
Approval process report

University of Worcester, Dietetics, 2023-24

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve the Dietetics programme at the University of Worcester. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme are fit to practice.

We have

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area.
- Reviewed the programme(s) against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme is approved.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. This is a new programme the education provider is seeking approval for.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the programme is approved.
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year.• The programme has been approved and will be delivered by the education provider from September 2024.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment.....	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions.....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment.....	4
The education provider context.....	4
Practice areas delivered by the education provider.....	5
Institution performance data	5
The route through stage 1	7
Admissions	8
Management and governance.....	9
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	11
Learners	12
Outcomes from stage 1	15
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	15
Programmes considered through this assessment	15
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	16
Quality themes identified for further exploration	16
Quality theme 1 – Collaboration with practice education providers to ensure commitment to provide practice-based learning.....	16
Quality theme 2 – Effective process to ensure sufficient practice-based learning to accommodate learners who need to repeat a placement.	17
Quality theme 3 – Training to ensure appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support practice-based learning.....	17
Section 4: Findings.....	18
Conditions	18
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	19
Section 5: Referrals.....	21
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	21
Assessment panel recommendation	21
Appendix 1 – summary report.....	23
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution.....	25

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme(s) detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme(s) approval / ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)
- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Duane Mellor	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Lead visitor, Dietitian
John Archibald	Education Quality Officer
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers seven HCPC approved programmes across four professions. This includes one post registration programme for independent prescribing and supplementary prescribing annotations. They have been delivering HCPC approved programmes since 2007. There are ten academic schools and these programmes are mainly based within the School of Allied Health and Community, however Independent and Supplementary Prescribing sit with the Three Counties School of Nursing and Midwifery.

The education provider engaged with the performance review process in the current model of quality assurance in 2022 where they achieved a five-year review period. Therefore, their next engagement with the performance review process will be in 2026-27.

The education provider engaged with the approval process in the legacy model of quality assurance for new occupational therapist and physiotherapist programmes. Both assessments were for new full time accelerated routes to their programmes. They engaged with the major change process in the legacy model of quality assurance for changes to their full time occupational therapist and physiotherapist programmes in 2019 and 2020. There was a major change for these professions in 2019 and it was agreed that these changes would be reviewed through the next annual monitoring process. Their paramedic programmes have been included in four major change reviews in 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 in the legacy model of quality assurance.

The education provider engaged with the programme closure process in the legacy model of quality assurance for their foundation degree for the paramedic profession in 2018 when the threshold level of qualification for paramedics' registration was raised. They also engaged with the programme closure process for supplementary prescribing and independent prescribing provision in 2018.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
	Occupational therapy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	01/09/2013
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	01/02/2007
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	01/09/2013
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	11/09/2023
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			01/09/2007

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare

provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench- mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	672	696	2022	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	3%	2020-21	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider’s performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 1%.</p> <p>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there</p>

				was no impact on SETs considered.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	97%	2019-20	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has dropped by 1%.</p> <p>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.</p>
Learner satisfaction	77.3%	72.6%	2023	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p>

We also considered intelligence from others, as follows:

