used to monitor and manage workload and support. The facilitative procedure, detailed within the placement handbook, was used to address, monitor and plan for action points required when an issue or concern had been raised. Within the degree apprenticeship course, the tripartite quarterly review meetings would also be utilised to ensure the workload, access to resources and supervision were appropriate, and meeting the needs of the apprentice.

64. During the meeting held with employer partners, the inspection team heard that the student profiles used by the course provider were an effective tool in supporting teams to match the student with both a suitable placement and practice educator. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 2.4

65. Within the placement handbooks for each course, induction, placement hours, title of student social worker, supervision and learning opportunities were required to be appropriately planned. Both the PCF and the professional standards were used to plan the learning content of the placements and help to ensure they aligned to the relevant stage of training.

66. During the meeting with students on the current courses, the inspection team heard how, when they had raised concerns about responsibilities provided on placement, the placement lead and university staff had supported them to make the changes necessary. The inspection team also explored the particular status of the apprentice social worker and how expectations of their responsibilities would be appropriately managed. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 2.5

67. Preceding the inspection, the inspection team were provided with the module outlines for the three modules required to be completed prior to the first placement for all courses. Practice Skills 1 for the BA course, Social Work Apprentice Skills 1 for the apprenticeship course, and Practice Stage 1 for the postgraduate routes incorporate the assessment of preparation for direct practice. Students would be required to complete an analytical written assignment on the requisite skills for practice and complete an assessed role play. The readiness for direct practice level of the PCF and the professional standards would inform the assessment of students prior to starting their first placement.

68. As part of the learning agreement, students would be required to agree to and sign a declaration highlighting elements relating to their suitability, including their DBS status, conduct, attendance and changes to their circumstances, before each placement. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard 2.6

69. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were provided with a link to the webpage for the PG Cert Practice Educator (Social Work) delivered by the university and the information on the 2024 National Organisation for Teaching Annual Conference, hosted by ARU Peterborough. The inspectors heard that practice educators working with the course provider had access to the Centre of Excellence in Practice Learning, and through their request for additional evidence, the inspection team received fliers for the workshops delivered and planned for practice educators, their mentors, and on-site supervisors.

70. During the meeting held with practice educators, the inspection team noted that some of the practice educators had very recently gained their practice educator qualification, so were unable to reflect on how they worked with the course provider. Participants of the meeting shared that they were regularly invited to workshops, however some felt unaware, for example, of the module content or course timetable. Some shared that they had utilised the QAPL process to raise where they identified a lack of preparation for some placement providers, in cases where the provision was new. Overall, the practice educators shared that they felt supported, and communication provided from the university practice team was of a high standard, and from which they and their students benefitted.

71. Some practice educators expressed that they were not always aware of curriculum content the students had completed prior to starting their placements. They noted that access to up-to-date information on the structure of the courses would support them further in their roles in the teaching and assessing of students.

72. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 2.6. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

73. During the meeting held with staff involved in practice-based learning, the inspection team heard how the placement team maintained a spreadsheet record of the qualifications, registration and training history for the independent practice educators they worked with. This record was updated annually.

74. In relation to onsite practice educators, the inspection team heard that their employers held responsibility for monitoring their qualifications, training and registration status. However, the inspection team were unable to identify the mechanism used by the course provider to enable them to have oversight of this and assure themselves that relevant requirements for all practice educators were met. As a result, the inspection team are recommending a condition be attached to this standard to ensure that all practice educators, including on site practice educators, are registered, have relevant and current knowledge and skills, and can support safe and effective learning.

75. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 2.6 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 2.7

76. In relation to this standard, the inspection team reviewed the learning agreement which clearly outlined the expectations for students and practice educators to have read and understood the university's policy for whistleblowing and the facilitative procedure. The placement handbook contained the policy for whistleblowing and both students and practice educators confirmed they were aware of the policy, how to use it and where they could access support and guidance.

77. The inspection team were also made aware of the work the course provider had undertaken, in response to student feedback, to integrate teaching and learning opportunities to help encourage and empower students to feel able to challenge wrongdoing and unsafe behaviour. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard three: Course governance, management and quality

Standard 3.1

78. In relation to this standard, the inspection team reviewed the staff CVs, the academic governance structure for the academic board and sub committees, and the Terms of Reference for the ARU- P Academic Board.

