



Department
for Education

Social work teaching partnerships: An evaluation

Final report

November 2020

Authors: Interface Associates UK Limited



Government
Social Research

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Evaluation findings	5
The Teaching Partnership programme	9
Evaluation purpose and method	11
Teaching partnership membership and representation	15
Enablers and challenges	16
Sustainability	16
Key findings	17
Governance and management structures	18
Enablers and challenges	19
Benefits and outcomes	20
Sustainability	21
Key findings	22
Entry standards and admissions	24
Entry levels	24
Assessment processes	25
Benefits and outcomes	26
Key challenges and enablers	27
Sustainability	27
Key findings	28
Practice placements	29
Placement management	29
Quantity of placements meeting the statutory definition	30
Quality of support for students whilst on placement	33
Benefits and outcomes	34
Challenges and enablers	36
Sustainability	37

Key findings	38
Curriculum	42
Benefits and outcomes	43
Challenges and enablers	45
Sustainability	45
Key findings	46
Academic and practitioner collaboration	48
Benefits and outcomes	49
Challenges and enablers	50
Sustainability	50
Key findings	51
Workforce planning	52
Benefits and outcomes	53
Challenges and enablers	54
Sustainability	54
Key findings	55
Workforce development	56
Benefits and outcomes	57
Challenges and enablers	58
Sustainability	59
Key findings	60
Overall conclusions	61
Annex One: Stretch Criteria	64
Annex Two: Method	67
Annex Three: Data	71
Data returns (January 2019)	71
Data refresh analysis (January 2020)	79
Annex Four: Glossary	85

Executive Summary

The Social Work Teaching Partnership (TP) programme was developed by the Department for Education (DfE) and Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) to transform the quality of education and experience received by social work students and practitioners. The programme aims to formalise collaborative working between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and service providers (Local Authorities (LAs), National Health Service (NHS), voluntary and private sector services (PVI)) to raise the quality of social work through attracting high quality students into the profession and ensuring students and existing social workers have the necessary knowledge, skills and values to practise effectively; and, to improve workforce planning and development to address retention and recruitment issues.

The TP programme funded 23¹ partnerships across three phases – four partnerships in the phase one pilot (2015), nine partnerships in phase two (2017) and ten in phase three (2018). Partnerships were subject to four funding criteria to guide local responses to stretch criteria focused on governance, admissions, practice placements and support, curriculum, academic delivery, workforce development and workforce planning.

Evaluation purpose and method

The evaluation explored three main areas: key activity delivered by TPs; approaches to delivery; outcomes and impact. In addition, the evaluation captured learning about the experience of TPs and explored sustainability. The evaluation is predominantly a process evaluation and is largely based on qualitative methods.

The evaluation was undertaken in two phases. The main phase (January to March 2019) comprised of an in depth document review and management information (MI) analysis (phase one and two partnerships) alongside an initial document review (phase three partnerships) and stakeholder research in two phase one partnerships. Findings of the interim evaluation were reported in May 2019².

The second phase (October 2019 to February 2020) comprised a range of qualitative research including a document review of case studies provided by phase three partnerships (and follow up interviews with project managers in four of these areas) and research with stakeholders in twelve other partnerships areas spanning phases one to

¹ Taking account of amalgamations.

² Social work teaching partnerships evaluation: interim research report early findings, Interface Associates UK, June 2019 [The report can be found here.](#)

three. This research focused on generating a detailed understanding of specific areas of activity and/or sustainability. In addition, a limited data refresh was undertaken, to support the identification of trends in the level of activity, benefits and impact.

Evaluation findings

Membership and governance

Expected governance and planning structures have been put in place in the two-year funded phase and partnerships continue to adapt these to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the context of making governance and management sustainable. Securing engagement (particularly leadership level) requires ongoing stakeholder engagement activity in an environment of competing priorities and capacity constraints.

The teaching partnerships programme has stimulated increased levels of collaboration to the way social work education is designed, planned and delivered across the six workstream areas. Partnerships most regularly cite collaborative culture as the most important benefit of the TP programme. Relationships are expected to continue beyond the funded period in the vast majority of TPs, albeit most likely on a more focused set of activity, some of which is already supported by embedded systems and processes.

Project management and support roles (funded through the TP grant) have been critical in facilitating the effectiveness of governance systems. Plans for resourcing project managers are currently being explored by partnerships to retain momentum. Partnerships are looking at ways to fund key posts, reduce costs and generate income to support longer-term sustainability.

Entry standards

Entry levels for undergraduate and post graduate social work courses have been maintained at, or increased to, the DfE expected levels³ in almost all HEIs in phase one and two partnerships⁴ and at least four phase three partnerships⁵. Rigorous assessment and selection processes are reported to be in place at undergraduate and post graduate levels in all partnerships, including increased involvement by Service

³ 120 points for undergraduates and 2:1 degree for masters courses.

⁴ Data refresh Jan 2020: 9/10 responses (phase one and two partnerships) maintained these entry levels.

⁵ Case study document review.

Users and Carers (SUC) and practitioners, whose role in this work is reported to be highly valued.

Practice placements

Improved organisation, consistency and quality assurance of placements is commonly reported across all phases of partnerships, achieved through better planning, guidance and new processes. Improvements in matching to preferences and earlier agreement of placements are better progressed than at the interim stage.

Increases in statutory placements are reported by TPs across all phases. Phase one and two partnerships have maintained high levels of students experiencing two placements meeting the statutory definition⁶. This is less evident in phase three partnerships who are still building capacity in this area. Significant effort has been required to achieve this, with approaches including practice education training and innovative new placement models. Emerging evidence from case studies suggests that partnerships value the contribution that statutory placements make to work readiness and are re-engaging PVI's to offer a rich breadth of practice learning and support sustainability.

Increasing the quality of practice learning support for students whilst on placement is well progressed, for example through increased levels of support for practice educators and the development of student reflective learning structures. Partnerships perceive a significant increase in the quality of placements and anecdotal impact on wider partnership aims (such as work readiness, retention, morale). Four partnerships have sustained TP funded posts that have been instrumental to these improvements.

Curriculum

Increases in the proportion of the curriculum delivered by practitioners⁷ are reported at both undergraduate and post graduate levels in phase one and two partnerships. This has been maintained by phase one and two partnerships into the AY 2019/20, with a majority of phase three partnerships also reporting⁸ increased pools of teaching practitioners. Anecdotal evidence is commonly reported by partnerships that students

⁶ 2019 data suggests an increase for 6/9 and 7/12 partnerships at undergraduate/postgraduate level. The data refresh 2020 shows this has been maintained or increased (7TPs) at U/G level and maintained by 8TPs at PG level. No partnership reported a decrease in the data refresh (Jan 2020).

⁷ In phase one and two – combination of data returns and document review.

⁸ 7/10 phase three partnerships provided evidence of this in their case study documentation.

place high value on practice input in the curriculum, enabling them to make better links between theory and practice.

All partnerships report that the Children and Family Social Work and Adult Knowledge and Skills Statements (KSS) are embedded in relevant curriculum and that practitioners (and sometimes users) have also reviewed and modified the curriculum content.

Academic and practitioner collaboration

Most partnerships⁹ have attempted activity that supports academics to spend time in frontline teams, refreshing their experience and observing contemporary practice. Feedback from participating academics acknowledges the value of immersion in everyday practice in terms of credibility, refreshing knowledge and learning about local tools and practices, but overall this area is less well advanced.

A greater level of activity has been focused on developing joint learning between practitioners and academics. There are examples of this leading to better working relationships, useful research (which could be shared more widely), influencing research mindedness and examples of changed systems and practice as a result.

Workforce planning and continuing professional development

Progress towards workforce analysis and strategic planning has taken place in all¹⁰ phase one and two partnerships, and in at least five partnerships in phase three (indicating faster progress than previous phases). Delivery has been affected by challenges including data availability, data protection, capacity and the complexity of the task. The commissioning of external support to add capacity (whether from within a partner HEI or external source) has accelerated progress. There are examples of new approaches to recruitment and retention, and some isolated examples of early impact in phase one and two partnerships as a result.

All partners report an increased continuing professional development (CPD) offer to practitioners. Just under half of all partnerships have embedded CPD within new progression frameworks – with others providing additional CPD to enhance existing local offers. Other developmental support has been made available including learning

⁹ The phase one and two document review found evidence that 10/12 TPs have delivered activity in this area, with evidence of plans but not necessarily delivery in the remaining two TPs. Activity levels appeared lower than across other workstreams.

¹⁰ 8/12 partnerships demonstrated evidence in the phase one and two document review (2019), and subsequent qualitative research with phase one and two partnerships suggest all have made some progress in this area.

symposia, research conferences and additional support and tools. Most TPs (if not all) have used funding to heavily subsidise these programmes to support access to the provision. It is too early to evidence whether sufficient reach into the workforce has been achieved in order to impact recruitment or retention. Travel time, budget and work pressures remain common challenges.

Conclusions

Overall, partnerships report that the programme has formalised collaborative working and has been a catalyst for cultural change in the way partners work together as well as achieving faster and more effective operational progress. A range of benefits, enablers and early outcomes are cited in the research and partnerships indicate a strong desire to continue working in partnership, most likely across a more focussed range of sustainable activity and subject to maintaining stakeholder engagement in a context of competing priorities.

The technical annex provides detailed case studies illustrating the different types of approaches that Teaching Partnerships have taken.

The Teaching Partnership programme

The TP programme was developed by the DfE and the DHSC to transform the quality of education and experience received by social work students and practitioners, following reviews such as those by Narey and Croisdale-Appleby¹¹. These reviews highlighted an urgent need for better social work education and professional development.

The programme aims to formalise collaborative working to raise the quality of social work, by attracting high quality students into the profession and ensuring students and existing social workers have the necessary knowledge, skills and values to practice effectively – and to improve workforce planning and development to address retention and recruitment issues.

The programme was piloted in 2015 in four areas (phase one). Eleven additional areas made successful applications for two-year funding in phase two (2016) and ten more in phase three (2018). As a result of an amalgamation¹², the programme involves 23 teaching partnerships (TPs) in total. Four of these partnerships are self-funded¹³ (three phase one partnerships and one phase two partnership), with nine partnerships from phase two in the sustainability phase¹⁴ and ten phase three partnerships still in the funded phase of the programme¹⁵.

The aim of the government funding is to provide a catalyst for improvement and for teaching partnerships to create sustainable changes within their regions. Partnerships had to meet eligibility criteria, and bid against stretch criteria (set out in Annex One), to facilitate the development of local improvements across specific workstream areas:

- Governance (strategic and operational delivery)
- Admissions
- Placements and curriculum

¹¹ Martin Narey (2014). Making the education of social workers consistently effective. Report of Sir Martin Narey's independent review of the education of children's social workers. [Link to the Narey report.](#) David Croisdale-Appleby. (2014). Re-visioning social work education. An independent review. [Link to the Croisdale-Appleby report.](#)

¹² Two partnerships (one from phase one and one from phase two) merged with other local authorities to form one of the phase three partnerships.

¹³ The funding from central government has ended and the partnership relies on its own resources.

¹⁴ The partnership has come to the end of the two-year funding and has successfully applied for one-year sustainability funding from central government to support transition into a fully self-supported partnership.

¹⁵ Phase three partnerships successfully applied for two-year funding from 2018-2020 and were still supported by this funding at the time of the evaluation.

- Academic delivery and academic experience of practice
- Practice support and delivery
- Workforce planning

Partnerships have funding conditions that require them to:

- Raise the standards of entry for students onto courses (through the raising of minimum entry requirements).
- Provide quality placements in statutory settings (every student to be guaranteed at least one statutory placement, although two placements are prioritised within funding applications).
- Embed the Knowledge and Skills Statements (KSS) throughout continuing social work education.
- Have frontline practitioners and managers employed in statutory settings, providing classroom teaching.

Evaluation purpose and method

The purpose of the evaluation is to explore three key research questions:

- What activity have TPs delivered?
- How have they delivered this activity?
- What are the early impacts of the TP activity?

In addition, wider aims of the evaluation include sharing learning around the enablers and challenges experienced by partnerships in meeting the programme aims, as well as exploring sustainability to understand if funding has created sufficient momentum to maintain beneficial activities in the medium to long-term future. The evaluation is predominantly a process evaluation largely drawing on qualitative data from document reviews and case study research.

Partnerships have been encouraged to develop customised programmes and local performance management processes in order to best reflect their own contexts. This has limited the ability of the evaluation to identify ‘typical’ approaches – and a lack of data and attribution issues have restricted the ability to quantitatively evidence ‘what works’. It should also be noted that the programme remains at an early stage of development, in terms of achieving impacts on quality of social work, with few cohorts of undergraduates graduating in the timeframe of the evaluation¹⁶.

The evaluation was undertaken in two phases. The main phase of the evaluation was conducted between January and March 2019 with the aim of understanding the scope of delivery, different delivery approaches and emerging benefits and challenges. It comprised of:

- an in-depth document review and MI analysis of all phase one and two partnerships; and
- an initial document review (all phase three partnerships) and stakeholder research in two case study areas (phase one partnerships).

It should be noted that there were challenges in collecting robust data, and this limited the scope of the quantitative analysis. Partnerships in general did not collect

¹⁶ Some cohorts from the phase one partnerships have graduated, most phase two partnerships took six to twelve months to deliver significant levels of activity, meaning that more change will have been experienced by undergraduate cohorts starting academic years 2017/18 and 2018/19 (and beyond).

comprehensive performance data at partnership level, with much of the requested data sitting with individual partners who often collected this differently or did not collect it in any sharable format. Some data was not yet collected.

Findings of the interim evaluation were reported in May 2019¹⁷. This showed that good progress had been made to develop effective, collaborative partnerships and substantial levels of activity had been delivered across most workstreams. Some partnerships were already experiencing a range of expected benefits from the collaborative work, particularly around building a collaborative culture, placement organisation, development of practice educators and involving practitioners and SUCs in designing and delivering teaching and training. Key enablers were identified by stakeholders as senior engagement alongside individual champions and a culture of perseverance. The report highlighted some key national and local challenges including the issues that partnerships are trying to address (recruitment, retention) as well as stretched budgets, cultural differences between partners and practical challenges such as travel distances and communication across partnerships. The critical contribution of project manager posts and other funded posts was highlighted as a catalyst for change (particularly those working across placement and academic delivery workstreams) providing the capacity to move the agenda forward more quickly than would otherwise have happened.

Research for the second phase of the evaluation took place between October 2019 and February 2020. The aim of this was to provide an update on delivery progress and sustainability across all phases of the programme, to share detailed learning around how partnerships were delivering their activity and any early impacts through developing written case studies. The method comprised:

- Data refresh with phase one and two partnerships, focusing on a limited number of key areas to explore trends relating to specific stretch criteria (see Annex One). Ten of the 12 partnerships provided data returns at varying levels of completeness.
- Document review of 51 case studies provided (in total) by all ten phase three partnerships and follow up interviews with project managers and/or Chairs in four of these TP areas (Regional West Midlands, Pan Dorset and Wiltshire, Kent and Medway, South West London and Surrey).

¹⁷ [Link to social work teaching partnerships: Interim research report](#), Interface Associates UK, June 2019.