- NHS England Midlands - we received information considering current pressures regarding practice-based learning in the Midlands. The information was reviewed but we considered it would not impact on this assessment, as these pressures related specifically to the Physiotherapy profession.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - Programme information is accessible on the webpages of the education provider. In line with current education provider practices and expectations, the education provider has set appropriate entry requirements, including for those who have studied outside of the UK.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - The relevant entry requirements are available on the education providers website and in the programme specifications. The admissions policy also outlines the English language, character and health requirements. To meet the requirements, applicants are required to provide evidence of the level of their English language, at a minimum of GCSE grade 4, as part of the application process.
 - Applicants are required to have enhanced disclosure and barring service (DBS) clearance. This is arranged by the education provider for applicants accepting an offer for a place. References are reviewed for each applicant to assure good character. All shortlisted applicants are assessed of their understanding of attributes, values, and behaviours related to professionalism.
 - Applicants are also required to satisfy the education provider's health requirements and have occupational health clearance. This is arranged by the education provider.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**
 - Applicants may apply for consideration of recognition of prior learning. These are considered on an individual basis and scrutinised internally by two assessors and externally by the external examiner. All successful applications are recorded through the learning, teaching and quality enhancement and registry services and reported via the education provider's governance system.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - No applicant is subject to discrimination on grounds such as race, gender, age, sexuality, parental status, marital status, and disability status. Recruitment of staff and applicants is subject to the Equality and Diversity Policy.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹ –**
 - The programme is subject to the requirements of the education provider's Taught Courses Regulatory Framework and Assessment Policy which meets the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) (2014) UK quality code for higher education. The education provider delivers education across a range of professions.
 - An external examiner is appointed to provide an external overview of academic and professional standards.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - The education provider established partnerships with local NHS Trusts and private / voluntary organisations within their integrated care system. The education provider reviews resourcing to ensure there are appropriate resources for programme delivery.
 - The education provider has an annual budget process and performance against this budget is monitored monthly, with any changes from the original budget updated in the full year forecast. These processes capture additional resource or capital investment requirements and consider any increase in learner numbers.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - Programmes have a programme specification which aligns with:
 - the requirements of the Taught Courses Regulatory Framework;
 - HCPC standards of education and training; and
 - the professional body curriculum framework.
 - The programme handbook contains information about how the programmes are run.
 - The programme is compliant with the education provider's Annual Evaluation Reporting requirements. This enables programme teams and other departments to evaluate the programme, to ensure quality assurance of standards is maintained, and enhancements are identified to ensure the programme remains current. The programme is subject to the education provider's six-yearly periodic review.
 - The programme meets the education provider's requirements for the regulations for the appointment of external examiners.
 - The education provider stated the learner voice is central within management and governance of this programme. Two learner and staff liaison committee meetings occur per academic year. There are various mechanisms through which learners can impact change on the curriculum, such as through the learner surveys, module evaluations, the Academic Representation Committee and programme representatives. The education provider aims to empower learners to take a leading role in enabling change, resulting in a more rounded learning experience.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - The education provider operates robust staff recruitment processes. All staff are offered an induction programme and mentorship. All academic staff new to teaching are supported to undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. The education provider has a substantial staff development and training programme. This is in accordance with the staff development policy.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The education provider has effective partnerships with local NHS Trusts and voluntary and independent sector healthcare provision. They work with practice-based learning partners to ensure the requirements of the policy for management of practice-based learning and work-based learning are met. This includes risk assessment,

health and safety, and auditing to assure there are learning opportunities and quality of the learner experience is maintained.

- The programme team meets regularly with practice educators to review practice-based learning provision, including capacity and compliance, learner experience and outcomes. The Head of School meets regularly with allied health professions leads across NHS Trusts and the integrated care system.
- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - The programme is compliant with the Course Planning and Approval / Re-approval Process, and the Annual Evaluation Process. Assurance of academic quality is demonstrated through benchmarking to internal and external benchmarks. An external examiner is appointed to provide oversight of quality and academic standards.
 - Quality is reflected through the appointment and continuing professional development of teaching and administrative staff. Staff are required to engage with the appraisal review process annually and undertake peer-supported review of teaching for their development.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - The programme complies with the education provider's policy of the management of practice-based learning and work-based learning. The education provider reviews Care Quality Commission (CQC) reports and completes exceptional reporting. The education provider meets quarterly with NHS England and has the processes in place to satisfy all quality review, monitoring and reporting requirements for the current provision.
 - Learners evaluate their practice learning after each practice-based learning. These evaluations are reviewed by the programme team, across the school and across the wider education provider to review themes and respond. Practice evaluations are shared with practice partners and summaries of the evaluations are incorporated into the practice-based learning audit.
 - Where concerns are raised, processes are in place to work in collaboration with practice partners to agree and implement action

plans. The education provider has implemented a process of 'speaking up'. This is to support and enable learners to raise concerns about their peers, practice colleagues or practice-based learning.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - Learners are involved in all aspects of curriculum development, delivery, and evaluation. Learners are represented at approval events to ensure their voice and learner's experience is central to the approval process. Learners are required to evaluate all modules, and module leaders' feedback to learners to 'close the loop'.
 - In addition, learners are asked to take part in an annual programme experience survey or the National Student Survey (NSS) in their final year of study. Programme leaders respond to these surveys. Learner and staff liaison committees are scheduled twice a year.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The education provider has a service user and carer group, IMPACT. Those involved in IMPACT have experience of both contemporary and historical experiences of health services. They play a key role in the work the education provider undertakes. New programme developments involve the involvement of IMPACT members from the outset. Their involvement in programmes is holistic, through involvement in recruitment, teaching, assessment, and review.
 - Co-ordination is via a part-time principal lecturer and dedicated administrative support. The co-ordinator arranges induction and training, liaises with the range of allied health disciplines, meets regularly with the IMPACT group, and allocates work. Members are remunerated for pro-active input, such as teaching or assessment. IMPACT members are part of both admissions and staff selection processes. Involvement in learning and teaching ranges from members 'telling their stories' to offering critique on policy, theory, and practice.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**