79. As part of the meetings with the course team and Peterborough Executive Group, the inspection team were provided with presentations which included detailed information about the governance structures. The senior management team outlined the planned phases as ARU Peterborough moved towards achieving its ambition to become an independent institution with degree-awarding powers over the next 10 years. The inspection team heard that governance structures were integrated with ARU, overseen by their own governors, who worked with the ARU senate. The Peterborough Education and Quality Assurance Committee was overseen by the Academic Board, centrally managed through ARU, alongside the Education Committee. The Peterborough Student Experience Committee was in the process of being established with its own working groups, as part of the phased approach to establishing independence.

80. The inspection team were also provided with detailed overviews of the teaching team's qualifications, experience, current connections with professional practice and areas of expertise. Each course would be led by a course director, all of whom were registered social workers. Roles and responsibilities, and lines of accountability were outlined and rationale and planning behind the development of the new courses and plans for the future were clearly demonstrated. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 3.2

81. During the inspection, the inspection team discussed placement agreements and heard they were in place with all placement providers and detailed the terms of the agreements. These agreements were all updated annually and were informed by the results from the QAPL surveys conducted. Within the Placement Handbook, the facilitative procedure was provided and outlined the process which was followed in instances of placement breakdown. The Learning Agreement covered plans for induction and supervision, the students' use of IT whilst on placement, procedures for dealing with complaints, whistleblowing and confidentiality. Whilst meeting with students and the placement team the inspection team heard examples of contingency

placement planning where placements had been deemed inappropriate or where students' needs had changed. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.3

82. Within the Learning Agreement, plans for supervision, reasonable adjustments and learning needs, lone working and safety, and dealing with concerns were laid out. Policies in relation to these areas were required to have been provided, read and understood by students, practice educators and on-site supervisors and agreed to at the learning agreement meeting. At the point at which the QAPL placement audit was completed, the placement lead ensured all placement providers held the necessary policies relating to students' wellbeing, health and risk, and this audit process was repeated annually.

83. Placement tutors were able to provide support for students, along with the students' practice educators and on-site supervisors, with students able to benefit from the range of support services delivered through the university. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 3.4

84. In relation to this standard the inspection team reviewed evidence which demonstrated how employer partners had been involved in the design and development of the new courses at Peterborough. This included the Validation Event Document which illustrated employer partners' input into curriculum design, and the GCSWTP meeting minutes, which highlighted how members of the social work team worked in partnership with local authority employer partners.

85. Examples of employer partner feedback informing the new courses' designs included the extension of placement days to 70 and 110, and the introduction of a statutory social work module.

86. Plans with the teaching partnership included the development of focussed work streams, one of which would be chaired by the practice lead and plans to focus on quality assurance of placements and enhancement of the analysis of feedback from the QAPL process.

87. The course provider worked with the Social Work Area Network (SWAN) which provided a forum for placement capacity planning, and further evidence illustrated some employers' involvement in the courses through guest lecturing.

88. Although the inspection team acknowledged the collaboration with employer partners in the design of the courses, they were unable to identify formal and reliable governance mechanisms in place which would continue to work in the future. They were unable to identify how employers for all courses would be enabled to engage in the management and ongoing monitoring of the new courses. Building on the plans already in place, the inspection team are recommending that formal mechanisms are established for employers to be effectively engaged in ongoing feedback

89. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.4 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 3.5

90. Annual monitoring processes included feedback from students from the Module Evaluation Surveys and the Student Staff Liaison Committees. The inspection team were provided with the example survey and student meeting minutes. Each new course would undergo their own individual annual monitoring process, overseen by Peterborough's Education and Quality Assurance Committee (PEQAC) which reported to Peterborough's Academic Board. Course Action Plans would be developed where necessary, and in response to the outcomes of annual monitoring. Modular review was currently undertaken by Peterborough, and for the new courses, these would also result in a module improvement plans where results required this. Feedback from external examiners and placement audits would contribute to the monitoring and improvement of the courses.