- In depth qualitative research with stakeholders in four areas, focused on specific areas of effective practice. These were selected on the basis of size, geography and the area of effective practice identified in the earlier document review (phase one of the evaluation). The areas selected were:
 - South Coast Regional Centre for Social Work Education (SCRC): Student learning hubs (phase two)
 - D2N2: Practice development structures, use of workforce data and their impact on quality of placement experience (phase two)
 - West London TP: Critical reflective practice programme (for Practice Educators) (phase two)
 - Suffolk and Norfolk TP: Service user involvement and the role of Practice Education Leads in practice education (phase two)
- Qualitative research with project managers in four areas regarding their approaches to sustainability (selected on the same criteria as case studies). These were:
 - North London TP, including understanding how they moved training online to make significant cost savings (phase two)
 - South Yorkshire TP, to explore their income generation approach (phase one)
 - Cumbria TP, to understand the perspective from a small partnership with limited central resource (phase two)
 - North East Region Social Work Alliance, to explore a regional approach (phase two)
- Qualitative ‘deep dive’ research with a range of stakeholders in four partnership areas, selected to explore specific areas of practice highlighted in the earlier document review and on the basis of geographical spread:
 - Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP: Placements and the role of the Practice Education Consultants (PECs) (phase two)
 - Leeds and Wakefield: Engagement of partners and building effective relationships (phase two)
 - North East London: Workforce planning (phase three)
 - West London: Building a research culture and workforce data (phase two)

The partnerships gave considerable time and support to this phase of the evaluation and welcomed sharing their learning journeys to support other funded or non-funded

partnerships. We are extremely grateful to them for their support and engagement in the associated fieldwork.

This report presents the findings from this latter phase of the evaluation, alongside relevant interim findings for context. Conclusions are drawn from both stages of the evaluation. In addition, the detailed case studies themselves are published in the technical annex, in order to maximise the sharing of learning.

Teaching partnership membership and representation

In January 2020, the 23 Teaching Partnerships had engaged:

- 110 local authorities (LAs)
- 51 higher education institutions (HEIs)
- nine NHS Trusts
- five Children's Trusts
- 14 Private, Voluntary and Independent (PVI) partners
- up to five Associate partners.

This represents just under 65% (51/80) of all HEIs offering social work¹⁸ at undergraduate or masters level and almost three quarters of top tier local authorities (110/149¹⁹). This is a slight decline on previously reported engagement levels²⁰, but this is largely as a result of local contextual changes as opposed to commitment and engagement with the programme aims.

Membership profiles suggest that partnerships are effectively using engagement structures to generate collaborative strategic and operational commitment across key partners. Some partnerships have invited other organisations or key bodies to be Associate Members, such as Regional Association of Directors of Children's and Adult Services, to reflect their key stakeholder base and to support sustainability.

Service users and carers (SUC) are formally involved in strategic or operational boards in a minority of partnerships, through structures (existing and new) such as a Regional Service User and Carer Reference Group and a Public Involvement Board. This is not reflective of the larger involvement of SUCs in workstream groups.

¹⁸ Source: UCAS [Link to UCAS](#) – note that the number of HEIs listed as providing social work undergraduate or masters level degree courses has increased from 79 to 80 since the interim evaluation report, reducing the % slightly.

¹⁹ Local Government Information Unity (LGIU) facts and figures England [Link to LGIU facts and figures England](#).

²⁰ At the interim reporting stage, partnerships had engaged 113 local authorities, 54 HEIs and 32 private, voluntary, NHS and other partners.

Enablers and challenges

Most partnerships report that Memorandum of Co-operation documents continue to be useful in generating higher level commitment from partners and re-confirming the different commitment required in relation to any pre-existing partnership.

Building and maintaining genuine whole-organisation commitment within partners remains an ongoing activity, recognising the complex environment that partnerships operate in (including different starting places, competing priorities, partner restructures, recruitment, Ofsted inspections, the competitive nature of higher education institutes and other related initiatives).

In some partnerships, the equal engagement of children's and adult services has been challenging. However, partnerships are conscious of this, for example in the Leeds and Wakefield Teaching Partnership, children's and adult services stakeholders are treated as separate partners to achieve this equal representation. This has also been tackled at operational level, for example in the Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP where Practice Educator Consultants (PECs) in children's and adult services are working more closely together. [Link to Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP example of children's and adult services PECs working together.](#)

The combined evidence from this evaluation suggests that any size of partnership can work collaboratively. Each partnership brings its own history, context and composition of partners which makes each area different. The smaller numbers of partners and HEIs make for simpler arrangements, allow a more intense focus on several local issues and partners can experience less competitive and cultural tensions. However, several smaller partnerships feel that wider approaches (particularly to workforce development and planning) may be more effective at a regional level. Alternatively, larger areas may experience more complex stakeholder engagement requiring significant relationship management but may benefit from a richer breadth of specialist skills, knowledge and experience, with potential for impact over a wider geographical area.

Sustainability

Partnership membership has remained stable and the vast majority of partnerships report that it is expected to remain fairly stable into the future, subject to factors such as the unknown (as yet) effect of levying a charge on members to cover central costs. Two partnerships have raised explicit concerns that some members will be unwilling or unable to pay a levy and this would have a substantial effect on the partnership membership.

Key findings

- Twenty-three partnerships have engaged just under 200 formal partners (including 110 LAs and 51 HEIs) in the programme. SUCs are more involved at the operational level than strategic level.
- Securing engagement (particularly leadership level) requires ongoing stakeholder engagement activity in an environment of competing priorities. Partnerships have worked hard to improve initial issues around parity in representation across children's and adult services.
- Partnerships vary in size and this brings differences in approaches and different challenges. The evaluation evidence suggests that different sized partnerships can be effective in making progress against their aims.

Governance and management structures

Relevant stretch criteria: A strategy to raise the quality of education and practice training through the Teaching Partnership is co-owned by all the leads in the partnership.

The partnership has a credible plan for improved performance for 2018-20, which senior managers in all partnership organisations own and will deliver.

Robust governance and management structures remain in place across partnerships from all phases of the programme. Phase three partnerships reflect earlier phases by developing boards at both a strategic and management level to lead and drive their agenda. These are supplemented by a range of workstream groups focused on specific areas of activity.

All partnerships have co-developed credible strategic and operational plans and systems are in place for operational boards to monitor the delivery of these plans. Most plans are developed and agreed through collaborative processes drawing together local knowledge from partners, for example away days, and then further developed by collaborative workstream groups. Project management and support roles, funded by TPs (through the TP grant funding), have been critical in facilitating the effectiveness of these structures and specifically in supporting stakeholder engagement and management. Partnership level quantitative performance frameworks remain under-developed in general. However, the latter phase of fieldwork and the phase three document review suggests a greater level of workforce planning is now taking place, which may support the data capture processes needed for more effective performance management in the future.

Partnerships across all phases demonstrated that they have adapted their structures over time to improve the engagement of stakeholders and minimise duplication at leadership, management and delivery levels. Some partnerships, as they evolve, have created task and finish groups in place of workstreams, to address specific issues such as how best to support Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) students and placements for non-car drivers.

Communication is cited as a key and ongoing activity for all partnerships to ensure that crucial information is consistently cascaded to the right stakeholders, for the effective delivery of strategic plans. Web based document storage systems are being used by some for internal communication, and partnership websites remain central to communication and dissemination strategies, with a growing use of social media. One relatively small partnership has over 450 followers.

An analysis of project management documentation and qualitative interviews with project managers and partnership stakeholders found that some progress has been made in increasing the diversity and range of opportunities for service user influence at an operational level. Partnership plans show commitment to furthering this area of work.

In the Suffolk and Norfolk TP, the partnership set out from the beginning to have meaningful SUC involvement at all levels of social work education and training, ensuring that they were involved in the co-production of TP initiatives. Building on existing practice in the HEIs and LAs, the TP appointed a SUC co-ordinator who led this work until funding ended in April 2019. A network of SUCs was developed across the TP and ensured and supported SUC involvement from both universities in all boards and workstreams. They also ensured that the SUC group could take forward the development of a range of useful tools to support ongoing work in this area.

Enablers and challenges

Governance and senior leadership continue to be considered critical by all stakeholders consulted in the evaluation research. Engagement and commitment can be challenged by issues such as financial limitations, staff capacity and restructures. Stakeholders consulted in the latest evaluation phase report that building an expectation that the teaching partnership is a long-term vehicle for change, as opposed to a short-term solution whilst funded, has been important in terms of stakeholder engagement and commitment. The existence of other regional and local strategic partnerships with overlapping aims can be challenging to this, and clearly defining the purpose and boundaries of each partnership is useful. Driving a positive values base through the partnership (e.g. transparency, recognising bias and power, compromise) has also been important in establishing trust and confidence in decision making processes. Partnerships have benefitted from the information exchanged at national network meeting and stakeholders have commonly reported²¹ they would welcome more opportunity to share learning, documentation and research.

Strong historical relationships and individual champions have helped partnerships to 'hit the ground running' and maintain momentum. Consistent and joint leadership are cited by partnerships as key factors to have supported them through turbulent times, but in effect partnerships report a reliance on goodwill until and after considerable visible benefits are realised (this is reported to take around two to three years).

²¹ Across qualitative interviews with partnerships (all phases).

In the Leeds & Wakefield TP, effective partnership working has been reflected at senior levels across the Children's and Adult services and within the HEIs as well as the LAs. Equal parity between the Children's and Adult services has been progressed through treating each service as separate partners. From the outset the Project Manager, Workforce Lead and Board adopted a conscious focus on building relationships with the right people through high levels of engagement supported by effective, open communication. This resulted in more trusting and realistic relationships which fostered a willingness to proactively address and resolve issues and challenges. Robust and honest discussions have taken place about their specific and different needs and how these can be accommodated or addressed. By recognising individual organisational drivers, priorities and challenges, the TP agreed common shared priorities. It allows opting in and out on some decisions. Partnership working has been strengthened by incorporating and celebrating the different components within the TP and partners feel that approaches have been strengthened and validated through the existence of the TP. Common and differing challenges between partners are identified and worked on collaboratively, especially through joint events and training where staff come together to plan, deliver and participate. Staff turnover has been a challenge. The impact of this has been lessened by embedding the work within partner organisations and through structures and systems which support new personnel, including developing a formalised partnership induction structure.

Project managers and business support resource continue to be instrumental in driving the pace of partnerships and facilitating effective structures, including stakeholder management and engagement. Most phase three partnerships, like earlier phases, have found recruitment to these posts to be time consuming (normally taking around six months from the notification of a successful application) which has slowed down the first year of implementation. It is perceived by some partnerships that the DfE funding requirements did not adapt quickly enough to this pattern, meaning not all the funding could be used in the first year.

Benefits and outcomes

It is very clear from the recent fieldwork that the TP programme continues to stimulate increasing levels of collaboration across employers and HEIs in the planning, development and delivery of social work education. This is consistently cited by stakeholders as the most important benefit of the TP programme. New relationships and collaborative working have led to a deeper understanding of the national social work reform agenda across stakeholders and the challenges, drivers and structures of partner organisations. In itself, this has enabled better working relationships and

supported organisations to slowly break down perceptions and cultural differences. However, this is an activity requiring ongoing stakeholder commitment and maintaining stakeholder engagement will be critical. One larger partnership has developed a sophisticated stakeholder management system to support them in this task. Individual organisational commitment can be vulnerable to challenge from the pressures in the wider environment affecting capacity and priorities, for example Ofsted inspections.

Greater levels of understanding, transparency and sharing of resources, as a result of working collaboratively, is perceived to have brought more effectiveness in finding workable solutions to practical issues and in delivering outputs and outcomes. Teaching partnerships acknowledge that tensions, competition and differences will exist, but that relationships are largely strong enough to withstand a greater level of challenge. There is evidence that strong relationships have enabled TPs to take advantage of wider strategic opportunities – for example one partnership reports that the TP has been a catalyst participating in the apprenticeship agenda and this would not have happened without the TP.

“Apprenticeships would not have been an initiative that we would have considered without the teaching partnership” – *Partnership Manager*.

Sustainability

Approaches to sustaining partnerships include:

- Identifying priority activities through partnership strategic planning, with awaydays being a common approach
- Embedding work across partners by adding partnership functions onto existing posts
- Streamlining structures – changing the frequency of meetings, amalgamating workstreams and creating virtual boards or groups
- Finding funding to maintain key posts in the longer term e.g. in several areas, local authority funding has been used to secure joint posts (such as PECs)
- Reducing costs (e.g. putting training online, reducing the volume of central resource).

Delayed decisions around sustainability have in some cases meant staff have left, causing some loss of continuity. Most partnerships (across all phases) want to retain some form of central resource permanently, depending on the size and future ambition of the partnership. Some partnerships, particularly those in phase three, have limited their initial infrastructure in order to make sustainability less expensive.

Most phase one and two partnerships that responded to the data refresh²² have, so far, retained some form of (often reduced) central capacity to facilitate the governance and management structures. This retains the interface between management and delivery and maintains the key role of facilitating accountability across structures. From the data refresh we are aware of only one phase one TP that does not fund some form of central resource. This relatively small partnership has divided out the key management functions across four individuals (one in each partner), with other activities being embedded into business as usual. They have been able to maintain some momentum through this approach, although it is too early to know whether this is sustainable in the long term. Most partnerships (across all phases) have not yet identified a robust long-term solution to retaining a central resource. The impact of changes in project management infrastructures on governance and delivery is unclear, although early informal feedback suggests partnerships will retain collaborative relationships but will likely focus on a more limited scope of work.

Key findings

- Expected governance and planning structures have been put in place in the two-year funded phase and partnerships continue to develop these to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the context of making governance and management sustainable.
- Collaborative workstreams have been set up to progress workplans based around the stretch criteria and these have furthered culture of collaborative working. Partnerships most regularly cite collaborative culture as the most important benefit of the TP programme.
- Partnerships have built extensively on existing relationships and collaborative working is expected to continue beyond the funded period in the vast majority of TPs, albeit most likely on a more focused set of activity.

²² From the ten responses to the data refresh (January 2020) nine suggested having a full time or part time project management resource.

- Partnerships are affected by a range of national and local challenges – for example senior engagement, staff turnover, capacity, geography – and look to strong senior leadership, individual goodwill and creative solutions to lessen the effect of these.
- Most partnerships report that they want to maintain a central resource (and key shared posts) as these have been critical to driving forward their work. It is currently unclear how partnerships will fund these posts in the longer term and what the implications will be on the volume of work going forward.

Entry standards and admissions

Relevant stretch criteria: The partnership is committed to a minimum of 120 UCAS points or a 2:1 requirement to undergraduate and postgraduate courses respectively from Sept 2018, requirements also maintained at clearing; The partnership owns a plan for the involvement of those with lived experience and employer representatives at all stages of admissions from Sept 2018, including decisions about applicants.

The partnership develops and implements by Sept 2019 tests at the point of application before an offer to study is made. Tests will assess all applicants' intellectual ability, social work values and behaviours. The tests must include written assessment, verbal reasoning, group discussion and scenarios/role play in all cases. These tests should be applied to all applicants, including those from access courses.

Entry levels

The data refresh for phase one and two partnerships (January 2020) and review of phase three case studies suggest that entry levels for undergraduate and post graduate social work courses have been maintained at, or increased to, the DfE expected levels²³ in:

- almost all HEIs in phase one and two partnerships²⁴
- at least four phase three partnerships²⁵. This is an increase in entry levels for HEIs in at least three out of six of these partnerships.

In around half of phase one, two and three partnerships, there is at least one HEI with an exception policy²⁶, however the use of these in recruitment appears low²⁷. The evaluation research suggests that exception policies within partnership HEIs are in place to widen diversity or select students who do not necessarily meet the new entry

²³ 120 points for undergraduates and 2:1 degree for masters level courses.

²⁴ Data refresh Jan 2020: 8/9 TPs reported they maintained these entry levels, with two HEIs increasing their levels to meet the requirements for AY 2019/20.

²⁵ Increased entry levels are also evidenced in admissions case studies provided by six phase three partnerships. At least four of these partnerships reported that all HEIs have implemented these entry standards, and two further partnerships showed good progress (with only one HEI in each having not yet raised entry levels).

²⁶ Policies which set out circumstances in which students may be accepted despite not meeting the expected entry levels.

²⁷ From the 2019 data returns at both UG and PG levels, only one HEI reported high levels of recruitment through their exception policy for entry to their masters course. The data refresh suggests stability in entry standards and exceptions.

criteria but bring extensive experience or can demonstrate other evidence of academic potential.