- Learners are offered a range of support services. These include:
 - Wellbeing support;
 - Careers and employability;
 - Chaplaincy;
 - Counselling and mental health;
 - Disability and dyslexia; and
 - Money advice.
- Every learner is allocated a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT). They are required to meet with their PAT a minimum of four times a year in the first year of their studies and a minimum of three times a year thereafter. Personal academic tutoring supports learners in engaging with the academic requirements and expectations of their learning, and professional and personal development.
- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - Learners are subject to the education provider's Fitness to Practice Procedures, Student Disciplinary Procedures, and the Student Attendance Policy. All learners are required to confirm their good health and good character at the start of each academic year.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - The programme is subject to the requirements of the College of Health, Life and Environmental Science Interdisciplinary Learning Policy (IDL). This policy applies to both the School of Allied Health and Community and the Three Counties School of Nursing and Midwifery. Learners have timetabled sessions to learn with, about and from other professionals, learners, and academics. IDL is incorporated into curriculum development.
 - IDL takes place in different formats including case studies, simulated learning, and augmented and virtual reality. The education provider has in place a strategic lead for IPE.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider is committed to EDI and considers it is integral to excellence in teaching and learning. In line with current education provider practices and expectations, EDI is embedded and promoted in the development of this programme. The education provider's EDI Policy Statement sets out their commitment and responsibilities about

EDI. The education provider's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Framework 2022 - 2027 describes the themes, areas of focus, and governance of EDI from 2022 - 2027.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - The education provider's Assessment Policy requires internal and external verification of assessments, one of the processes through which objectivity is assured. The programme satisfies this policy's standardisation procedures. This ensures the programme team are familiar with, and understand, the marking standards and conventions in relation to giving feedback.
 - The education provider meets internal moderation procedures. This ensures academic standards are appropriate and consistent across programmes and subject teams and feedback reflects agreed assessment policies and assessment criteria. Therefore, the assessment outcomes are fair and reliable.
 - The education provider is responsible for external moderation. External examiners are consulted and agree a schedule for standardisation and internal and external moderation of assessments.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - The programme complies with the requirements of the education provider's Taught Courses Regulatory Framework. Progression and achievement decisions are ratified by the board of examiners.
 - Learners will need to achieve 120 credits at each level to progress to the following year of study. There is no compensation between assessments for modules where a practical skill component exists. Learners need to achieve all elements of their programme to be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
 - We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Appeals –**
 - The programme complies with both the Student Academic Appeals Procedures (2021) and the Student Complaints Procedures (2018).

The appeals procedures define the grounds for making an appeal and describe how they are investigated and heard. The complaints procedures define the grounds for learners to bring their dissatisfaction or concern to the attention of the education provider and how the complaint will be investigated and heard.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes.
- We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- Currently the team consists of two full time registered Dietitians, 0.5 Full time equivalent (FTE) registered Nutritionist and 0.25 FTE administrator who will also provide support for practice-based learning.
- Another Dietitian will be employed prior to the programme commencing, which will ensure adequate teaching resources are in place. In addition to this, the education provider will employ Associate lecturers to deliver specific parts of the teaching when required. As the programme grows, the education provider will recruit staff to reflect the increase in learner numbers and review this annually. All staff employed to teach on the programme will be registered with the HCPC.
- The education provider offers a range of facilities to support the programme. These include teaching spaces for lectures and seminars and library and e-learning resources. There are dedicated simulation facilities, which include two community houses and clinic rooms that learners can access.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date

BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics	Full time	Dietetics	24 learners per cohort, one cohort per year	01/09/2024
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	---	------------

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the [Findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – Collaboration with practice education providers to ensure commitment to provide practice-based learning.

Area for further exploration: The education provider supplied evidence of how they were collaborating with local practice-based learning providers in their region. This included meetings with practice educators and the Integrated Care Systems Allied Health Professionals group. From the information supplied it was clear there was a commitment to the programme from these stakeholders, however it was not clear to visitors how the education provider was securing placements with these stakeholders to ensure there was sufficient capacity. Further evidence was therefore requested to demonstrate how placements were secured through collaboration.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method to understand how the programme demonstrated this area.