91. The inspection team were provided with the draft SUPA handbook and meeting minutes. The group met monthly and discussed the work they had been involved in and future opportunities, and there was opportunity there for informal feedback to be shared.

92. As described above, in relation to standard 3.4, the inspection team acknowledged the contributions and input from employer partners, students and people with lived experience of social work, in the development and design of the new courses. However, they were unable to identify how the university's monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems would involve these stakeholder groups systematically in the

future, including for the degree apprenticeship course. Therefore, whilst they recognise the role of the annual monitoring process to support the regular evaluation of the courses, they require the development of oversight systems to ensure the ongoing involvement of people with lived experience and employer partners.

93. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.5 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 3.6

94. As part of the initial and additional evidence submission, the inspection team reviewed evidence of considered planning which had been undertaken by the course team to ensure provision of placements was in line with the number of students on the courses. The inspection team reviewed detailed narrative evidence which demonstrated scrutiny of national and regional statistics related to social work courses. In addition, the inspection team heard how review of their placement and practice educator capacity, as well as resourcing, were considered, and aligned to student numbers on their courses.

95. As part of this evidence, and during the inspection, the inspection team heard of the recent and ongoing work, to expand registered placement opportunities. The course provider had also increased the number of independent practice educators registered with ARU Peterborough and had started to deliver a PGCert Practice Educator Social Work programme. Ongoing work with a local authority was increasing their capacity for practice educators, and the course team were confident in their ability to maintain this area of growth.

96. During the meetings with the course team, the inspection team explored how the increase in demand for placements through the introduction of the degree apprenticeship course would impact placement availability for the other courses. They were satisfied that the partnerships they were developing with local authorities and placement providers would be sufficient to provide all students and apprentices with suitable practice placements. Discussions with the senior management team included the planned growth of placement expansion in regional areas, and their expectation

that there would be a redistribution of demand for placements across the new courses. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

97. Further to the evidence the inspection team reviewed in relation to planned numbers of students for the courses, placement capacity and workforce demand, the inspection team are recommending that the course team maintain a clear overview of student numbers as the courses become established.

98. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 3.6. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 3.7

99. Preceding the inspection the inspection team were provided with the CV for the professional lead for the courses. This illustrated appropriate qualification, experience and professional registration. During the meeting with the senior management team, the inspection team heard about how the assistant principal and the professional lead worked together to manage the courses and provided strategic oversight and expert professional advice. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 3.8

100. In relation to this standard the inspection team were provided with the Academic Work Balance Model which was used to assess the staff resource required to deliver the courses. The inspection team were informed that staffing needs and recruitment were evaluated on an annual basis, and they heard a commitment from the Principal and Assistant Principal that staff would be recruited to respond to the predicted level of growth for the courses. At the time of the inspection the course team were actively recruiting two full time social work lecturers, one of whom was already in post at the time of the visit. Both within the staff CVs and the introductions during the presentations from the course team, the inspection team were able to be assured that staff were appropriately qualified and experienced and held a range of specialist subject knowledge.

101. As part of an additional evidence request, the inspection team were informed about the plans for recruitment for specialist staff who would be involved in the delivery of the apprenticeship course. The inspection team reviewed the Study Coach Job Description, which outlined the roles and responsibilities which would be covered.

102. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 3.9

103. As part of the initial evidence submission and subsequent additional submission, the inspection team were provided with data in relation to student progression and outcomes. The course provider explained that the small current cohort sizes meant data collected was limited in terms of capacity for meaningful evaluation. However, the course team articulated clear plans to capture relevant data for the new courses through its annual monitoring reports, which would enable them to evaluate and use student data, including in relation to EDI.

104. Subsequently the inspection team were unable to agree that this standard was met and are applying a condition to this standard.

105. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 3.9 in relation to the approval of these courses.