Assessment processes

In the interim evaluation report, rigorous assessment and selection processes were reported to be in place at undergraduate and post graduate levels in all phase one and two partnerships. This continues and is also evident in phase three partnerships, with all six of those that provided relevant case studies showing evidence of improved processes. Examples from phase three partnerships include:

- The introduction of pre-interview screening based on an interaction with a virtual reality online exercise and written exercise on research and reflective skills.
- A new assessment centre approach including a reflective teaching session delivered by a senior lecturer followed by a discussion with students about the course and what to expect; a group discussion observed by an academic, an expert by experience and a social worker; a written, reflective assessment.

These more rigorous processes all suggest increased involvement by SUCs and practitioners, whose role in this work is reported to be highly valued and embedded by those partnerships completing the phase three case studies. Examples of stakeholder involvement from phase three partnerships reflect approaches taken in earlier phases. These include:

- SUCs reviewing the questions used at interview and being heavily involved at the assessment days, including in the decision making of who is offered a place. To support this involvement, partnerships have developed Service User/Carer training packages.
- Developing central registers of pools of practitioners (often linked to 'practitioners who teach' initiatives) who would like to participate in selection days – aiming to increase accessibility, diversity and improve the availability of substitutes in the event that staff have emergencies or other reasons why they can no longer participate.

Some partnerships have reviewed best practice and harmonised selection processes across all HEIs in the partnership. This is more often found in smaller partnerships.

In the Suffolk and Norfolk TP, the admissions process in both universities was standardised and influenced by the SUC group. University A had included a group discussion involving SUC in the student interview process. This was subsequently adopted by university B and has become the TP admissions process. The process now has three elements with SUCs being involved in each one.

Larger partnerships, which tend to find it more resource consuming and challenging to achieve detailed decisions that change practice across multiple organisations, are in general developing a set of guiding principles and a set of assessment tools for voluntary application. The aim is to contribute to consistency across institutions but allow variation to fit the character and requirements of each HEI. For example, in the Regional West Midlands partnership, a comprehensive best practice guide to admissions processes was collaboratively produced to support continuous improvement.

Benefits and outcomes

Not all partnerships perceive that raised entry levels to 120 UCAS points or a 2:1 has had a significant impact on the quality of candidates. One partnership reported that it conducted a basic data analysis which showed no clear correlation between points on entry and later attainment. Partnerships across all phases do however consistently report²⁸ benefits from improved entry tests and assessment (including as a result of greater practitioner and SUC input) – perceiving that their processes are more aligned with the skills, values and attributes that are key to contemporary social work. This supports them to recruit the right students, which is reported anecdotally across both phases of the evaluation in case studies and the document reviews. Several partnership areas also report that they perceive students are better matched to courses and are clearer about expectations of what is expected from them due to better information provided at selection days.

“The stakeholders directly involved on the admissions workstream noted in interviews that having the experts by experience and social workers on the admission interview panels is invaluable as they have different perspectives, which can positively contribute to the

²⁸ This was reported by all phase one and two reported in the document review, and from phase three there was evidence of this in all six areas that submitted admissions case study documents or related information.

selection of the right social work students” – *phase three partnership*.

“I have noticed a significant improvement in the quality and calibre of the students coming into practice since the TP was established and employers have been more involved in the training of students” – *trainer of seven years, phase one partnership*.

It should be noted that it will continue to be difficult to measure the effect of increased entry levels and selection processes on the quality of students because there are many internal variables affecting achievement, as well as wider contextual factors.

Key challenges and enablers

Some partnerships report challenges around engaging a diversity of SUCs to support admissions processes. Working with SUC representative organisations is one way that partnerships have tried to broaden their reach into communities. There are also practical challenges about how to value/pay SUCs. Suffolk and Norfolk TP conducted research into this area and subsequently produced a paper to inform decisions regarding how to value the time of SUCs.

Sustainability

The qualitative feedback from partnerships suggests that entry criteria are expected to be maintained. It is likely that exceptions policies will continue to be used as part of widening participation. The key purpose of these policies is to enable high quality candidates to be recruited, in line with the TP programme goals. Some partnerships²⁹ expressed concerns about the viability of maintaining entry criteria across multiple HEIs in any one partnership.

The increased rigour and consistency in admissions processes is reported³⁰ to be embedded and sustainable. Stakeholders report it is likely that involvement of practitioners and SUC will increase in quality, diversity and quantity through embedded processes, if the commitment and leadership in this area remains.

²⁹ Four partnerships raised this in the data returns or phase three case study review.

³⁰ Triangulation of qualitative data sources.

Key findings

- All partnerships demonstrate a commitment to increasing entry levels, with nearly all phase one and two partnerships maintaining the expected levels of entry into the Academic Year (AY) 19/20 and also at clearing³¹. Phase three case studies indicate that all HEIs in around half of phase three partnerships have fully implemented the entry standards.
- At least half of all partnerships have one or more HEIs with an exceptions policy for undergraduate and/or masters level entry³², but most report low use of these, and that they are commonly linked to widening participation.
- All partnerships involve SUC and employer representatives in HEI admissions processes, including at least eight out of ten phase three partnerships.
- All phase one, two and at least six phase three partnerships have improved their recruitment and selection processes to better assess ability, values and behaviours. There is anecdotal evidence that this is having an impact on their ability to select the right calibre of candidates and that these processes are embedded and sustained.

³¹ Data refresh Jan 2020: 9/10 phase one and two TPs report maintaining these entry levels.

³² Data refresh Jan 2020 combined with phase three document review.

Practice placements

Relevant stretch criteria: Partnerships offering both statutory placements relevant to students' preferred areas of practice in contrasting settings from AY 2018-19 will be prioritised in the assessment of applications; Programmes providing units in child and family and adult areas of practice will be prioritised; All placement students are guaranteed statutory placements relevant to their preferred areas of practice, which they are offered from AY 2018-19. In child and family settings, these will offer all students significant experience of using the statutory framework for child and family social work. In adult services, students will have experience of using statutory frameworks for adult social care in delivering outcome-focused, personalised responses.

Placement management

Improved organisation, consistency and quality assurance of placements is commonly reported across all phases of partnerships³³, achieved through better collaborative planning, guidance and new processes. Improvements in matching to preferences and earlier agreement of placements are much better progressed than at the interim stage, with some excellent examples of collaborative practice in place. Phase three partnerships appear to have made faster progress with placement matching (when compared to earlier phases), with five partnerships already showing evidence of improved processes.

Examples of matching approaches across phases include:

- Face to face involvement of students, for example through a statutory partner interview panel or 'speed interviewing' where practice educators (PEs) and students interview each other and each list preferences.
- Placement matching or panel meetings involving local authority and HEI placement leads – often held on one day – to purposefully organise placement allocation based on skills and experience of PEs and preferences of students. One TP now holds this day in late June/July to allow more time to address any arising issues.
- Improved student preference forms and placement profiles have been established to aid the matching process, often facilitated by nominated roles e.g. Practice

³³ A consistent theme across both the case study research and phase three document review.

Education Leads (PELs), Principal Social Workers (PSWs) and/or Workforce Development Leads (WFDL). In some areas, matching is further improved as a result of these lead roles personally knowing PEs more individually through new training, support and development activities.

Quantity of placements meeting the statutory definition³⁴

There has been a significant increase in the number of placements meeting the statutory definition across all three phases of the TP programme and this is considered a major achievement by partnerships. Building on increases achieved by earlier phases³⁵, all phase three partnerships qualitatively indicate³⁶ increases in statutory placements by January 2020, although the extent of the increase is not quantifiable.

Approaches to increasing placement numbers in statutory settings include:

- Increasing placement capacity through increased PE training, support and development – which has been a focus for partnerships across all phases.
- Partnerships formally requiring all LAs with teams working in adults and children’s statutory frameworks to make placements available. This has resulted in the participation of LAs that have not offered placements before. Placements are purposefully being developed in teams where there are vacancies to support recruitment.
- Staggering placements (e.g. for BA and MA students) to require fewer placements at any one time, using the same placement twice in one academic year for different students.
- Using pods, hubs and student units to support groups of students to alleviate pressure on the number of PEs needed and/or to provide an additional and different learning experience – SCRC and Suffolk and Norfolk TPs, for example.

³⁴ In child and family settings, placements will offer all students significant experience of using the statutory framework for child and family social work. In adult services, students on placement will have experience of using statutory frameworks for adult social care in delivering outcome-focused, personalised responses.

³⁵ By January 2019 at least 6/9 eligible phase one and two partnerships (three TPs did not cover UGs) reported increases at undergraduate level and 7/12 at post graduate level, with qualitative data suggesting this is an under-representation.

³⁶ Source: Phase three case study document review.

- Finding new placement locations – in one phase three area, in order to increase the number of first placements in statutory settings, the TP is embarking on a pilot project to put twelve first year students on placements in schools in one LA, with one seconded PE overseeing all twelve students. This commenced in January 2020 and is based on a model used in a different LA.
- HEIs in the partnership being given preference for placements at LAs in the partnership.
- Strategic review of the capacity of the PVI sector and structures to understand sufficiency and need (often using jointly agreed working definitions of ‘statutory’) – there are several excellent examples of this work including in phase three.

In many partnerships, for example D2N2 and Yorkshire Urban and Rural, increasing the volume of placements is part of a whole system approach, incorporating data, new posts and new systems and processes.

In D2N2 this has been achieved through a collaborative working group driving the placement agenda. TP funding was used to increase operational capacity by creating four posts of Principal Practice Educator Lead (PPEL). These posts were linked to each of the four LAs which are the main source of increased statutory placements and provide close links to local Placement Coordinators. Students within placements are viewed as potential employees, creating a vested interest in delivering a positive experience. Placements are embedded at the core of a new practice learning and quality assurance (QA) system which includes a comprehensive placement audit and monitoring process (four weeks, midway and at the end). Enhanced levels of data are captured by the QA system to support further improvements.

In the Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP, they have driven change through a collaborative placement group, embedded into normal practice (led jointly by one local authority and one HEI). Between the leadership of the placement group and the deployment of six PECs, they have developed new and extensive placement systems and processes and built PE capacity and morale through training and a host of support (conferences, tools). Increased PE capacity has enabled them to meet their needs for statutory placements and students report high quality learning experiences in their student survey.

The data refresh (January 2020) suggests that all phase one and two partnerships continue to expect to provide two placements for students (normally totalling 170 days), with at least one of these placements being in a statutory setting. It also provides

evidence that phase one and two partnerships largely maintained high levels of students experiencing two placements meeting the statutory definition:

- Six out of nine³⁷ phase one and two partnerships (that responded to the data refresh and had a remit that covered undergraduates) report all or some HEI partners that offer two statutory placements at undergraduate level to a majority of students.
- at least eight out of ten phase one and two partnerships have all or some HEIs that offer two statutory placements at masters level.

However, the number of phase one and two partnerships offering 100% of students two placements meeting the statutory definition is slightly decreased on last year³⁸ at both undergraduate and post graduate stages, reflecting both the ongoing commitment and challenges involved in achieving this.

All phase three partnerships evidenced activity to increase statutory placements³⁹. At least four phase three partnerships indicate they are providing one or two statutory placements for 100% of students. Exposure of students to statutory frameworks is valued by stakeholders because it is perceived to provide the necessary statutory experience to be more 'work ready' to transition into employment in statutory teams.

It has taken considerable effort, including the effective deployment of specific TP funded posts, to achieve these substantial increases⁴⁰ in the number of placements that meet the statutory definition. Examples of deployment of these roles (PECs, PELs and PPELs) are detailed in the evaluation case studies in the technical annex (Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP; D2N2; Suffolk and Norfolk TP). Effective approaches include year on year increases in Practice Educator (PE) training and closer working with partners inside (and sometimes external) to the TP to identify and develop placements. As the programme has developed, more innovation is evident with high quality integrated placements being developed, placements in schools, the use of student pods and one area is funding a pilot of ten student units to deliver final placements.

³⁷ Data refresh 2020.

³⁸ At undergraduate level this is decreased in two partnerships (from 100% to 63% in one partnership and from 97 to 90% in another); at masters level one partnership reports a slight decrease (from 100% to 90%).

³⁹ Phase three case study document review.

⁴⁰ 2019 data suggested an increase for 6/9 and 7/12 partnerships at undergraduate/postgraduate level. The data refresh 2020 shows this has been maintained or increased (7TPs) at U/G level and maintained by 8TPs at PG level. No partnership reported a decrease in the data refresh (Jan 2020).

Emerging evidence from the data refresh and the recent qualitative research suggests that, following an earlier drop in PVI involvement, partnerships are re-engaging PVIs to support high quality placements meeting the statutory definition, some of which are integrated with experience in a local authority setting. This work is supported by collaborative activity to develop their own working definition of what the 'statutory placement' means in practice and audit tools to help identify and develop high quality placements. This approach is mirrored in phase three partnerships, who report PVIs as an integral part of their strategy to provide placements meeting the statutory definition⁴¹. In general, partnerships feel this mixed approach supports sustainability, enhances preference matching and provides a rich breadth of practice learning.

Quality of support for students whilst on placement

Relevant stretch Criteria: The partnership describes a credible plan for ensuring that students will be supported and developed throughout their placements by a broad set of child and family and adult practitioners appropriate to their placements. It will commit to using no more than 20% independent PEs by or before March 2019. All those supporting and developing students must be familiar with the Chief Social Workers' Knowledge and Skills statements.

Increasing the quality of practice learning support for students whilst on placement has been a key focus of activity across all phases of the programme, with all phase three partnerships also showing related evidence in the case studies submitted. Approaches across phases include:

- Increased levels of PE training⁴² (refresher, level one and two) often with more focus on the KSS and increased practitioner input in design and delivery to ensure the training more fully prepares PEs for the role. Fourteen out of 18 TPs can evidence that 50% of PEs are trained to Level Two⁴³.

⁴¹ Three out of the four phase three case studies who expect to provide 100% placements this year that meet the statutory definition will use PVIs to achieve this.

⁴² Data refresh (Jan 2020) shows 4-6 phase one and two TPs are maintaining or increasing PE training. All phase three TPs are delivering increased levels of PE training or have plans to (document review).

⁴³ 2/8 partnerships in the data refresh (Jan 2020) could not evidence this. Two out of 10 phase three case studies did not meet this target, one already has a plan in place to address this through additional PE level two and refresher training.

- Substantial capacity⁴⁴ has been built through training to support increased availability of statutory (and in some cases PVI) placements. A minority⁴⁵ of LAs in partnerships have taken PE training in-house to reduce costs and to deliver it more locally.
- Databases to record details of PEs including their currency, training and engagement in development activities (four phase three partnerships have developed these).
- Highly supportive developmental support for practice educators including PE conferences, additional resources, PE networks, PE critical reflective programme, practical tools and improved processes. There is evidence from the in-depth case studies (Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP, West London TP, D2N2, Suffolk and Norfolk TP) that these approaches have increased confidence and the quality of support provided from PEs to students, which has meant better support for students who are struggling and/or faster identification of issues at an earlier stage. Increased confidence of PEs is also noted in two of the phase three case studies⁴⁶.
- The development of student learning structures and reflective practice models such as Student Learning Hubs. In SCRC, these comprise small groups focusing on developing reflective and practice skills. In the Suffolk and Norfolk TP, learning hubs bring together students and those on their assessed and supported year in employment (ASYE) for small group practice learning.

Benefits and outcomes

The number and quality⁴⁷ of placements meeting the statutory definition has significantly increased as a result of the TP programme, underpinned by increases in trained PEs who are better equipped to support student learning whilst on placement.

⁴⁴ 5/8 responses to the 2018/9 quantitative data return reported increased training of PEs at level two and 3/8 at level one; Data refresh (Jan 2020) shows 4-6 TPs are still maintaining or increasing PE training (although 2/8 respondents do not/are unsure if 50% PEs are yet trained to this level). All phase three TPs are delivering increased levels of TP training or have plans to (phase three case study document review).