Outcomes of exploration: In their response, the education provider explained how they were collaborating with stakeholders to secure practice-based learning. This included having discussions with new placement providers with the aim of securing and increasing practice-based learning capacity. In addition to this, discussions were also taking place with the existing stakeholders to explore alternative supervision models to increase capacity. To support this narrative, documentary evidence was supplied in the form of email conversations, which indicated the type of placements secured and agreement of learner numbers.

The visitors acknowledged the additional information supplied by the education provider and confirmed they were satisfied the education provider was collaborating with new and existing stakeholders to ensure capacity of practice-based learning.

Quality theme 2 – Effective process to ensure sufficient practice-based learning to accommodate learners who need to repeat a placement.

Area for further exploration: Visitors noted many of the conversations with stakeholders to secure placements were in the early stages. These discussions are outlined in Quality Theme 1 and demonstrate the commitment to supply practice-based learning. However, it was not clear to the visitors how the education provider ensured there was sufficient practice-based learning for all learners. They were particularly concerned about how placement capacity would be managed if a learner was required to repeat a placement, or if a placement provider withdrew at the last minute. Visitors therefore requested further information in the form of a process to ensure there was sufficient practice-based learning for learners who needed to repeat placements. They also requested the education provider to demonstrate how they would manage last minute placement withdrawals.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method to understand how the programme demonstrated this area.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider outlined a process to demonstrate how they will ensure there is sufficient practice-based learning for learners. In their response, they explained how learners who are required to repeat their placements will be supported to complete the required placement hours through simulation activities. This will also apply to learners who have their placements withdrawn at the last minute. In addition to this, there is an 'in-house student led clinic', which is currently being led by the learners on the Physiotherapy programme. However, there are plans to involve learners on the proposed programme with this. Lastly, the structure of placements allows learners to repeat their placements with minimal impact on their progression, as they are delivered throughout the year. The different models of supervision also enable stakeholders to support additional learners with placement where necessary.

The visitors acknowledged the additional information supplied by the education provider and confirmed they were satisfied the education provider had an appropriate process in place to ensure sufficient practice-based learning for learners who were repeating or where their placements had been withdrawn.

Quality theme 3 – Training to ensure appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support practice-based learning.

Area for further exploration: The education provider submitted staff curriculum vitae in relation to this area. These did not demonstrate the training available to

practice educators. Visitors subsequently referred to the practice placement handbook. They recognised the clear structure to this, however it did not provide sufficient information in relation to practice educators and any training available for the stakeholders. For example, it was not clear to visitors how practice educators would be prepared to support learners during their placements, especially in new emerging placements, such as with private providers. Visitors therefore, requested further information to understand how practice educators would be trained and if this training would be delivered annually and shared with other education providers in the West Midlands region.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We agreed to explore this area further by requesting email and documentary evidence from the education provider. We considered this would be the most effective method to understand how the programme demonstrated this area.

Outcomes of exploration: The visitors noted how all learners would be supported by their Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) throughout the programme and their practice-based learning. Learners would also be supported, whilst on placement, by HCPC Registered Dietitians who will have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. To ensure this, practice educators in the NHS Trusts will be provided with training through the West Midlands Dietetic Practice Education Partnership group, which will be shared with other education providers across the region. Visitors noted practice educators supporting learners in the private, independent and voluntary practice placements were provided with practice educator training through the education provider. This approach ensured practice educators in all placement settings received the appropriate preparation and training to support learners. In addition to this, the visitors understood the education provider would also be offering a workshop in 2025 for practice educators who would be specifically supporting the learners commencing the first placement. The purpose of this workshop would be to ensure the requirements and expectations of learners in this placement were clearly understood by practice educators.

The visitors acknowledged the additional information supplied by the education provider and were satisfied this demonstrated there were appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support learners during placement.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that

standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
 - The entry criteria were clear and set at an appropriate level for an undergraduate programme. These included details of GCSE qualifications and equivalence and other entry requirements.
 - Information relating to the appropriate disclosure and barring service checks and occupational health checks was also included.
 - The process to apply for a place on the programme was clearly documented through the admissions process.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met at threshold level.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
 - Through [Quality theme 1](#) the education provider demonstrated effective collaboration between themselves and practice education providers to increase the capacity of practice-based learning.
 - Through clarification, we noted the education provider was liaising with four local higher education institutions (HEIs) regarding placement capacity within the region. As a group, the education providers recognised the constraints within the region and worked together to ensure appropriate capacity.
 - Through [Quality theme 2](#) the education provider demonstrated there was a process to ensure there was sufficient capacity of practice-based learning.
 - The education provider demonstrated there were an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme who were HCPC registered. They also outlined plans for further recruitment to ensure there was an adequate number of experienced and qualified staff to deliver the programme.