106. 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 3.10

107. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the staff CVs which illustrated a range of examples of staff maintaining links to professional practice, pursuing academic qualifications and research, and leading on work projects within the profession. In addition, the inspection team reviewed the ARU Mentoring Policy and heard from members of staff about the support provided for them to gain guidance from more experienced colleagues. The inspection team heard from the course and senior management team about allocation of time for continuous professional development. For staff who were engaged with practice, a further 120 hours were allocated for this work. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard four: Curriculum assessment

Standard 4.1

108. The inspection team reviewed the professional standards mapping forms for each course. These illustrated how the courses would enable students to demonstrate that they had the knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards. The course team submitted the module definition forms for the courses which evidenced how the course learning outcomes were mapped to the professional standards. Both the PCF and the Knowledge and Skills Statements informed the content of the courses and were used to support the assessment of students throughout the courses. During the meeting with students, the inspection team heard how the professional standards were integrated throughout their courses and embedded within their assessments. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 4.2

109. The inspection team reviewed the Validation Event Document which highlighted the stakeholder consultation which had taken place as part of the design for the courses. These groups included employer workforce development leads from statutory placement providers, the SUPA group, the academic team, and some informal feedback from students. Detailed narrative evidence provided to the inspection team illustrated the considered and collaborative approach taken to the design process by the course team. This included numerous examples of how particular feedback and consultation had informed design aspects of the courses, such as the introduction of a specific statutory social work module for all courses. For the undergraduate courses, new co-designed and co-delivered modules with the SUPA group would support the course to embed principles of coproduction.

110. Similarly to standards 3.4 and 3.5, the inspection team recognised the work undertaken by the course team to synthesise and reflect the views of relevant stakeholder groups in the design of the curriculum. However, they were less clear, beyond the annual monitoring processes, how the views of employers, practitioners, and people with lived experience of social work, would be incorporated into the ongoing development and review of the curriculum on an ongoing basis.

111. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.2 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 4.3

112. When meeting with the staff responsible for delivering professional support services, the inspection team heard a number of examples of how the course provider ensured the physical environment was accessible, promoted health and wellbeing, and treated all students fairly. Students were encouraged to declare health and wellbeing conditions and access appropriate support, and staff were prepared and ready to facilitate reasonable adjustments.

113. Another highlighted example came from the redesign of the course module reading lists. Each had been designed to include two new categories: 'underrepresented voices and perspectives', and 'international perspectives'. Content for these reading lists was co-selected alongside the SUPA group.

114. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 4.4

115. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team were referred to the Validation Event Document. This highlighted the process of updating the courses and designing modules which reflected developments in research, legislation, government policy and best practice. Beyond the initial new design process for the new courses, the course team evidenced that they would use their annual monitoring processes, module evaluations and Student Forum feedback to inform change to the modules in the future. Module leaders and library colleagues worked closely to ensure that teaching resources, research literature and textbooks were updated and reflected new developments in the field of study. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

116. In order to support the ongoing development of the new courses, the inspection team are attaching a recommendation to this standard in relation to the process of continual updating. This is to include input from employers and people with lived experience of social work, and particularly in relation to best practice.

117. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 4.4. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 4.5

118. In relation to this standard the inspection team were provided with the Education Strategy and the Active Learning Framework, both of which outlined the teaching and assessment strategy. Module outlines highlighted where students were provided with the opportunity to learn and apply theoretical principles, and the course design enabled opportunities to apply theories alongside colleagues from SUPA and whilst on placements. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

Standard 4.6

119. Preceding the inspection, the inspection team were provided with narrative evidence which outlined the opportunities students would be provided with to work with and learn from other professions. Colleagues within the faculty from midwifery and nursing presented guest lectures, and simulated learning areas provided contextualised learning for students on the new courses. During the inspection the inspection team visited the extended reality learning room, where students would have the opportunity to learn in an immersive environment, including about other professionals' roles.

120. A solicitor and CAFCASS manager supported teaching of courtroom skills and students had the opportunity to visit the Crown and County Court to observe hearings. Events through World Social Work Day and the Social Work Society provided further opportunities for students to learn about other professions.

121. During the meeting held with students, they noted their opportunity to work alongside midwifery students during the Ruskin modules as part of the BA course. A new Interagency and Interdisciplinary Collaboration module has been developed for the undergraduate courses, which focuses on the development of skills required to work effectively within a multidisciplinary working environment.

122. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 4.7

123. Prior to the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the Academic Regulations which outlined the hours of study allocated to course credits. Module definition forms highlighted the number of hours and credits attached to each. Students would be required to attend 80% of their academic sessions, and intervention and support were offered if levels dropped below this.

124. Following on from student feedback the teaching hours allocated to the postgraduate courses have been increased for the new courses, to provide further academic teaching time in the shorter courses.

125. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.8

126. In relation to this standard, the inspection team reviewed the Academic Regulations and the module definition forms, which illustrated how the module assessments were aligned to learning outcomes mapped to the professional standards. As part of an additional evidence request, the inspection team reviewed the assessment strategy which outlined the rationale for incorporating particular assessment methods. These included presentations, short writing assignments, placement portfolios, poster designs and role play.

127. The inspection team were provided with the assessment strategy for the degree apprenticeship course, along with the module definition forms. However, the inspection team heard that the stipulated assessments were currently indicative for this course. Continued development would be carried out to confirm the granular detail of the content of the assessments and would be conducted with stakeholder input, and undergo internal review and approval by an external examiner before being implemented.

128. A process for internal moderation of assessment marking was outlined, and marking rubrics for students to refer to was available on Canvas, the online learning platform. The inspection team agreed that the standard was met for the BA (Hons), MA and PGDip courses. Given the final assessments for the degree apprenticeship course were yet to be finalised, and were subject to change, the inspection team are recommending a condition be attached to this standard in relation to confirmation of the assessments required.

129. 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 4.9

130. Prior to the inspection the inspection team reviewed the module definition forms, which indicated how each learning outcome would be assessed. The Academic Regulations outlined rules for progression and when students would be required to pass all modules and gain all course credits. Students were required to pass each placement related stage of the course in order to progress on to the final placement. During the meeting with the course team, the assessment strategy was explored. The inspection team heard about the design of the spiral curriculum and how this facilitated students' revisiting and building on prior learning, embedding knowledge and developing skills.

131. The inspection team also heard how the design of the assessment strategy aimed to time assessments so that students wouldn't be overburdened by a crowded assignment deadline schedule. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 4.10

132. The course specification documentation and module definition forms provided detail on how and when students would expect to receive feedback to support their development. Formative assessments and assignment guidance would provide opportunity for students to understand how they could improve their work.

133. During the inspection the inspection team were provided with a demonstration of Canvas, the online learning platform, where students could access the marking rubric. Students were also able to gain support and feedback through the submission of draft assignments, discussion and planning with tutor and peer feedback, assignment checklists, tutorials, and discussion boards.

134. During the meeting with students, they confirmed that feedback supported their development, that there were a range of different ways to access guidance and support, and study skills sessions were helpful.

135. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.11

136. In relation to this standard, the inspection team reviewed the ARU Academic Regulations, staff CVs and Senate Code of Practice for External Examiners on Taught Courses. As part of a request for additional evidence, the inspection team received the CVs for the current external examiners along with modular external examiners' reports.

137. The inspection team were satisfied that the staff CVs indicated appropriate expertise for assessments to be carried out.

138. The inspection team heard that new external examiners would be recruited for the new courses. Therefore, they require these posts to be confirmed for the new courses and are applying a condition to this standard in relation to this.

139. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is recommending that a condition is set against standard 4.11 in relation to the approval of these 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 [proposed outcome](#) section.

Standard 4.12

140. In relation to this standard the course provider submitted narrative evidence which described the range of people involved in student assessment. These included members of the SUPA group, practice educators and on-site supervisors, people with lived experience of social work during their placements, as well as tutors and academic teaching staff. The inspection team also reviewed the Direct Observation Template used to record the planning and assessment of the direct observations' students complete on placement.

141. As part of the apprenticeship course, a study coach and the workplace mentor would provide feedback, manage tripartite meetings and support learners to develop their professional knowledge. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 4.13

142. The inspection team reviewed the module definition forms which demonstrated how evidence informed practice was integrated into the learning outcomes of several modules. The Placement Handbook outlined how students would be required to reflect on their knowledge of theoretical frameworks. Additionally, the Critical Reflections on Practice template was used to require students to identify models, theories or research which informed their decision making.