⁴⁵ Two TPs reported this in case study research; other evidence sources indicate this is not widespread.

⁴⁶ Phase three case study document review.

⁴⁷ In the data refresh six out of eight responding partnerships report increased placement quality at undergraduate level and seven out of eight at post graduate level.

All partnerships perceive that a key benefit of the TP programme is that more students have experience of statutory frameworks before they qualify, which stakeholders perceive as supporting students to be more 'work ready'. There remains a debate within partnerships over the level of benefit that is brought by both placements being in a statutory setting⁴⁸. There have been suggestions by at least four partnerships that a high quality PVI setting can be a better match for those with less experience (often younger cohorts, which several partnerships have anecdotally reported as a local trend).

More consistent and better-quality support for students whilst on placements is commonly reported in qualitative consultations and local evaluations with cited examples including:

- Higher quality PEs. For example, in one local evaluation, PEs report that they have changed their approach from modelling and teaching to being facilitative; drawn on a wider range of input to enrich the student experience; provide reflective group supervision and feel more confident to acknowledge uncertainty in practice.
- Improved processes and structures to support students who are struggling to meet expectations or where placement is at risk of breakdown because of PE sickness or other reason (there is some anecdotal evidence of reduced placement failures).
- Increased levels of practice learning support for students whilst on placement is easing the transition of theory into practice and building reflective practice (student learning hubs, group supervision, additional skills days).

“Placements are 100% better. The role of the PEC is crucial, and the time and effort put into this has paid off” – *Social Worker, phase two local evaluation*.

There is evidence that students⁴⁹ are reporting increases in the quality of their placement experiences, across different partnership approaches. However, much of this evidence is anecdotal, with most TPs not yet appearing to implement systematic

⁴⁸ In the data refresh one TP attributed an increase in the National Student Survey (NSS) rating in one HEI to increased statutory placements.

⁴⁹ Feedback from focus groups in two case study areas and from three local evaluation reports.

evaluation of placements at TP level⁵⁰. However, there are good examples of student placement surveys in at least three partnerships, alongside evidence in periodic local evaluation reports. These sources show that whilst there are improvements from a student perspective, these are not universal or consistent with some students reporting inexperienced, inconsistent or too little support.

- Students who were offered additional skills development days as part of their placement, felt that there were benefits of this approach in easing their transition of theory to practice (phase one partnership).
- A post placement student survey provides evidence of a 5% increase in overall satisfaction and when asked about the overall learning experience provided by the placement, over 90% of respondents rated the placements as good or very good across four elements including confidence to become a social worker' (2019 placement survey, Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP).
- The student learning hubs in SCRC have brought key benefits in terms of transitioning theory to practice, as well as resilience, reflective practice skills and a range of other benefits. Feedback from TP and non-TP newly qualified social worker (NQSW) interviews showed that NQSWs from the TP were rated more highly on being ready to practice, recognising own strengths and limitations, using reflective practice and applying practice evidence and research at interview.
- Students who experienced the 'InterVision' process (a peer led group reflection method) as a means of placement support cited emotional containment, perception change, learning how to reflect and professional development from university to practice (making better use of their practice learning) as the most significant benefits (phase two).

Challenges and enablers

Collaborative placement working groups and TP-funded roles have been critical to the pace and level of work achieved in this area. The closer working relationships developed through the working groups have created new opportunities to address this area of work, through better understanding of each others drivers and barriers. The TP

⁵⁰ In the data refresh, phase one and two partnerships were asked if they had evidence of improved placement quality, only two were able to provide details of this.

funded roles have provided dedicated time to persist in identifying new placements and better support for PEs. Challenges include:

- Time taken to engage, train, refresh and retain PEs (particularly in adult services) and ensure management support for release for training and time needed whilst a student is on placement with them.
- Time taken to work with partners to identify and develop appropriate placement opportunities.
- Managing demand for placements from traditional routes alongside the wider demand for placements from other entry routes.
- Turnover and sickness levels among PEs – for example in Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP, the PEC will find an alternative PE or provide the PE role themselves to ensure the placement is sustained.
- Non-drivers limiting the ability of students to take placements in more rural areas or areas not well served by public transport. There is anecdotal evidence of increasing numbers of non-drivers. One partnership has set up a working group to explore this; others give non drivers priority in urban areas.

Sustainability

Partnerships have successfully developed more statutory placements but for most it has been a struggle to provide two statutory placements for all students (including for those who achieved this) and this is reflected in the slight decline in this area shown in the January data refresh 2020, and low numbers reporting this⁵¹ in phase three. However partnerships indicate that they have seen value from statutory placements (in terms of job readiness) and this is expected to remain a key part of placement provision, although potentially achieving this will involve a greater use of other settings where the statutory placement definition can be met, alongside other placement structures (integrated placements, student pods and units).

In terms of placement quality, most phase one and two partnerships demonstrate how they have embedded more robust QA systems across their partnership, and these are expected to be maintained. Enhanced support for students including group learning systems and processes (learning hubs, centres of excellence, peer led reflection

⁵¹ Phase three document review suggests four out of ten partnerships are offering one or two statutory placements to all students.

processes, additional skills days) are considered a key achievement and there is evidence that these will also be sustained.

Most areas report continuing with PE training at similar levels or increases this year, although two TPs from phase one and two (out of eight responding) will decrease their provision (one because they have achieved sufficiency in PE numbers). Significant capacity has been built which is sustainable, subject to turnover levels. One area has embedded PE training 'in house' through train the trainer events and another area has taken PE training in-house (delivered by PECs) to reduce costs.

Partnerships report that a key driver to achievement around placement quality and a more practice-based curriculum is commonly been linked to TP funded posts. Many TPs are focusing on retaining this capacity as a priority and there are at least four phase two partnerships where these posts have already been retained through core funding. One partnership reports:

“Employing the PECs on a substantive role within the local authority has added capacity and value in terms of taking forward the apprenticeship agenda, Step Up, ASYE and our newly launched Social Work Academy for Children”.

Key findings

Quantity of placements; placement setting & matching

- The process of developing and providing sufficient quality placements is jointly owned by HEIs and employers, and more formalised guidance, structures and new methods of support have been developed.
- All phases of partnerships aim to provide two placements⁵², with at least one of these placements being in a statutory setting.
- There has been a significant increase in placements taking place in statutory settings. By January 2019 at least 6/9 phase one and two partnerships reported increases at undergraduate level and 7/12 at post graduate level⁵³, with

⁵² Phase one and two document review; Phase three case study review.

⁵³ From data return and local evaluations 6/9 eligible partnerships (undergraduate) reported increases; two additional areas showed high % statutory placements but only provided latest data (no comparator). Data return and local evaluations and case studies suggest minimum of seven partnerships have increased statutory placements. This could be an underestimation (indicated by qualitative data).

qualitative data suggesting this is an under-representation. All ⁵⁴ phase three partnerships qualitatively report increases in sourcing statutory placements by January 2020. This is considered a key area of achievement by partnerships in all phases.

- High levels of students experience two placements meeting the statutory definition in phases one and two. The data refresh (January 2020) suggests that six out of nine⁵⁵ phase one and two partnerships have all or some HEI partners that offer two statutory placements at undergraduate level, and at least eight out of 12⁵⁶ partnerships have all or some HEIs that offer two statutory placements at masters level. Low numbers⁵⁷ have achieved this in phase three.
- The number of phase one and two partnerships offering two placements (meeting the statutory definition) to 100% students is slightly decreased on last year at both undergraduate and post graduate stages, reflecting the ongoing commitment and challenge involved in achieving this.
- It has taken significant effort to increase placement numbers, with nearly all⁵⁸ using a multi-method approach that includes PE training, placing new expectations on LAs and reviewing PVI capacity. As the programme has developed, more innovation is evident, with high quality integrated placements being developed, placements in schools and one area is funding a pilot of ten student units to deliver final placements.
- Partnerships are simultaneously working to increase the number and proportion of placements hosted in statutory settings alongside a refreshed, high quality PVI placement 'offer' that meets the statutory definition. This is for both sustainability reasons and is a proactive, conscious belief that students benefit greatly from a high quality PVI experience.

⁵⁴ Source: Phase three case study document review.

⁵⁵ Three partnerships do not have undergraduates in their remit (one of these has recently included undergraduate students, but placement data is not yet available). A combination of data returns, data refresh and document review has been used to generate this figure.

⁵⁶ A combination of data returns, data refresh and document review.

⁵⁷ Phase three document review indicates four partnerships who report providing one or two statutory placements to a majority of students.

⁵⁸ Data refresh and phase three case study reviews suggest that only two partnerships offer placements in only local authority settings.

- Matching to specialisms and preferences in all phases has progressed significantly in the last year due to new processes and new placement opportunities.
- TP funded posts have substantially increased the capacity of partnerships to improve the sufficiency and quality of placements.

Quality of support for students whilst on placement

- The capacity to support practice placements has been improved by increased numbers of PEs, including increases in PEs trained to Practice Educator Professional Standards (PEPS) Level Two⁵⁹. This applies across all phases of the TP programme.
- New models of student support have been developed including recruiting specialist practice education co-ordinator/consultant or supervisor roles who directly support individuals or groups of students and develop, supervise and/or mentor PEs. A phase three partnership is piloting ten student units (groups of students working across local authority teams).
- Enhanced support for students is being provided through different types of local authority led group learning (e.g. student learning hubs; student development groups) and additional programmes of jointly delivered skills days.
- Most partnerships report the use of fewer – or minimal use of independent PEs⁶⁰ and most phase one and two partnerships⁶¹ have PE caseloads of one, with only two areas reporting greater caseloads⁶². Local evaluations show evidence of protected time for PEs, but it is not always enough or protected in order for PEs to fulfil the role effectively.

⁵⁹ 5/8 responses to the data return (Jan 2019) reported increased training of PEs at level two and 3/8 at level one; Data refresh (Jan 2020) shows 4-6 TPs are still maintaining or increasing PE training (although 2/8 respondents do not/are unsure if 50% PEs are yet trained to this level). All phase three TPs are delivering increased levels of TP training or have plans to (document review).

⁶⁰ 5/9 data returns contained comparative data with four reporting reductions and one maintaining one IPE; one additional response showed the use of offsite PEs in mentoring, not direct support of students.

⁶¹ From data returns 6/8 reported PE caseload of one.

⁶² One area reported PE caseloads of between one to two; and one area of between one and 3.4.

- There is significant evidence of activity to embed knowledge of the KSS into the training of staff who are providing placement support in partnerships across all phases of the TP programme⁶³.

⁶³ Document review across all phases and case study research.

Curriculum

Relevant stretch criteria: The partnership can evidence enhanced collaboration between employers and HEIs to undertake long term planning for training and development of the social work workforce throughout their careers; The partnership can demonstrate an increase in the amount of child and family practitioner and adult practitioner teaching on the initial education academic programme in 2018-19 compared to existing baselines. In feedback, 90% or more of students rate academic delivery as at least good. The partnership can evidence how experienced, effective child and family, and adult social workers (whether or not they are PEs) are involved in curriculum development.

The data refresh (January 2020) suggests that the KSS are embedded appropriately into curriculum and assessment in all phase one and two partnerships, and there is evidence of good progress in phase three partnerships⁶⁴. Two partnerships highlighted challenges around this because the KSS are post qualifying standards. In most cases, practitioners (and sometimes users) have also reviewed, updated and modified curriculum content to ensure it is relevant to contemporary social work.

The data returns and phase three case study review⁶⁵ indicate that students in TPs continue to be taught by very high proportions (between 86%-100%) of qualified, registered social workers employed by HEIs. There is a significantly larger and better trained pool of practitioners who are involved in teaching the curriculum, including, but much wider than, TP funded posts (e.g. Lecturer Practitioners, Practice Educator Consultants, Practice Development Workers). All phase one and two partnerships responding to the data refresh⁶⁶ report that previous increases in the percentage of the curriculum taught by practitioners have either been maintained or further built on in the

⁶⁴ In the data refresh two TPs reported that one or more HEIs had made further increases of between 10-20% in the focus on the curriculum on the KSS between Jan 2019 and Jan 2020. The remaining 8/10 phase one and two partnerships (that responded) reported maintaining previous increases detailed in the interim report which means that a range of 30-100% of the curriculum remains focused on the KSS in these partnerships at UG level and 35-100% at PG level. Two partnerships highlighted an inherent issue exists within this expectation at UG level because KSS is a post qualifying standard. Embedding KSS is evident in 8/10 phase three case studies.

⁶⁵ From the data returns 2019 (phase one and two), all eight partnerships who responded reported that HEIs have maintained high levels (over 86%) of teaching staff who are qualified, registered social workers, with a small number who are also practising (most commonly one per staff body, although one HEI reported 25% practising staff). Phase three case study document review suggests that all HEIs in the seven responding TPs (bar one exception) have at least 60% of HEI staff who are qualified registered social workers.

⁶⁶ 10/10 responses (two of the twelve phase one and two partnerships did not return the data refresh proforma in Jan 2019).

AY 19/20. At least seven (out of 10) phase three partnerships report in case studies that they have already increased their practitioner teaching pool. In one of these areas, the TP appointed 34 Teaching Consultants (TCs) with a variety of specialisms (from 100 applicants). Thirty-one TCs were involved in 152 hours of teaching across HEI courses on modules running from January to May 2019. Twenty-seven TCs were scheduled to deliver 225 hours of teaching between Sept 2019 and April 2020 on HEI courses.

All partnerships can evidence SUC engagement in skills development days or taught modules, with most building on existing practice and HEI links with SUCs. Commonly the focus is on working with local authority services and representative organisations to develop a more diverse SUC pool.

Suffolk and Norfolk TP have funded a short-term role to develop a network of SUCs, whilst others are providing training or support to boost the confidence of SUCs to bring their experiences into teaching for example, on modules around ethics and values.

In a phase three area, BSc and MSc students at the HEI started in September 2019 on the new revalidated curriculum which the SWs and SUCs were involved in developing. Workshops were held and they were credited for their input. The new curriculum has modules never delivered previously and provided a good opportunity for SWs to be involved in co-designing and delivering these sessions. Ninety five percent of all modules offered out to SWs to co-deliver are now full, for example, readiness for practice.

Benefits and outcomes

Bringing together practitioners⁶⁷, users and academics to design and deliver a curriculum is reported to have brought benefits in terms of making the curriculum more relevant to the workplace (transition of theory to practice), supporting transition to ASYE and in terms of raising awareness of national government agenda and expectations around KSS⁶⁸, Professional capabilities framework (PCF)⁶⁹ and the National Assessment and Accreditation System (NAAS)⁷⁰. For example:

⁶⁷ In all phase one and two partnerships, curricula at both undergraduate and/or masters levels have been jointly reviewed and changes have been made as a result of practitioner input. This is also evident in phase three case studies, where review of curriculum has taken place in at least three partnerships.

⁶⁸ [Link to social work knowledge and skills statements](#) (now known as post qualifying standards).

⁶⁹ [Link to professional capabilities framework](#).

⁷⁰ [Link to National Assessment and Accreditation System](#).

- In Yorkshire Urban and Rural TP, the role of the lecturer practitioner (LP) – a practitioner employed by the HEI through TP funding – is reported as having positive impact on student learning. In their local evaluation, all stakeholder types cited benefits of a more practical curriculum and in their student survey, 100% of a sample of those who had had contact with an LP (five respondents) reported positive impact on their learning. One student reported: ‘The LP was able to draw on experience and provide clear examples throughout the module which made it easier to understand and easier for us to see how theory can lead to practice’.
- In SCRC, the input from PECs into practice learning through facilitating student learning hubs is reported to have eased transition of learning from theory to practice and supported transition to ASYE, with interviewers noting that the students exposed to the SLHs scored more highly in a range of areas at ASYE interview, including ability to analyse and reflect on their practice.
- One phase three partnership reports ‘early indications are that the introduction of the Teaching Practitioner posts, based in the HEIs have helped to transform how current social work practice needs are reflected and taught in the social work curriculum at our two HEIs’.