- Through the Curriculum Vitae, they demonstrated the team was made up of experienced educators who were appropriately qualified and had a range of specialist knowledge and expertise.
 - There was clear evidence of sufficient learning resources to deliver the proposed programme, which was outlined in the course handbook. These included a range of learning teaching facilities, the library and online resources.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met at threshold level.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The module specifications and the Standards of Proficiency mapping document demonstrated the programme and modules are clearly structured and well designed. The learning outcomes were clearly mapped against the Standards of Proficiency.
 - Professional behaviours and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics were embedded throughout the programme. These were covered across a range of modules and continued through to the placements.
 - The philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base were clearly articulated in the structure and delivery of the programme.
 - There were appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. It was noted this was covered well and included aspects of immersive and simulated practice.
 - The structure of the programme ensured the integration of theory and practice. Visitors noted how clearly this was covered across the programme and how closely theory was linked to appropriate practice-based learning.
 - There was evidence of a wide range of delivery and assessment methods used, which were detailed in the module specifications, such as through simulation.
 - The module descriptors demonstrated how autonomous and reflective thinking was developed and supported. Visitors noted this was covered across the programme, however the level of detail was not consistent across all the modules. This was not to the detriment of the delivery or assessment of the learning outcomes or SOPs.
 - Evidence based practice is demonstrated throughout the programme at level 4 in DIET1002 Nutritional physiology and metabolism, at level 5 in ALHS2205 Developing the evidence and the dissertation module DIET3003 Generating the evidence. It was noted how the dissertation module enabled learners to undertake independent research and develop those skills.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met at threshold level.
 - **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**

- The structure and duration of practice-based learning demonstrated learners could achieve the learning outcomes and were supported by the existing placement structures in place in the West Midlands region.
 - There was evidence of an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support practice-based learning, which included practice educators. Through [Quality theme 3](#) further clarification was provided on how they ensured practice educators had the relevant skills, knowledge and experience to support learners.
 - Visitors noted the clear integration of practice-based learning in the programme. Practice-based learning was delivered in four blocks across the programme and structured around the teaching element of the programme.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met at threshold level.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The programme was clearly mapped against the HCPC SOPs and the assessment strategy ensured learners met these. These included expectations of professional behaviour, including the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The visitors were therefore satisfied the knowledge, skills and understanding being delivered and assessed, would allow an individual to practise safely and effectively upon graduation.
 - The module specifications outlined the learning outcomes and appropriate assessment methods, which demonstrated professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct and, performance and ethics. These were covered well in practice-based learning.
 - Visitors noted the assessment methods used to measure the learning outcomes were appropriate across the modules.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met at threshold level.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- All standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programme is approved.
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2027-28 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Education and Training Committee Panel agreed with the findings of the visitors and were satisfied with the recommendation to approve the programme.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
University of Worcester	CAS-01429-S6X1F3	Fiona McCullough & Duane Mellor	<p>Through this assessment, we have noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved. 	<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently the team consists of 2 full time registered Dietitians, 0.5 registered Nutritionist and 0.25 administrator who will also provide support for practice based learning. Another registered Dietitian will be employed prior to the programme commencing, which will ensure adequate teaching resources are in place. In addition to this, the education provider will employ Associate lecturers to deliver specific parts of the teaching when required. As the programme grows, the education provider will recruit staff to reflect the

				<p>increase in learner numbers and review this annually. All staff employed to teach on the programme will be registered with the HCPC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education provider offers a range of facilities to support the programme. These include teaching spaces for lectures and seminars and library and e-learning resources. There are dedicated simulation facilities, which include 2 community houses and clinic rooms that learners can access.
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics			Full time	Taught (HEI)

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2013
MSc (Pre-registration) Occupational Therapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Occupational therapist			01/07/2021
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2017
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2013
MSc (Pre-registration) Physiotherapy	FTA (Full time accelerated)	Physiotherapist			01/07/2021
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		11/09/2023
V300 Non-Medical (Independent and Supplementary) Prescribing Programme	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/02/2014