143. The undergraduate routes both contained a Contemporary Theory and Evidence Based Practice module, and the postgraduate route included the Foundations of Social

Work Practice: Theories and Evidence module. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

Standard five: Supporting students

Standard 5.1

144. Prior to the inspection the inspection team were provided with the weblink to the students support services available through the university. This included counselling services, careers advice and occupational health services. Students were also able to access information and advice about these services through Canvas, the internal online learning platform. During the meeting with the professional services team the inspection team heard about how students could access support for their wellbeing through a support desk on campus, which provided further information about who to contact and where to access support services. Further assurances were provided by the students who felt their wellbeing support needs were provided for by the university. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.2

145. The inspection team reviewed evidence which illustrated the range of resources students could access to support academic development. This included support which was provided through the university's Student Services team and the Disability and Dyslexia support services for students with different learning needs. During the meeting held with professional support services the inspection team met with a range of staff responsible for delivering the services and included a Study Skills Plus coach. Varying levels of academic study support was offered through this service and included individual study skills sessions, bespoke class workshop and online resources available to all. During this meeting the inspection team heard how the Personal Development Tutors worked closely with support services to ensure the needs of each cohort were provided for. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 5.3

146. Preceding the inspection the inspection team were provided with the Student Conduct, Rights and Responsibilities document which students were expected to agree and sign up to at the start of their courses. The inspection team were also provided with the Fitness to Study Policy and Lapses in Professionalism Policy which were applied to

ensure students were fit to practice. Prior to each practice placement all students were required to sign the declaration as part of their placement Student Profile Form to provide details of their DBS check. As part of the additional evidence request the inspection team were provided with the Student Agreement document which students would be required to complete prior to each placement. This included a declaration covering health, suitability, criminal convictions, conduct and attendance. The inspection team determined that this standard was met.

147. The inspection team are applying a recommendation to this standard to require the course provider to consider how processes to assess ongoing suitability are linked to channels of communication with employer partners to monitor this.

148. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 5.3. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 5.4

149. Preceding the inspection the inspection team were provided with the Procedures for Circulation of Summaries of Reasonable Adjustments, which was followed to ensure the timely facilitation of adjustments. The inspection team heard how there were opportunities for students to request reasonable adjustments throughout their courses and gain support and advice to do so. During the meetings with students and the course team, the inspection team heard examples of how students had been provided with supportive and reasonable adjustments. The inspection team were also assured to hear how students were encouraged to take a break in their studies if this was appropriate for their physical and mental wellbeing. The inspection team concluded that this standard was met.

150. The inspection team heard examples of arrangements made for students on the courses and the considered plans and adjustments managed in order for them to continue their study. As a result of this, the inspection team are applying a recommendation to this standard in relation to how the needs of the students are addressed and the necessity to meet the learning outcomes are balanced.

151. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 5.5. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 5.5

152. Prior to the inspection the inspection team were provided with evidence illustrating the different sources of information available to students, about different aspects of their courses. The inspection team reviewed the placement handbooks which contained important information about the placements students would undertake. All modules had their own online learning page, on the Canvas online learning platform, which the inspection team were shown during the inspection. Within these, students were able to locate assessment rubrics, learning resources, assignment dates and the learning outcomes for their courses. The students were also able to access their course community page online, share information and interact with each other.

153. During the meeting with the professional services team, the inspection team heard how the employability team work alongside the course team. They coordinate employability fairs and talks by local employers, including providing information about the assessed and supported year of employment (ASYE). Students confirmed that they had the information they needed about their course. However, some felt that receiving their placement handbook earlier would be beneficial for their understanding of expectations throughout their placements. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Standard 5.6

154. Preceding the inspection, the inspection team reviewed the course and module specifications which detailed the mandatory requirements of attending placement and skills days. During the welcome day sessions on placement and skills days, this requirement was reinforced and was detailed within the placement handbooks. During the meeting with students, they confirmed they were aware of the mandatory parts of the course. Electronic registers monitored attendance, and the inspection team heard that if attendance fell below 80% for taught sessions, personal development tutors were informed, and a support process was activated. Engagement with online resources through Canvas was also monitored, and the inspection team heard how students were contacted if there were concerns.