However, the experienced benefits are not yet reflected in teaching or course ratings at any reliable level⁷¹. There are several reported isolated⁷² changes in achievement of undergraduates or the National Student Satisfaction (NSS) rating and/or attainment, although this is not sufficiently robust to determine a trend or attribution⁷³:

- HEI A – NSS percentage has increased from 56% (2018) to 97% (2019)
- HEI B – has increased its pass rate at 2:1 or first rating since being in the partnership (68% to 77%).
- HEI C – reports a 100% pass rate with a record number of first-class degrees.
- HEI D – reports the readiness to practice module pass rate has improved from 71% in 2017/8 to 90% in 2018/19 on both the BA and MA SW courses (phase three).

⁷¹ Low responses in data returns Jan 2019 (only 4/9 provided data) and there was little provision of comparative data; there were both increases and decreases in those that reported. In the data refresh (Jan 2020), there was a better response rate (8/9) but no clear trend.

⁷² Change is only seen in one HEI in a partnership, as opposed to across more HEIs in the same TP.

⁷³ Reported in the data refresh (Jan 2020).

One partnership reports a link between an improved curriculum and retention:

“We have seen an increase in practitioners involved in teaching modules on the BA, MA and CPD courses. Consequently, students are developing crucial employability skills and knowledge of the social work sector, and our partner councils are employing more of our graduates”.

Challenges and enablers

The TP funded roles provide additional capacity in this area both in terms of enabling immediate capacity for organising direct practitioner teaching, as well as facilitating developments such as practitioner teaching pools which allow for a much greater range of expertise and capacity available to HEIs. HEI support and training for practitioners is perceived to have enabled practitioners to increase their teaching skills and confidence.

The ability of practitioners to input into teaching can be affected by time constraints⁷⁴ and the emergency nature of frontline social work which may mean they are unavailable at short notice. Overcoming this has been achieved through growing the number of practitioners and processes (such as databases) to ensure ‘substitutes’ are readily available and as a result of better working relationships between HEIs and practitioners.

There is qualitative evidence from at least four phase one and two partnerships that working more closely in teaching and learning has helped to break down cultural barriers that previously existed between HEIs and LAs and generated better understanding of the different environments, leading to closer collaboration.

Sustainability

KSS and other expectations are embedded across the curricula and curricula review processes are in place to review and maintain this. Similarly, the involvement of practitioners and SUC in reviewing, teaching or contributing to the learning of students is embedded.

Capacity has been built by developing pools of trained practitioners, although this will require ongoing systems of ‘matching’ and training to offset turnover. Workload pressure remains a key influence on activities such as this.

⁷⁴ Evident in local evaluation reports reviewed as part of the document review in 2019 and in primary case study research conducted in 2020.

The extent to which lecturer practitioner or similar posts will continue to be funded through partner contributions is unclear.

Key findings

- In all phase one and two partnerships, curricula at both undergraduate and/or masters levels have been jointly reviewed and changes have been made as a result of practitioner input. This is also evident in phase three case studies, where review of curriculum is reported to have taken place in at least three partnerships.
- The KSS are embedded to underpin the relevant curriculum and assessment in all phase one and two partnerships, and there is evidence of good progress in phase three partnerships⁷⁵.
- Data indicates that students in all phases of the programme continue to be taught by HEIs employing very high proportions (86%-100%) of qualified, registered social workers⁷⁶.
- There is a significantly larger and better trained pool of practitioners who are involved in teaching the curriculum, including, but much wider than, TP funded posts. All phase one and two partnerships responding to the data refresh⁷⁷ report that previous increases in the percentage of the curriculum taught by practitioners have either been maintained or further built on in the AY 19/20. At least seven (out of ten) phase three partnerships report in case studies that they have already increased their practitioner teaching pool.
- All partnerships can evidence SUC engagement in skills development days or taught modules, with most building on existing HEI links. Commonly the focus is on working with local authority services and representative organisations to develop a more diverse SUC pool, with HEIs providing support and training.

⁷⁵ 10 out of 10 phase one and two partnerships responding to the data refresh maintained previous increases or further increased the % of the curriculum that is focused on the KSS, with two noting that an inherent challenge exists as KSS is a post qualifying standard. Embedding KSS is evident in phase three case study documentation.

⁷⁶ 2019 data returns and phase three case studies. Note one HEI in a phase three partnership did not meet DfE expectation and improvement plans are in place.

⁷⁷ 10/10 responses (two of the twelve phase one and two partnerships in Jan 2019 did not return the data refresh pro-forma).

- HEIs report having developed methods of measuring and refining the quality of their courses using student feedback. However, these are not commonly shared at TP level or used as part of TP performance management.

Academic and practitioner collaboration

Relevant stretch criteria: Practitioners involved in teaching are supported by employers to do so. There are joint appointments across practice and education. There is a plan to embed practitioner research approaches for students and ASYEs in partnership with HEIs.

The majority of phase one and two partnerships report that 10% of academics have protected time in practice in the AY 19/20⁷⁸, and this is expected to be maintained or increased in six out of seven responding partnerships, with only one of these reporting a decrease in the current academic year. Three out of seven phase three partnerships reported that this protected time was in place⁷⁹, with this information not being clear in the other case studies provided.

At the interim stage, the document review suggested that most phase one and two partnerships⁸⁰ had attempted activity to support academics to spend time in frontline teams, refreshing their experience and observing contemporary practice. Generally, this has been through shadowing a specific social work team for a number of days (from two to eight days). However, this activity has not been significant in most partnerships in comparison to other elements. Some HEIs report that their academics already use their contractual '10% for scholarly activities' time in practice, for example, sitting on ASYE assessment panels, and therefore did not need additional exposure to remain 'current'.

Four phase three partnerships demonstrate a thorough and structured approach to 'Academics in Practice (AiP)' in their case studies⁸¹ which represents good progress in comparison with the previous phases. These TPs have developed clear guidance and procedures to facilitate opportunities for one off learning activity for academics. In one TP this was achieved through developing a 'Time in Practice' process guidance document, shared with any academic who confirmed an interest to spend time in practice. Opportunities were identified using their 'Register of Interest' process whereby local authority practitioners volunteer to contribute to the work of the TP. This is

⁷⁸ 9/9 reported this in 2019 data returns and 5/7 in the data refresh Jan 2020, with an additional partnership reporting one HEI where this is not the case.

⁷⁹ Phase three case study review. In one of these areas it was in place at three out of four HEIs.

⁸⁰ The document review found evidence that 10/12 phase one and two TPs have delivered activity in this area, with evidence of plans but not yet delivery in the remaining two. Activity levels appeared lower than across other workstreams.

⁸¹ Out of seven phase three case studies – qualitative data suggests this could be an underestimation.

managed by the practice development worker in each LA. Three Academics (from two HEIs) spent between one to five days of time in practice in the Summer 2019.

A greater focus across partnerships within this workstream has been to facilitate sharing of academic research skills and knowledge into practice. This includes joint working between practitioners and academics using research to support 'real life' practice issues – and to formally co-deliver research in areas of identified interest. This has gained traction throughout phase one and two⁸², in at least five partnerships, and in phase three in at least four partnerships, with conferences, learning events and symposia being common approaches.

Benefits and outcomes

Benefits cited from academics spending time in practice⁸³ include credibility, refreshing knowledge and learning about local thresholds, assessment tools and local practices. There has also been an opportunity for academics to support local authority staff with a different perspective and some useful case discussions are reported, for example:

“It is ten years since I was a full-time social worker, seven years since I have undertaken any direct social work practice... I had a two day shadowing experience in August 2019 with [the HEI]... as an academic it has been really valuable to observe decision making in practice, reflections on values, understand the current tensions and also see at first hand the support available for students”.

Benefits from collaborative research are reported anecdotally in documentation provided by partnerships in terms of cementing relationships, improved local practice, creating a research mindedness in those involved and reinvigorating social workers interest and morale. Similar findings were identified in the case study research in the West London TP, which set up seven practice and research development groups to research specific areas of practice, led by practitioner research advocates. This has contributed towards a better understanding of local issues, and by involving 100 practitioners, is reported by stakeholders to have supported the development of a research culture.

⁸² The in-depth document review identified five phase two partnerships showing significant progress in this area and the phase three case studies identified four partnerships showing progress in this area.

⁸³ In local phase two evaluations and through the phase three case study document review.

Challenges and enablers

For academics to spend time in practice, a number of conceptual and practical challenges have had to be overcome. These include developing a clear definition and purpose around what 'academics in practice' means and addressing service user data protection, safeguarding clearance and contractual issues for academics. Those partnerships that appear to better progressed in this area have collaboratively developed clear processes and expectations. One partnership reports that timing of the arrangement (Summer) was crucial in order to enable Academics time to plan and agree arrangements, giving consideration to their workloads and commitments.

A similar pattern emerges from reviewing approaches to collaborative research, with those who have made good progress generally having set up clear and jointly developed processes (application forms, funding pots and staff release), and used specific events or conferences as a catalyst for generating interest and identifying shared areas of research. Sustaining the agreed release of staff for the duration of the research is raised as an issue by some stakeholders, and the ability to juggle and work flexibly to accommodate both activities is considered helpful by practitioners delivering research in at least two partnerships.

As part of the case study research, stakeholders report not having a mechanism to share their research with other TPs or learn from research conducted by other TPs. Some have posted their research on their websites to support this. One TP (SE London) has published collaborative research in The British Journal of Social Work – [This is the link to the research for those who subscribe to this publication](#).

Sustainability

Some of this activity has been channelled and sustained through structures developed and embedded by the TP, such as Centres of Excellence (for example Greater Manchester), learning hubs or practice research development groups. In other areas, the organisational functions of facilitating time in practice or collaborative research are added onto existing posts and this will be reliant on those individuals to fit it in. In one area this has resulted in a decrease in related activity.

Key findings

- The majority of phase one and two partnerships report that 10% of academics have protected time in practice in the AY 19/20⁸⁴ and this will be maintained or increased in six out of seven responding partnerships, with only one of these reporting a decrease. Three out of seven phase three partnerships reported that this protected time was in place⁸⁵ in the AY 19/20, with others providing unclear evidence.
- Most phase one and two partnerships⁸⁶ have attempted activity to support academics to spend time in frontline teams, refreshing their experience and observing contemporary practice. Although beneficial for those involved, this activity has not been significant in comparison to other elements. Four phase three partnerships demonstrated a structured approach to ‘Academics in Practice’ in their case studies⁸⁷ which represents good progress in comparison with previous phases.
- A greater focus within this workstream has been to facilitate sharing of academic research skills and knowledge into practice. This includes joint working between practitioners and academics using research to support ‘real life’ practice issues – and to formally co-deliver research in areas of identified interest. This has gained traction throughout phase one and two⁸⁸, in at least five partnerships, and in phase three in at least four partnerships.
- Anecdotal evidence of benefits of collaboration in terms of research and spending are commonly found in the documentation provided by partnerships in all phases, and include building better HEI-LA/provider relationships, refreshing practice and building a greater use of research into practice which in some cases is reported to have led to local system changes and contributed to building a research minded culture.

⁸⁴ 9/9 reported this in 2019 data returns and 5/7 in the data refresh Jan 2020, with an additional partnership reporting one HEI where this is not the case.

⁸⁵ Phase three case study document review.

⁸⁶ The phase one and two document review (Jan 2019) found evidence that 10/12 phase one and two TPs have delivered activity in this area, with evidence of plans but not yet delivery in the remaining two.

⁸⁷ Out of seven phase three case studies.

⁸⁸ The in-depth document review (2019) identified five phase two partnerships showing significant progress in this area. The phase three case study document review (Jan 2020) identified four TPs showing progress in this area.

Workforce planning

Relevant stretch criteria: The partnership describes how it will produce by March 2019 an improved medium-term labour market plan (3-5 years). Implementing the plan will attract more students into social work training and posts and retain higher numbers of practitioners with local and regional employers. The partnership's application specifies what expert support would be useful to assist with the plan.

Progress towards workforce analysis and planning has taken place in all⁸⁹ phase one and two partnerships. This has been a slower area of progress because of data challenges and the scale of the process, but several areas have now driven this work forward effectively by working collaboratively with an external commissioned resource⁹⁰, or by using partner HEI expertise. Phase three partnerships have progressed faster (in comparison to earlier phases) with at least five partnerships reporting good progress, most likely because all five have taken early decisions to fund external support in this area, learning from earlier phases.

Despite data challenges, partnerships have used the available evidence to support a range of operational actions in specific areas of challenge. The evaluation conducted two case studies to explore different approaches to long term workforce planning:

In North East London (phase three partnership), a key challenge for the partners has always been the fluidity of staff who can migrate easily between local authorities in and around London. The partnership committed to achieving a comprehensive labour market analysis which would inform future planning in terms of recruitment, retention and migration of staff and the professional development of students and social workers across the partnership areas. The Workforce and Labour Market Planning Project is being implemented by one HEI in collaboration with members of the wider partnership. They set about creating a bespoke mechanism which can be used to forecast their workforce needs in the next five years but it is also able to generate what is needed at various levels and can be adjusted according to drivers of demand.

In West London, TP funded was used to 'buy in' capacity of an external consultant to enable them to make faster and better-quality progress in this area. The analysis provided an indication of the number of qualified social workers required across the

⁸⁹ 8/12 partnerships demonstrated evidence in the original document review (2019), and subsequent qualitative research with phase one and two partnerships suggest all have made some progress in this area.

⁹⁰ At least nine⁹⁰ partnerships across all phases have taken this approach – including five phase three partnerships (potentially learning from earlier phases).

teaching partnership over the next three years and supported the identification of specific priorities to inform a regional workforce strategy/plan. The recommended actions for implementation centre around initial social worker education (recruitment) and continuing professional development opportunities post-qualification (retention).

Benefits and outcomes

Partnerships are using data to identify/quantify and better monitor specific concerns, such as caseloads, and are planning more strategically to address recruitment and retention issues. These include:

- Diversity in recruitment, for example one phase three partnership is now working with year 12 students who show an interest in social work.
- Transition to ASYE (including developing harmonised ASYE frameworks; employability skills and practical support such as putting contracts in place whilst waiting for their professional registration confirmation; providing an NQSW pack setting out what to expect).
- Addressing retention of ASYE social workers after three years (through greater focus on resilience training and reflective practice).
- Increasing numbers of experienced social workers (through Apprenticeship and return to work schemes).
- Better communication of vacancies through TP websites.
- Research into specific issues, for example BAME student experiences, to improve achievement and progression.

In most cases it is too early for measurable impact on recruitment or retention to be experienced because changing perceptions of social work and working cultures will most likely take considerable time.

However, there are some isolated evidence of approaches that have enabled partnerships to make progress towards workforce goals:

- Micro improvements, for example in one LA, caseloads are reducing due to the success of new monitoring arrangements which have enabled a better prediction of the social work capacity needed include monitoring sick leave, maternity leave and ASYE capacity (phase one partnership).

- Increased recruitment – for example a successful gateway⁹¹ (to SW qualification) programme for existing staff and two successful return to work programmes (one recruiting 58 social workers).
- Increased local transition and ASYE retention is reported by several partnerships as a result of improved placement support. For example, the SCRC achieved a 7.5% increase in local students progressing to ASYE and they presented as more work ready; in D2N2 the latest data indicates that 78% of students are progressing to jobs in the TP LAs from a previous level of 45%; and, in Cumbria a rural initiative is reported to have increased ASYE retention.

Challenges and enablers

Key challenges in achieving data led workforce planning remains the quality of data available. Partnerships have found that different data is collected by partners and it can be out of date and incomplete. Data can be held across different systems within and between organisations and there are varying views on the reliability of national workforce datasets. In addition, there have been concerns about sharing detailed staffing information within the confines of data protection regulations. In North East London this was overcome through establishing a method that allows pseudonymised personal data from LAs and HEIs to be cross-referenced which, in turn, allows analysis of individual learner and employee journeys.

Overall, the workforce planning process (in general) has taken longer (and was more complex) than partnerships expected. In addition to issues around the data itself, the scale of the data collection and analysis has proven considerable (particularly in larger partnerships). TP funding has effectively been used to buy in additional capacity and capability to overcome this.

Sustainability

Although partnerships have found it challenging to develop comprehensive workforce plans – and some of these are one off pieces of work – the commitment to tackling key workforce issues is inevitably a high priority for all partnerships. Commitment to working collaboratively to address specific recruitment and retention challenges remains at the heart of TP strategic plans. TP operational plans show a considerable focus on

⁹¹ In one partnership, all 26 students passed the certificate in social work and four have already progressed to the MSc programme.

progressing recommendations from the workforce analysis that has been completed thus far.

Key findings

- Progress towards workforce analysis and planning (attributable to the TP) has taken place in all⁹² phase one and two partnerships, and in at least five partnerships in phase three (who appear to have made faster progress than previous phases).
- Progress has been affected by challenges including data availability, data protection and capacity and the complexity of the task. The commissioning of external support to add capacity (whether from within a partner HEI or external source) has hastened progress. There are examples of new approaches to recruitment and retention, and some isolated examples of early impact in phase one and two partnerships as a result.

⁹² 8/12 partnerships demonstrated evidence in the document review (2019), and subsequent qualitative research with phase one and two partnerships suggest all have made some progress in this area.

Workforce development

Relevant stretch Criteria: The partnership has a plan for embedding the CSWs' Knowledge and Skills statements, ASYE requirements, Approved Child and Family Practitioner (ACFP) and DfE supervisor proposals into practitioner CPD from Sept 2019; There is a credible plan to deliver AY 2016-17 employment rates in social work of at least 70% and 80% at 6 months and 12 months respectively after graduation and at least the same in the following AY. The partnership can evidence that a system is in place to support final year students in their transition to qualified practitioner, above and beyond final placement arrangements.

All partnerships have developed a partnership Continuing Professional Development (CPD) 'offer'⁹³, with just under half of phase one and two (5/12) mapping this to a TP level progression pathway including the ASYE. In phase three, at least four⁹⁴ (out of ten) partnerships have developed a career progression framework. All these partnerships have mapped, reviewed and/or developed new accredited and non-accredited learning to support these pathways, which reflect the KSS and other expected standards.

Six phase one and two partnerships have developed structures to facilitate access to new learning opportunities. These include structures, such as Centres of Excellence, Professional Practice Development Hubs, a new Social Work Academy and in one area (North London) the TP has moved their extensive range of CPD online. Structural responses to CPD are less evident in phase three partnerships, although examples include:

- One partnership held a collaborative 'away day' to identify training needs, which resulted in a whole new programme of training, within a framework that incorporates existing offers such as PE training and Approved Mental Health Professional training. All opportunities are mapped to the KSS and PCF and should also support the Social Work England revalidation of social work accreditation.

⁹³ Evident in case study review at interim stage and the phase three case study review in the final stage of the evaluation, with 9/10 phase three partnerships showing some progress (seven of these well-developed), with the remaining partnership less clear if it has progressed beyond the planning phase as a result of an Ofsted inspection delaying progress.

⁹⁴ Phase three case study document review.

- In the Kent and Medway TP (phase three) they created a career progression pathway and core development programme, across both Children's and Adult Directorates after identifying partnership-wide training needs which was additionally informed by a literature review undertaken by two researchers employed by the partnership.

The training most commonly available by TPs across all phases is Practice Educator (PE) training level one, two and refresher, skills modules, practitioners who teach, masterclasses and accredited learning for leaders/aspiring leaders. Among phase one and two partnerships, the data refresh (January 2020) suggests PE training has been maintained or increased into the sustainability phase in four to six partnerships, and reduced in two partnerships (one of these reports that they have developed enough capacity so does not need further training).

A host of other developmental support has been made available to social workers including learning symposia, research conferences and additional support and tools. Most TPs (if not all) have used funding to heavily subsidise these programmes to support access to the training provision.

There is evidence of planning and a focus on transition to the ASYE in eight out of ten phase three partnerships. Three of these partnerships reported that they already meet the target of 70% achieving employment in social work after six months. Four partnerships report that they do not yet have the data to measure this target, with complications in terms of obtaining data from HEIs, different local employment definitions and changes to these definitions over time. Examples of strategies to improve local employment include: improved employability skills modules, improved vacancy advertising (at an earlier stage and using TP websites), guidance on 'transition from receiving a job offer' and an NQSW pack.

Benefits and outcomes

Most partnerships⁹⁵ have provided evidence of benefits from the additional CPD activities designed and funded by the partnership. Benefits cited include:

- increased volume and accessibility of learning

⁹⁵ Through case study research and case study document reviews.

- different types of learning opportunities, including more that bring practitioners and HEIs together
- improved quality of learning opportunities
- more up-to-date knowledge and skills in the workforce
- PEs feeling more valued and supported.

High quality CPD is perceived as a key tool in supporting the retention of experienced social workers. It is too early to evidence whether sufficient reach into the workforce has been achieved in order to impact retention, progression or recruitment (and most partnerships are not measuring this reach).

Developing learning cultures across partnerships remains aspirational, but there are some isolated examples of progress reported, with individuals in local evaluations citing that:

- NQSWs expect ongoing learning to be a key feature of their working life.
- Social workers re-engaged in learning were progressing onto further learning.
- An enhanced consciousness is developing amongst social workers in terms of being research minded.
- Student learning hubs are supporting a cultural change towards reflective practice and resilience, as exemplified in several case studies (SCRC; Suffolk and Norfolk TP).

Challenges and enablers

Travel time, budget, organisational capacity and work pressures remain common challenges to accessibility and sustainability of CPD. In North London, the move to online learning has proven effective to date in terms of reducing costs and increasing accessibility going forward.

It can be challenging for TPs to measure student destinations⁹⁶. The destination data can be incomplete or different destinations definitions are in place within partnership

⁹⁶ Qualitative feedback as part of case studies and data returns (Jan 2019) and data refresh (Jan 2020).

HEIs. The HESA definition is reported to have changed and 2018/19 data was not yet available at the time of the research.

Sustainability

Key structures that facilitate collaborative and specific workforce learning and development and progression are likely to be retained as these are generally embedded as the way of working across the partnership area (Centres of Excellence, Social Work Academies; revised ASYE frameworks and some progression frameworks).

PE training and development is reported to be relatively secure, particularly where there are now embedded posts to continue this work with sustainable funding (at least four partnerships).

Other more operational structures, particularly those bringing together academics and practitioners around research-based practice, are embedded or partially embedded and partially reliant on individual drive, goodwill and supporting staff release. There are examples of this type of activity being both retained and not retained by phase one and phase two partnerships.

Whilst there is a commitment to maintain key features of enhanced CPD offers, there is anecdotal evidence from several partnerships that accredited courses (particularly leadership) have been difficult to fill without the TP funding⁹⁷. This may affect the impact of progression frameworks. It is unclear how the additional CPD will be funded going forward. One partnership, which had developed a successful CPD programme reports:

“The national agenda does not require local authorities to mandate CPD – this is a key issue which needs resolving as without ringfenced funding for this you get stagnation and lack of innovation in the social work workforce”.

Partnerships are however successfully exploring ways to retain levels of CPD:

- One partnership (South Yorkshire) has set up systems to charge for training places and masterclasses outside of the TP for an income generation source.
- One partnership (North London) has successfully cut costs and increased access by transferring training to an online platform.

⁹⁷ Two partnerships reported that they had struggled to fill places on these courses once no longer subsidised by TP funding.

Key findings

- All partnerships have developed a CPD 'offer', with some partnerships focussing heavily in this area (particularly in the funded period).
- TP wide progression pathways have been developed in just under half phase one and two partnerships (5/12)⁹⁸. In phase three, at least four partnerships have developed a progression framework, with two of these reported as well progressed. All have mapped, reviewed and/or developed new accredited and non-accredited learning to support these pathways, which reflect the KSS and other expected standards.
- Around six phase one and two partnerships⁹⁹ have focused on developing new partnership level CPD structures that embed progression frameworks more firmly into business as usual e.g. Centres of Excellence, Geographical Hubs, new Social Work Academies. There is less evidence of this approach in phase three case studies.
- The training made most commonly available through new CPD offers is: PE training level one, two and refresher, skills modules, practitioners who teach, masterclasses and accredited learning for leaders/aspiring leaders. Most TPs (if not all) have used funding to heavily subsidise these programmes to support access to the provision. High quality CPD is perceived as a key tool in supporting the retention of experienced social workers.
- Various activities are in place to transition graduates from the TP into local social work employment including additional support on final placement, employability skills, centralised vacancy advertising and clearer transition support and guidance.
- The ability of partnerships to sustain CPD that underpins progression frameworks is unclear. Moving training online and exploring alternative ways of funding or income generation are approaches taken by individual partnerships.

⁹⁸ Phase one and two document review (Jan 2019).

⁹⁹ Data returns (Jan 2019).

Overall conclusions

The evidence from the evaluation, largely drawn from qualitative sources, suggests that the teaching partnerships programme has been a catalyst which has stimulated an increased level, depth and formality of collaboration in the way social work education is designed, planned and delivered. Building and maintaining this level of collaboration is itself considered by partnerships to be a key achievement of the programme to date, particularly in a challenging national and local context. These challenges include financial and capacity constraints, changes in national policy and the issues of recruitment and retention that they are trying to tackle.

Partnerships have put considerable resource (funding and energy) into establishing and maintaining effective collaborative structures and continue to work to maintain stakeholder engagement at senior and operational levels. There are high levels of commitment within partnerships to continue to work collaboratively to tackle key workforce issues. Successful senior engagement and communication within from LAs and HEIs remains a critical (and for some challenging) factor in securing the ability of partnerships to achieve lasting strategic change. Ongoing stakeholder management, communication of how the partnership will contribute to long term goals and sharing success are examples of strategies that have supported senior engagement.

Bespoke and flexible workstream delivery approaches have been developed in partnerships which reflect different local contexts, including historical relationships, size, composition, geography and specific local issues. Partnerships of all sizes have proven to be able to work effectively in a collaborative way, although naturally regional and local partnerships operate differently. Larger partnerships are more focused on building effective practice frameworks and guidance than agreeing standardised processes across partners (as found more often in smaller partnerships).

The most common areas of successful delivery against the stretch criteria across all partnership phases include admissions and selection processes, statutory practice placements, quality of placement support, practitioner and service user involvement in design and delivery of the curriculum and workforce development – although there is room for improvement in terms of achieving influential SUC involvement at more senior levels of TPs and – particularly in phase three – in meeting ambitions to provide two statutory placements.

A greater level of collaborative research and workforce planning has taken place more recently. However, there remain challenges in identifying, collecting and analysing data at partnership level. If used effectively, this could further support partnerships to develop

effective recruitment and retention strategies. Academics spending time shadowing and learning from practice is a less developed activity, with academics more involved in building collaborative research projects.

TP-funded infrastructure posts, in terms of project management and posts related to curriculum and placement development are reported by partnerships to have added enormous value to the pace, expertise and volume of work delivered. There are several examples where these posts are being sustained through core partner funding, in recognition of the benefits experienced as a result of these roles.

The evidence from this evaluation suggests that activity delivered across the programme has brought a range of benefits which contribute to the programme's strategic aims, including:

- A culture of collaborative working between HEIs, LAs and other partners
- Improved admissions and selection processes for social work undergraduates and post-graduates
- Increased and improved statutory practice placements, with new practice learning structures to transition theory to practice
- Increased numbers of better trained and supported Practice Educators
- Curricula with a stronger focus on the skills and knowledge needed in practice
- Increased support for ASYEs
- Refreshed and updated skills from workforce training for social workers
- Better understanding of local workforce issues and challenges.

There is anecdotal evidence¹⁰⁰ of these benefits leading to students being more practice ready, greater retention of students into local ASYE programmes and improved status of the PE role. However, there is limited quantifiable evidence of this, and it is too early in the journey of the programme to expect significant impact on higher level aims such as quality of social work, recruitment and retention. There are data and attribution challenges in measuring impact given the many external variables that will also affect social work recruitment and retention. However, most partnerships feel confident that the programme has moved them further towards their goals of recruiting high calibre

¹⁰⁰ From local evaluation reports, case study research and phase three case study reviews

entrants to the profession, raising the quality of social work education and developing a workforce with the skills, values and experience needed in contemporary social work.

An unexpected benefit of the partnership programme is that it has developed a platform from which partners can more easily work together to engage in other national initiatives, such as apprenticeships. There is the appetite within partnerships to develop a stronger voice in the sector and take a more active role in influencing national policy, although it is too early to say if teaching partnerships will be a vehicle for this.

The extent to which partnerships are sustainable (and in what form) will become clearer over the coming years. Partnerships are working to embed new structures and changes into business as usual, fund substantive posts, reduce costs and generate income (via partner contributions and/or selling training). Systems, structures and processes relating to admissions, placement quality, placement support/practice learning and refreshed curricula are commonly well embedded and are expected to continue. However, there is a continued reliance on local champions and goodwill which are dependent on local priorities and individual capacity. Limited budgets, competing priorities and partner restructures are ever present concerns for partnerships.

Plans for resourcing project managers (or some form of central resource) are currently being explored, particularly in phase two and phase three partnerships. Most partnerships indicate that these posts are needed to retain partnership momentum, but it is challenging to identify resource. Partnerships could potentially work more closely with other partnerships to identify reciprocal arrangements that might support sustainability.

Partnerships have found the national exchange meetings useful and they would like to continue to find ways to learn from each other going forward. Some suggest national level processes to facilitate the sharing of effective approaches, collaborative research papers and local best practice guides. This would also offer support to partnerships who have not been part of the formal TP programme.

Annex One: Stretch Criteria

All 2018 application details and requirements can be found [here](#). We list below a summary of the stretch criteria to provide context for TP activity and the evaluation focus.

Governance

- A strategy to raise the quality of education and practice training through the Teaching Partnership is co-owned by all the leads in the partnership.
- The partnership has a credible plan for improved performance for 2018-20, which senior managers in all partnership organisations own and will deliver.

Admissions

- The partnership owns a plan for the involvement of those with lived experience and employer representatives at all stages of admissions from Sept 2018, including decisions about applicants.
- The partnership is committed to a minimum of 120 UCAS points or a 2:1 requirement to undergraduate and postgraduate courses respectively from Sept 2018, requirements also maintained at clearing.
- The partnership develops and implements by Sept 2019 tests at the point of application before an offer to study is made. Tests will assess all applicants' intellectual ability, social work values and behaviours. The tests must include written assessment, verbal reasoning, group discussion and scenarios/role play in all cases. These tests should be applied to all applicants, including those from access courses.

Placements and curriculum

- Partnerships offering both statutory placements relevant to students' preferred areas of practice in contrasting settings from AY 2018-19 will be prioritised in the assessment of applications.
- Programmes providing units in child and family and adult areas of practice will be prioritised.
- All placement students are guaranteed statutory placements relevant to their preferred areas of practice, which they are offered from AY 2018-19. In child and

family settings, these will offer all students significant experience of using the statutory framework for child and family social work. In adult services, students will have experience of using statutory frameworks for adult social care in delivering outcome-focused, personalised responses

- The partnership can evidence enhanced collaboration between employers and HEIs to undertake long term planning for training and development of the social work workforce throughout their careers.