155. Following a review of the evidence, the inspection team is making a recommendation in relation to 5.6. Full details of the recommendation can be found in the [recommendation](#) section.

Standard 5.7

156. Prior to the inspection the inspection team reviewed the Senate Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students, which outlined the timeframes in which students would receive their feedback. Formative feedback was provided within 5 days and included ways to develop and strengthen their assessments. During placements, students received feedback from their practice educators, onsite supervisors and people with lived experience of social work. During the meeting held with students, the inspection team heard them speak about how their feedback supported their learning and progression. The inspection team were assured that this standard was met.

Standard 5.8

157. The inspection team were provided with the Academic Appeal Form and the Request for a Hearing of the Appeals Panel, used by students when they wished to submit an academic appeal. During the meeting with students, they confirmed their awareness of the process, in addition to support available to them from the Students' Union. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

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

Standard 6.1

158. The course provider submitted the course specifications for the courses which outlined the qualification titles for each, awarded by Anglia Ruskin University. Exit awards available to students held alternative titles, and the course documentation stipulated that these did not convey eligibility to apply for registration. The inspection team agreed that this standard was met.

Proposed outcome

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

Conditions

Conditions for approval are set if there are areas of a course that do not currently meet our standards. Conditions are binding and 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, we are proposing the following condition for this course at this time.

	Standard not currently met	Condition	Date for submission of evidence	Link
1.	1.1 (<i>only for BA (Hons) Social Work degree apprenticeship</i>)	The education provider will provide evidence of how an in-person delivery will take place and include methods for assessment of the written task, individual and group interview and ICT capabilities. For the degree apprenticeship course: The education provider will provide evidence to clarify how it will liaise with employer partners to ensure that the components of the admissions process for the degree apprenticeship are clear and appropriately coordinated.	23.09.25	Paragraph 27
2.	1.4	The education provider will provide evidence of how it enacts a systematic process to assess the suitability of applicants in terms of their conduct, health and character.	23.09.25	Paragraph 38
3.	2.6	The education provider will provide evidence which demonstrates their systematic and comprehensive oversight of the registration, qualifications and experience of all the practice educators they work with, including onsite practice educators.	23.09.25	Paragraph 69
4.	3.4, 3.5, 4.2	The education provider will provide evidence which demonstrates a systematic process for employers to be involved in the management and monitoring of the course. This will include evidence of the active participation of employers and people with lived experience	23.09.25	Paragraph 84 Paragraph 90 Paragraph 109

		of social work in arrangements for the governance of the respective programmes, including quality assurance processes. In addition, the education provider will provide evidence of the processes to enable the involvement of employers, people with lived experience of social work and students in the ongoing development, review and evaluation of the courses.		
5.	3.9	The education provider will demonstrate a clear process which will enable it to collect, analyse and use data on performance, progression and outcomes, including in relation to EDI issues such as trends in attainment and potential attainment gaps for the courses.	23.09.25	Paragraph 103
6.	4.8 (<i>only for BA (Hons) Social Work degree apprenticeship</i>)	The education provider will demonstrate the assessment structure and content for the new BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Apprenticeship course, following their stakeholder engagement, review, and internal approval processes.	23.09.25	Paragraph 126
7.	4.11	The education provider will provide evidence of the new external examiners recruited for the new courses including demonstration of their suitability for the role.	23.09.25	Paragraph 136

Recommendations

In addition to the conditions above, the inspectors identified the following recommendations for the education provider. These recommendations highlight areas

that the education provider may wish to consider. The recommendations do not affect any decision relating to course approval.

	Standard	Detail	Link
1.	1.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider adapting the admissions process for the postgraduate routes so as to assess candidates' readiness to engage with the academic demands of a level 7 course.	Paragraph 27
2.	1.3	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider how they will ensure consistency, equity and fairness when managing the role of the employer representative during interviews for the assessment and selection of prospective apprentices.	Paragraph 34
3.	1.4	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider developing a set of guidelines which support the decision-making process when disclosures are made as part of the suitability checks.	Paragraph 38
4.	1.5	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider developing equality, diversity and inclusion training for all panel members at the admissions stage. They are also recommending that equality, diversity and inclusion data is collected on applicants for the apprenticeship programme. This would enable the team to monitor the equality, diversity and inclusion policies, in partnership with the employer partners they are working with.	Paragraph 44
5.	2.1	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider using the placement profile form for apprentices for all their placements, regardless of where their placements are identified.	Paragraph 49
6.	2.2	The inspectors are recommending that the university continues their work in partnership with the GCSWTP to develop and improve their QAPL process for placements.	Paragraph 58
7.	2.6	The inspectors are recommending that the university considers how it ensures practice	Paragraph 69

		educators have access to information on the structure of each course to optimise their support for students' learning.	
8.	3.6	The inspectors are recommending that the university maintains a clear and strategic oversight of the student numbers and local/regional placement capacity, as the courses develop.	Paragraph 94
9.	4.4	The inspectors are recommending that, through the work developed as part of meeting conditions (3.4, 3.5 & 4.2), the course provider ensures that developments in research and best practice are continually reflected in the updating process for all courses.	Paragraph 115
10.	5.3 (<i>only for BA (Hons) Social Work degree apprenticeship</i>)	The inspectors are recommending that the university and employer processes for ensuring ongoing suitability of apprentices' conduct, character and health are incorporated within the formal apprenticeship management and monitoring processes.	Paragraph 146
11.	5.4	The inspectors are recommending the university consider how they ensure that reasonable adjustments are not at risk of compromising how students are enabled to demonstrate fulfilment of the professional standards	Paragraph 149
12.	5.6	The inspectors are recommending that the university consider reviewing how the threshold attendance requirement for university teaching sessions is presented to students as part of encouraging and supporting students' engagement in their own learning performance, progression and outcomes.	Paragraph 154

It should be noted that all qualifying social work courses will be subject to re-approval under Social Work England's [2021 education and training standards](#).

Annex 1: Education and training standards summary

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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
take up an 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	☐	☒	☒

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
current knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.			
2.7 Ensure that policies and processes, including for whistleblowing, are in place for students to challenge unsafe behaviours and cultures and 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.	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
3.5 Ensure that regular and effective monitoring, evaluation and improvement systems are in place, and that these involve employers, people with lived experience of social work, and students.	☐	☒	☐
3.6 Ensure that the number of students admitted is aligned to a clear strategy, which 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendati on given
that they have the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the professional standards.			
4.2 Ensure that the views of employers, practitioners and people with lived experience of social work are incorporated into the design, ongoing development and review of the curriculum.	☐	☒	☐
4.3 Ensure that the course is designed in accordance with equality, diversity and inclusion 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	☐	☒	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendati on given
necessary to meet the professional standards.			
4.9 Ensure that assessments are mapped to the curriculum and are appropriately sequenced to match students’ progression through the course.	☒	☐	☐
4.10 Ensure students are provided with feedback throughout the course to support their ongoing development.	☒	☐	☐
4.11 Ensure assessments are carried out by people with appropriate expertise, and that external examiner(s) for the course are 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	☒	☐	☐

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
5.2 Ensure that students have access to resources to support their academic development including, for example, personal tutors.	☒	☐	☐
5.3 Ensure that there is a thorough and effective process for ensuring the ongoing suitability of students' conduct, character and health.	☒	☐	☒
5.4 Make supportive and reasonable adjustments for students with health conditions or impairments to enable them to progress through their course and meet the professional standards, in accordance with relevant legislation.	☒	☐	☒
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			

Standard	Met	Not Met – condition applied	Recommendation given
6.1 The threshold entry route to the register will normally be a bachelor’s degree with honours in social work.	☒	☐	☐

Regulator decision

Approved with conditions.

Annex 2: Meeting of conditions

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

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

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

	Standard not met	Condition	Inspector recommendation
1			
2			
3			

Findings

Regulator decision