Academic delivery

- The partnership can demonstrate an increase in the amount of child and family practitioner and adult practitioner teaching on the initial education academic programme in 2018-19 compared to existing baselines.
- In feedback, 90% or more of students rate academic delivery as at least good.

Practice support and development

- The partnership describes a credible plan for ensuring that students will be supported and developed throughout their placements by a broad set of child and family and adult practitioners appropriate to their placements. It will commit to using no more than 20% independent PEs by or before March 2019.
- The partnership can evidence how experienced, effective child and family, and adult social workers (whether or not they are PEs) are involved in curriculum development.
- All those supporting and developing students must be familiar with the CSWs' Knowledge and Skills statements.

Workforce and labour market planning

- The partnership has a plan for embedding the CSWs' Knowledge and Skills statements, ASYE requirements, ACFP and DfE supervisor proposals into practitioner CPD from Sept 2019.
- The partnership describes how it will produce by March 2019 an improved medium-term labour market plan (3-5 years). Implementing the plan will attract more students into social work training and posts and retain higher numbers of practitioners with local and regional employers. The partnership's application specifies what expert support would be useful to assist with the plan.

Progression

- There is a credible plan to deliver AY 2016-17 employment rates in social work of at least 70% and 80% at six months and 12 months respectively after graduation and at least the same in the following AY.
- The partnership can evidence that a system is in place to support final year students in their transition to qualified practitioner, above and beyond final placement arrangements.

Academics' experience of practice

- Practitioners involved in teaching are supported by employers to do so.
- There are joint appointments across practice and education.
- There is a plan to embed practitioner research approaches for students and ASYEs in partnership with HEIs.

Annex Two: Method

The evaluation has been delivered in two phases between January 2019 and March 2020. The evaluation is predominantly a process evaluation and is largely based on qualitative methods.

Phase one (January 2019 - March 2019)

Document review

A template for the document review data collection and analysis was agreed with DfE, to collect key information on activity across workstreams, achievements and benefits, lessons learnt and to identify available core MI.

DfE provided the evaluators with the documentation held centrally including application forms, reports and returns previously sent to DfE. In addition, partnerships across all phases were contacted by the evaluators and asked to share key documents regarding their governance, activity, progress and learning. Informal discussions were held with project managers from the majority of partnerships to clarify and understand elements of the documents sent.

An in-depth document review was undertaken of phase one and two partnerships. A 'lighter touch' document review was undertaken with phase three partnerships because of their earlier stage of development.

Areas were generous in sharing their operational documentation and over 350 documents were analysed as part of the evaluation. These documents provided a good overview of the activity delivered and approaches taken, as well as indicating a range of benefits and lessons learned. It should be noted that, outside of six local independent evaluation reports, the evidence from the document review is not independently verified. In addition, some of the documents reviewed may not reflect the latest progress or changed approaches.

Case studies

Two case studies (both with phase one partnerships) have been conducted, which included stakeholder research with key stakeholders (project manager, local authority leads from workforce development, principal social workers, HEI curriculum leads and other relevant leads according to the area of practice) across strategic, management

and operational levels. The aim of these was to provide a more in-depth level of insight into what is working and how this has been achieved.

MI review

The MI review focused only on phase one and two partnerships, due to the early stage of delivery in phase three. The planned method was to draw core MI out of evaluation and progress reports, as part of the document review – to minimise burden on partnerships project managers. However, it became evident at an early stage that this data was not available through the documents provided by partnerships. A pragmatic approach was agreed with DfE, who requested that partnership managers be asked to develop a dataset from what already exists within the partnership. A new template was agreed (comprising a larger dataset than initially included in the document review) and discussed with all project managers from phases one and two. A timescale of four weeks was provided for the collection of anonymised partnership level data.

Nine out of 12 partnerships returned the data template. Most project managers did not have the requested data at a partnership level. Therefore, the project managers needed to share the template and ask individual partners to complete sections relevant to them. Some project managers collated responses, and others sent through individual, anonymised partner level data (due to time pressures). This process has created a level of unreliability in the data, as the template was not designed as a self-completion template at partner level (i.e. it did not contain detailed guidance for consistent completion across multiple partners) – it was designed as a collation tool for existing partnership level data. However, project managers put significant efforts into trying to co-ordinate and collect data from individual partners, with some success. Most areas were not able to collect data from all partners, and the basis of data is not always clear. The data should therefore be treated as indicative. Further detail is provided in Annex Three.

The approach taken to data collection and the organising of case studies ensures that no sensitive personal data is shared between partnerships and the evaluation team. In addition, in order to maximise the contribution by partnerships to the evaluation, qualitative and quantitative was provided by partnerships in confidence to the evaluation team – based on an agreement that no individual partners – or partnerships – would be named in the reporting in the first phase.

Phase two of the evaluation (September 2019 - March 2020)

Data refresh

Phase one and two partnerships were asked to complete a data pro-forma to capture key data across key areas of work. Learning from the first data collection process, the pro-forma was simplified and offered qualitative response options where data was not available. Ten out of 12 data forms were returned. Completion was good quality overall. Due to the nature of the data reliability in the first phase of the evaluation, and the fact that we asked several different questions to explore areas of emerging interest, the comparative analysis is limited and should be treated as indicative.

Four phase two partnership case studies

The aim of this strand was to understand partnership approaches, challenges, enablers, benefits and sustainability in specific areas of activity. These were selected on the basis of size, geography and the areas of good practice identified in the earlier document review (phase one of the evaluation). Selected areas were South Coast (Student Learning Hubs), West London (Critical Reflective Practice), D2N2 (Practice Development) and Suffolk and Norfolk (Service User Engagement). Case studies involved interviews with project managers and an agreed range of stakeholders most relevant to the area of effective practice identified. In total, we consulted with around 55 stakeholders including board and workstream members associated with the areas of enquiry and those involved in operational delivery. This included staff from HEIs e.g. subject and curriculum leads, lecturers, tutors, placement leads) and those from LAs PSWs, TP funded roles, practising social workers and students. Stakeholders were consulted through individual face to face and telephone consultations, focus groups and small group discussions. We also were invited to observe relevant meetings and delivery (for example student learning hubs in the South Coast TP (SCRC)).

Phase three document review and follow up

DfE provided the Interface team with 51 case studies that phase three partnerships had provided as part of their reporting processes. These were mostly in draft format because final case studies were not yet submitted. These were reviewed against a template to enable approaches and progress to be identified and thematically analysed. These are case studies that partnerships had developed themselves and contained a mixture of description, perceptions, anecdotal evidence and a limited amount of formal evidence from local evaluation and monitoring.

Four phase three areas were selected for further exploration around their progress. This took place through interviews with the project managers. Areas were selected as a result of showing good progress in specific areas, and on the basis of geography and size. Areas selected were Regional West Midlands, South West London and Surrey, Pan Dorset and Wiltshire, Kent and Medway.

Deep dive research

The aim of this research was to establish, in detail, four partnership approaches to particular areas of effective practice. Areas were selected on the basis of geography, size and area of good practice identified from the phase one and two document review – and the phase three review of case studies. Areas selected were North Yorkshire Urban and Rural (Practice Education); Leeds and Wakefield (Relationships and Engagement); West London (Research Culture); North East London (Workforce Planning).

Sustainability case studies

Partnership areas were selected as a result of demonstrating different features of sustainability that would be of interest to other partnerships, in addition to geography and size. Areas selected: South Yorkshire, North London, Cumbria, and North East. This involved consultations with the project manager, and other nominated stakeholders who the project manager selected to contribute.

Annex Three: Data

Data was sought at two points in the evaluation – January 2019 (data returns) and January 2020 (data refresh). The data from both these sources is presented below. The purpose of this annex is to ensure that the source, reliability and key analysis of the data used in the report is understood. It is important to note that the data is not considered to be comprehensive and should be treated as indicative only. For more robust analysis, we have at times triangulated or combined the quantitative data from data returns with quantitative and/or qualitative data found in the document review (and this is clearly referenced in the report).

Data returns (January 2019)

Response rates

- 9/12 phase one and two partnerships provided a completed or part completed data return. This included two (out of three) partnerships from phase one and seven partnerships (out of nine) from phase two.
- Whilst response rates are by individual partnerships, although over half of these do not include data from all relevant partners for all or some questions.
- For undergraduate questions, the eligible population is nine or ten (not 12) because:
 - two partnerships do not include UG in their remit (it should be noted that one of these did not complete a data return);
 - one partnership only included UG in their remit in the latest year (2018/9) so cannot answer most of the UG questions.

Data questions	Response rate	Key analysis
UNDERGRADUATE COURSES		
Number students on undergraduate courses (Split by year and course) in Year 1, 2 and 3 (and starting month if not Sept) Broken down by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of applications rec'd • Offers made • Conversion from offer to firm acceptance 	7/10	7/7 have experienced a general trend of a decrease in applications – although not for every year (inconsistent in five partnerships). Most have experienced an overall decrease in student numbers comparing pre-post TP (but variation in-between), although some are planning or had slightly increased numbers in the latest year. No reliable total possible – missing partners, use of projections/estimates from application form and inconsistent years.
Student cohort demographics (if available)	1/10	Only one partnership provided data within time frame.
Is entry standard for undergraduate degrees minimum 120 pts? List all courses and state yes/no.	8/10	6 out of the 8 responding partnerships reported an entry minimum of 120pts across the partnership; the further two (possibly three) partnerships have one HEI with a lower entry criteria (112pts). This reflects an increase in entry standards in at least two partnerships.
Entry standard for clearing - still 120 pts? Number of exceptions to TP admissions criteria	6/9	Of the six responses, four partnerships report exceptions at UG level, but where level of exceptions indicated, this is low (one TP states four exceptions) (one TP states 'rarely'). Two (possibly three) TPs have individual HEIs with 112 pt. entry level.
PLACEMENTS		
Number and % of students offered 2 statutory placements.	7/9	5/7 responses offer 90%-100% students two statutory placements and 6/7 have at least one HEI who has increased the % of students being offered two stat placements. One offers minimal level. Most provided % not a number.
Number and % of students offered only one statutory placement	7/9	2/7 (eligible) provide only one statutory placement, one partnership offers this to 99-100% students and HEIs in the second are moving towards providing one Statutory placement, with one HEI achieved 83%.
How many days do the statutory placements total (e.g. 1x70 days + 1x100 days =170)	7/9	170 (1x70 +1x100) if two stat placements are provided; 100 days if one placement is provided. Priority to final year students. One phase two partnership has +30 days skills day

How many placements are for: Adult Services, Children's Services, PVI, other	6/9	4/6 partnerships showed more Children's placements, although placements in AS are increasing. For three partnerships there are broadly equal number of places in CS & AS. Reduced PVI evident. PVI generally not broken down into sector.
Number and % Placement pass rate (split by demographics) (if available)	5/9	Of the five eligible, all had historical pass rates over 93% and these varied between 93% up to 100% in the TP period. Not enough years of data/attribution to draw conclusions.
Placement quality (e.g. this could be via student satisfaction survey feedback for new arrangements, or you may have other evidence (or not)	4/9	A quantitative response (QAPL) was provided by three TPs and a qualitative response from one TP. Not enough data for trend analysis (no baseline and only latest data in two TPs; only data from two years in the other). The qualitative response to the data return suggested higher levels of satisfaction through more proactive engagement/intervention.
PRACTICE IN CURRICULUM		
% curriculum focused on KSS	7/9	100% (7 responses) indicated increases. (Baseline range from 0-100%, latest year estimated range 30% to 100%). Min increase was 15% (one HEI within a partnership where other HEIs reported much higher) largest increase 0-50%
% curriculum taught by practitioners	7/9	Six quantitative; one qualitative. 100% report increases. Baseline range: 10% to 36% to range 15% to 100%
STUDENT ATTAINMENT		
Final grades (compared to historic)	1/9	No clear trend.
NSS student course ratings (compared to historic) % of students who rated academic delivery as at least 'good'. Prior to funded TP / post TP funding.	4/9	One phase one TP: Yr. 2 to 3: increase 75-85%. Only one other area where one HEI provided a comparative – increase from 80-90 & 94% (other HEIs in same partnership range 88-95%). Other provided latest – both HEIs over 90%; one of these reported this is steady.
Undergraduate employment rates % of graduates gaining posts as social workers within 6 & 12 months of graduation	4/9	One phase one TP reported 3% increase from baseline. [Three Phase two TPs provided data (one steady; one increase; one TP no comparator).

Student attrition rate	3/9	Three replies; all report low rates. [One TP reduced but only over one yr. of data]. No conclusions possible.
POST GRADUATE COURSES		
Number students on MA courses	9/12	Numbers incomplete. No clear pattern – those reporting application numbers (3/10) had a reduction. Partnerships report variations between HEIs, 5/10 areas reporting at least one HEI with reductions and two reporting HEIs with increases.
Entry requirements 2:1 or above? Number of exceptions to TP admissions criteria	9/12	8/9 responding HEIs in partnerships report a minimum of 2:1 as the standard entry criteria – one is unclear. 5/9 partnerships report at least one HEI with an exception policy. Only one partnership provided exception levels, and these were high.
PLACEMENTS		
Number and % of students offered 2 statutory placements.	9/12	6/9 TPs (including 100% of P1s replying (n2)) report that the TPs offer two statutory placements to 96-100% students. One further partnership has one HEI that offers two statutory placements to 100% students. Three of the four that gave comparative data show large increase that indicates a clear change of policy from one to two stat places. There were smaller increases in two further TPs (increase from 87%/96% to 96%/97%) One of the 3/9 reporting low levels, has dropped the offer back to one statutory placement. One offered 12% students two stat placements in yr. two but dropped these in yr. three.
Number and % of students offered only one statutory placement	9/12	The data shows that all those not offering two placements offer one statutory placement.
On average, how many days do the statutory placements total (e.g. 1x70 days + 1x100 days =170)	8/12	One hundred days for statutory placement. Seventy days for those offering information on second placement in PVI.
How many placements are for: Adult Services, Children's Services, PVI, other	8/12	Eight responses, overall incomplete/poor data; one not useable. PVI experience not categorised into As or CS for some. More places in CS in most partnerships, but smaller difference than in UG placements.

Number and % Placement pass rate (split by demographics) (if available)	5/12	Five provided some data (percentage only for 3/5) or specified no change (1/5). All four providing clear data have pass rates over 90%. There is no change in three partnerships (One phase one TP reports 100% for both years). Two phase two possibly indicate improvement; need more years data to draw conclusions.
Placement quality (student satisfaction survey feedback for new arrangements)	5/12	5/5 provided some form of response from some individual HEIs. 3/5 TPS reported quantitative data. One comparative response was provided, showing an increase of 5%. [96% (P1) and 90% were other ratings provided]. 2/5 reported qualitatively 'positive' and QAPL'. Data not generally being collated at partnership level.
CURRICULUM AND TEACHING		
% curriculum focused on KSS	8/12	8 responses. 7 TPs report increases (and one reported a stable 100%). Range baseline: 5%-90% to latest range 35%-100%. Generally found to be a difficult question to answer in these terms.
% curriculum taught by practitioners	8/12	Range 5-100%. 6/8 provided comparative data, all of which showed increases (5-25% change). Two TPs provided statements of number or % practitioners involved for one year (5-100%)] indicate significant work going on in this area. One partnership provided SUC involvement of 20%.
Student Attainment & satisfaction		
Final grades (compared to historic)	4/12	No pattern. Data incomplete. Many students not in TP remit for full period.
NSS student course ratings (compared to historic) % of students who rated academic delivery as at least 'good'. Prior to funded TP / post TP funding.	3/12	Not enough data to draw conclusions. One phase one possible increase, but different data source different years; One phase one TP stable at high level.

Postgraduate employment rates - % of graduates gaining posts as social workers within 6 & 12 months of graduation (latest data available. E.g. Prior to funded-TP / post TP funding etc.)	5/12	Not provided in consistent manner/limited years of data provided. No trends.
Student attrition rate	4/12	Mix qual/quant. Range 2-7% or 'Low'. Not enough data for trend analysis.
Existing workforce – LA and HEI		
Numbers practising SW on CPD courses	7/12	7/12 responses. Numbers incomplete/potential duplication as completed at individual partner levels; not all partners in partnerships completed. Trend (more reliable when triangulated with qual): wider range of CPD; more PE training; more ASYE training. More skills-based learning.
% promotions from CPD courses into leadership positions	2/12	Most TPs or partners do not collect this. Examples provided: Aspiring Team manager programme: 5 of which are now in Management posts. Aspiring Advanced Practitioner programme positive for promotions.
Do academics have protected time in practice? % time spent by academics in practice.	9/12	7/9 responses yes (One TP not protected, but can be taken out of 10% scholarly activities) and one DK. For those that gave percentages, 5-10% was the norm (n3). For those that provided time (n2) these were 2-8 days; 5 days. Compared to pre-TP this indicates an increase for at least two areas and not for one area (no other baseline data provided).
Can the partnership evidence that 10% of academic staff are supported to have protected time in practice during 2018-2020	9/12	100% responded yes (although one did not explicitly confirm the %). 10-15% is the norm, but up to 50% staff have this protected time in one phase two partnership (unclear if across all HEIs) and 100% in one phase two HEI.
Number of Practice Educators used in each LA or provider (latest data available) Split by children and adult services	9/12	Total number provided for latest year is 1466. Trends: three TPs report mixed (some providers increase/some decrease). Three report overall increase. Two report overall decrease. Data incomplete – missing many providers. Some PEs are used more than

		once. This data not routinely collected at partnership level. No reliable baseline.
Number/% of independent PEs used. PES not employed by member of TP (if available)	9/12	Incomplete (partners and partnerships missing) 5/9 provide comparative data. 4/5 of these show reduced no's of independent PEs (reductions vary from -4% -17% -11 PEs (& no data). 1/9 shows no change (one ind. PE). One shows an increase in use of own TP borough PEs. One shows a mix (reductions by LA but increases by an HEI). Of the 3 TPs providing no comparator, levels reported are 20% and 20% & 'minimal', one of these uses independent PEs to mentor PEs.
Can the partnership evidence that at least 50% of all Practice Educators (PEs) currently used by the partnership have demonstrated capability against Level 2 of PE Professional Standards?	8/12	5/8 report 'yes'. Of the three that said no, one could say 'yes' in yr. one but not in yr. two (combination of increased PE1 training and resistance to PE L2 training), one could evidence it for some, but not all LAs; and one reported 'no'.
Number of the above Practice Educators qualified to level 2 of professional standards.	8/12	5/8 report increases and 1/8 TP steady at 100% (because combine training). Numbers not reliable: unclear years, not all partners, mixed trends across partners. One TP decrease in line with overall PE/student reductions and one TP 'minimal'
Number of the above Practice Educators qualified to level 1 of professional standard.	8/12	No reliable number as many partners missing; unclear sources. 3/8 TPs report increases. 3/8 indicate probable increases. Two TPs report decreases.
Average Practice Educator caseload (number of students).	8/12	6/8 report '1' – for two of these there is no change; one of these reports that for offsite supervisors the caseload is two. One partnership reported PE caseload ranges from 1 to 2 and another 1 to 3.4.
Can the partnership evidence that at least 60% of the HEI-employed academic teaching team are qualified, registered social workers?	9/12	9/9 report 'yes' (although this does not represent all HEIs in all responding partnerships).

How many (inc raw and FTE) and what percentage of the HEI-employed academic teaching team are qualified, registered social workers? Practising social workers?	9/12	Not all provided numbers. 9/9 TPs report high levels of staff who are qualified (90%-100%) and registered SWs (86%-100%). Less data on practising numbers – indicative one or two per staff body; but 25% in one partnership. One HEI has put in the contracts of two new staff that they should remain in practice. Not possible to measure change.
DfE funding total	6/12	Six TPs provided the costs of their partnership. The remainder signposted to DfE Claims or did not respond.
Spend per workstream	3/12	No pattern for expenditure except generally lower on admissions and workforce planning.
Workforce demographics (if available)	2/12	Two responses were made. We collected reports from other areas, but no conclusions to draw as data from different years/minimal attribution.
Turnover rate (if available)	4/12	Four responses. Varies 8% 20-23%. One individual LA reduced from 43 to 7% over the last two years but only CS and small numbers. No conclusions possible.
Qualifying route of NQSWs within TP: Fast track (Step Up, Frontline, Think Ahead) Degree within TP Degree (other HEI) Apprenticeship (future years) (if available)	7/12	Seven responses, all demonstrate multiple entry strands. Some covered by TP time period and others not; some unclear if in remit or not.

Data refresh analysis (January 2020)

Question	Response rate	Analysis
UNDERGRADUATE COURSES		
U/G course name(s) – for ease of completion	Overall 10/12 TPs returned data responses	17 BA SW courses; three integrated four yr course; three Apprenticeship degrees. Note new integrated courses replace courses. Not all TPs listed their courses.
Please provide number of expected yr 1 enrolments for 19/20 academic year on HEI courses offered within partnership scope.	10 out of 10	878 (incomplete and estimations) Trend vs 2019 data returns: Not enough comparators for trend; unreliable comparators due to unclear completion rates.
Has there been any discussion/perceptions shared by HEIs about applications increasing or decreasing as a result of being a TP or specific TP recruitment activity? If so, what evidence underpins these?	7 out of 10 provided an observation	Two TP planned decreases in line with raised admissions and placement availability. [one of these had increase in applications] One TP increased enrolment due to new Apprenticeship degree. Two TPs decline in applications as per national trend at the time. One TP volatile; One TP slight decline overall but more enrolments from within TP area.
Are entry requirements set at minimum of 120 points for Sept 2019/Jan 2020 for all UG courses?	10 out of 10	9 out of 10 TPs yes
Was 120 pts the entry standard for clearing for the Sept 2019/20 intake?	10 out of 10 (note not all HEIs within TPs use clearing)	8 out of 10 TPs yes; one of these has one HEI that does not retain at clearing.
PLACEMENTS		
What % students will be offered TWO statutory placements (i.e. those placements meeting the DfE definition of statutory) this academic year?	9 out of 10 [two no comparator]	Two TPs offer 90-100% for all students (one TP a slight decrease; one TP maintained). Of the remaining 7TPs, 3XTPs have 50%-66% of HEIs that are offering 95-100%. One TP is offering two statutory placements to 63% (decline). Two TPs are offering 100% to final placement students and more if possible. One TP achieved 64% of final placements (and low for 1st placements).

<i>[If data not known: Do you expect to increase, decrease or not change the % students offered 2 statutory placements (i.e. those placements meeting the DfE definition of statutory)?</i>	7 out of 10 provided observation (optional)	5 TPs no change 2 TPs decrease (1 is slight decrease).
Is there any change to the number of placement days offered compared to last year? (e.g. 1x70; 1x100 or 2x100)	9 out of 10 (one N/A as no placements last year)	7 no change; two HEIs changed number of skills days (One HEI increased to match other HEI in the partnership; One decreased)
How would you describe the use of PVIs to deliver placements meeting the statutory definition in 2019/20: same, more, less than last year OR not at all?	9 out of 10 (one N/A as no placements last year)	Only one TP suggests they do not use PVIs. Four TPS have not changed their level of PVI use since last year. Four will use PVIs slightly more in placements where the statutory definition can be met. These are all areas that had reduced their use of PVIs previously.
Do you have evidence of change in placement quality attributable to partnership activities?	8 out of 10 replied (one N/A; one no response)	Two TPs report no evidence. Six suggest improved quality. One HEI within a partnership has a higher NSS (56% to 97%) which is reported relates partly to better placements. One TP presents survey results showing high quality placements (90% rate good or v good but no comparator). The remaining four have anecdotal evidence relating to improved quality from the use of key roles (2xTPs). (2TPs) cite improvements from better matching from closer working (one TP) and early resolution of issues (one TP). [One TP has no update to evidence provided previously which was stable (-4%)].
PRACTICE IN CURRICULUM		
Have changes been made to the % of the curriculum that is focused on KSS for:		
Yr 1 students?	10 out of 10	Six no change i.e. maintained that KSS is embedded effectively; 2TPs further positive improvements. 1TP no comparator and no change. 1TP KSS evident in handbook and portfolio. HEI asked to note that KSS is post qualifying so limitations on application to academic measures.

Other students?	10 out of 10	As above
Have changes been made to the % of the curriculum that is taught by practitioners for:		
Year 1 students:	9 out of 10 (one no response)	Five TPs maintained previous increases. 2 TPs have HEIs within them that made further increase (one 50%; one slight increase on their first year programme due to increase on social work in context module. One no change and no comparator (new inclusion).
Other students:	9 out of 10 (one no response)	As above
Did your partnership measure changes in student attainment for 2019 final grades?	7 out of 10 responses (3 no response)	Two individual HEIs provided evidence of change. A different HEI notes that they review data (no details of any change) but change is not necessarily attributable to the TP. Others report no data.
End of 2018/9: NSS student course ratings (measured by % of students who rated academic delivery as at least 'good')	8 out of 9 applicable (one no response)	No clear pattern TP wide. One HEI increase. Otherwise steady or mixed/volatile.
<i>HEIs in partnership providing Masters level courses - this is not a question - headings are for ease of completion</i>		
<i>Course names - for ease of completion</i>		10MA SW; 3x Step Up 1x Apprenticeships and two four-year integrated courses. Incomplete.
Please provide number of expected yr 1 enrolments for 19/20 academic year on masters level courses offered within partnership scope.	9 out of 10	537 Unreliable: Incomplete responses & projected values.
<i>Has there been any discussion/perceptions shared by HEIs about applications increasing or decreasing as a result of being a TP or specific TP recruitment activity? If so, what</i>	9 out of 10 offered an observation	Four decreasing as a result of a perceived combination of student debt from BAs or fast track schemes; one also cites more stringent admissions. Two TPs increases due to fast track/other programmes. One individual HEI (not shared across TP) increases due to increased stat placements and promotion. Two TPs no change. One TP is currently reviewing data

evidence underpins these?		
Are entry requirements set at minimum 2:1 for Sept 2019/Jan 2020 for all Masters courses?	10 out of 10	Five focus on 2:1 but with exceptions; Three TPs report 2:1 or above – one of these is an improvement on last year. One TP reports 2.2. or above. [9/10 same]
Entry standard for clearing – was this kept at 2:1?	10 out of 10 (one no comparator; two HEIs did not use clearing)	Eight TPs maintained at clearing. One TP reports low levels of exceptions (under 10%). One TP – many exceptions.
PLACEMENTS		
What % students will be offered TWO statutory placements this academic year (i.e. those placements meeting the DfE definition of statutory)?	10 out of 10 (one no comparator)	Four TPs 100% all HEIs in TP (three maintained and one increased this AY year); one TP has 2/3 HEIs offering 100%; two TPs high (80% first (decrease); 100% 2nd/ 87%). One TP first placements only but possibly improved % of 2nd placements (unclear comparator); one TP mix; one TP unclear as PVIs not included even if statutory definition applies.
<i>[If % not known: Do you expect the % students offered two statutory placements (i.e. those placements meeting the DfE definition of statutory) in the partnership to increase, decrease or not change?</i>	Four offered observations	Three TPs unchanged, one slight decrease.
Is there any change to the number of placement days offered compared to last year?	10 out of 10	No changes to statutory placement day structure. Majority 100+70 (two TPs have other configurations).
How would you describe your use of PVIs to deliver placements meeting the statutory definition in 2019/20: same,	10 out of 10	Six TPs same use of PVIs (one of these TPs has no PVI use). Four TPs slightly increased where PVIs can offer statutory work.

more, less than last year OR not using PVIs		
Do you have evidence of change in placement quality attributable to partnership activities?	10 out of 10 responded (5 no comparator)	One TP quantitative increase of 5% survey. Six TPs report having positive change based on anecdotal evidence. Three TPs no evidence of change [NB one QAPL 98%] NB. comment restricted because only one LA in the TP offers places to non-drivers
CURRICULUM		
Have changes been made to the % of the curriculum that is focused on KSS for:		
Yr. 1 students?	10 out of 10 responses	Eight TPs maintained previous increased levels. Two TPs further embedded it into the curriculum this year. Two TPs, of those maintaining, found this difficult to answer because KSS is post qualifying but they report KSS underpins and is mapped across all assessments; in the other TP, students are assessed on PCF entry criteria.
Other students?	10 out of 10 responses	Eight TPs maintained previous increased levels. (Two of these TPs found this difficult to answer because KSS is post qualifying but KSS underpins and is mapped across all assessments; in the other TP, students are assessed on PCF entry criteria). Two TPs further embedded it into the curriculum this year.
Have changes been made to the % of the curriculum that is taught by practitioners for:		
Year one students:	10 out of 10	8 maintained; 2 increased.
Other students:	10 out of 10	8 maintained; 2 increased.
STUDENT ATTAINMENT		
Did your partnership measure changes in student attainment for 2019 final grades? If so, was there any significant increase or decrease in attainment that can be attributed to TP activity?	10 out of 10 responded	No evidence of change

Do you have any evidence of change in student satisfaction as a result of partnership activity	9 out of 10 provided responses	No hard evidence. Anecdotal employment increases, positive feedback on practitioner involvement in academia (two TPs).
Numbers of practising social workers on CPD courses – since March 2019 [i.e. that were not counted in the data provided previously]	6 out of 10 provided a number (two confirmed this is not collected this at TP level)	421 (not reliable as not representative of all LAs). Combination of decrease and lack of data at TP level.
Will there be changes to the amount of time academics spend in practice in this academic year?	7 out of 10 responded (1 no comparator)	3 TPs no change; 3 TPs increase; 1 TP decrease
Can the partnership evidence that 10% of academic staff are supported to have protected time in practice during AY 2019/2020	7 out of 10 responded (1 no comparator)	5 TPs yes; 1 TP no; 1 HEI in a TP no
Current number of Practice Educators being used within the partnership	9 out of 10 (comparator unreliable/missing; not all LAs responded)	No reliable figure possible.
Will there be an increase, decrease or same level of PE training this year (all levels?)	8 out of 10	Training will be increased in 2-3 TPs; maintained at same level in 2-3 TPs and decreased in 2 TPs due to funding/increased competition.
Can the partnership evidence that at least 50% of all Practice Educators (PEs) currently used by the partnership have demonstrated capability against Level 2 of PE Professional Standards?	8 out of 10	6 TPs yes (or mostly yes); 1 TP no; 1 TP unsure
SUSTAINABILITY PLAN	8 out of 10	All eight respondents are working on sustainability, but many are currently reviewing plans. One of these has different plans with partners and is looking to develop one plan in the future.

Annex Four: Glossary

ADCS Association of Directors of Children's Services

AMHP Approved Mental Health Professional

ASYE Assessed and Supported Year in Employment

AY Academic Year

CPD Continuing Professional Development

CSWKSS Chief Social Workers' Knowledge and Skills Statements

DfE Department for Education

DHSC Department of Health and Social Care

HEIs Higher Education Institutions

KSS Knowledge and Skills Statements

LAs Local Authorities

NAAS National Assessment and Accreditation Scheme

PCF Professional Capabilities Framework

PE Practice Educator

PEC Practice Education Consultant or Professional Education Consultant

PPEL Partner Practice Educator Leads

PEP Practice Education Pathway

PSW Principal Social Worker

PVIs Private or Voluntary Institutions

QA Quality Assurance

QAPL Quality Assurance in Practice Learning

SUC Service Users and Carers

SWTPs or TPs Social Work Teaching Partnerships



Department
for Education

© Department for Education 2020

Reference: DFE-RR1072

ISBN: 978-1-83870-185-7

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education.

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at:

Socialworkreform.SG@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications