
Approval process report

University of Plymouth, Dietetics, 2023-24

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve the BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme at the University of Plymouth. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme(s) against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme(s) 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 against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Decided all standards are met, and that the programme is approved

Through this assessment, we determined that quality activity was not required, as the education provider had made a thorough submission. We did have a virtual meeting with the education provider to clarify certain points related to the submission.

Previous consideration	N/A as this did not arise from a previous process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide whether 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 2025.

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	8
Admissions	9
Management and governance	10
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	11
Learners	13
Outcomes from stage 1	15
Section 3: Programme-level assessment	16
Programmes considered through this assessment	16
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	16
Quality themes identified for further exploration	16
Section 4: Findings	16
Conditions	16
Overall findings on how standards are met	17
Section 5: Referrals	20
Recommendations	20
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	20
Assessment panel recommendation	20
Appendix 1 – summary report	22
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	23

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 detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme 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:

Sarah Illingworth	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Fiona McCullough	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 24 HCPC-approved programmes across 8 professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1995. There are 2 post-registration programmes for independent prescribing and supplementary prescribing annotations.

The education provider engaged with the performance review process in the current model of quality assurance in 2022-23. The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process would be in the 2027-28 academic year. The reason for a recommendation of a five year monitoring period was the visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Their data points demonstrated they are performing as expected with regards to learner satisfaction, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.

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 2](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
	Biomedical scientist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2014
	Chiropodist / podiatrist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005
	Dietitian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2004
	Occupational therapy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2008
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2003
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2008
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2004
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1995
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2019
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2006

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	984	999	2024	<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> <p>We did not need to explore any issues around learner numbers at this time, because the data did not indicate any issues.</p>
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	7%	14%	2021-22	<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 above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p>

				<p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 10%</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider would support the learners on the programme.</p> <p>We considered the resourcing and pastoral support that was available for learners, as outlined in section 4 below, and considered that it was appropriate, for the reasons described.</p>
<p>Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study</p>	<p>92%</p>	<p>94%</p>	<p>2021-22</p>	<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 improved by 1%</p> <p>We did not explore this data point through this assessment because the data did not raise any concerns.</p>

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	2023	The definition of a Gold TEF award is “Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector.”
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	79.9%	81.8%	2024	<p>This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for 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 improved by 5%.</p> <p>We did not explore this specific area as we did not consider that it required specific consideration in the context of this process.</p>
HCPC performance review cycle length	N/A	5 years	2027-8	<p>Five years is the maximum interval that an education provider can be offered, and suggests that an education provider is performing very well overall.</p> <p>The last performance review was in 2022-23.</p>

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 –**
 - The new programme is an apprenticeship which means that it has different requirements and characteristics from non-apprenticeship approved programmes. There is a webpage which explains the nature of the programme and highlights the additional apprenticeship-related requirements. These include the need for applicants to be employed in a relevant dietetics role, with an employer able to engage with the apprenticeship.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider operates. The approach is institution-wide and will apply to the proposed new programme. The relevant standards are met because the education provider has a clear mechanism for ensuring applicants have access to appropriate information.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - The approach for the apprenticeship programme set out in the approval request form is closely aligned to the approach already used at the education provider. It involves a specific proficiency test for English language skills, a Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) check, and an occupational health assessment. We know that there is alignment with existing approaches based on a comparison with the baselining exercise and information received through the 2022-23 performance review.
 - We consider that the standards in this area are met because we can be confident that the education provider has a clear process for ensuring the suitability of learners.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**
 - The education provider has in place a specific assessment of learners' readiness to undertake the apprenticeship, which will form part of the process by which applicants are brought on to the programme.
 - This is closely aligned with the education provider's existing approach, which they have set out in the baseline document and the findings from their last performance review process. We consider the standards in this area are met because the education provider will be able to make reasonable assessments of whether applicants with non-standard educational backgrounds are suitable for the programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)–**
 - The education provider stated that they have an institutional approach to EDI based on a number of key policies, covering areas such as race, gender, background and sex.

- All programmes are required to conform with this institutional approach. The apprenticeship will have a particular focus on learners without a family history of higher education.
- This approach to EDI will be applied to admissions on the new programme. The proposed approach for this programme is therefore closely aligned with the overall institutional approach.

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 –**
 - There is an existing undergraduate programme in dietetics at the education provider. The proposed apprenticeship is closely based on this existing provisions and will incorporate many of the same modules and assessments.
 - The education provider has the staff, and the institutional infrastructure and experience, to deliver Level 6 education in dietetics. They have a large number of HCPC-approved programmes and so have the institutional knowledge and capacity to deliver the proposed programme.
 - We consider the standards are met because they have shown their ability to deliver dietetics education, and HCPC-approved programmes more generally.
- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - The education provider state that the Faculty of Health, in which the new apprenticeship will sit, is “the largest Faculty within the University, and is therefore well positioned to support the development and delivery of new programmes.” They also note their collaboration with local partners in the development of the programme, to ensure that it will meet the needs of employers and other stakeholders.
 - We consider the standards in this area have been met because the arrangements for maintaining programme sustainability are appropriate. We are confident of this based on the above information and on the recent performance review.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - The education provider has been delivering dietetics education at Level 6 since 2004. This means there is a large amount of institutional experience and expertise available, as well as the facilities to enable effective delivery of the apprenticeship programme. Additionally the programme team will work with the Central Apprenticeships Hub to co-ordinate with employers and apprentices.

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

- Considering the education provider's history and their arrangements for ensuring that apprentices are well supported, we are confident that the standards are met. The new programme can be delivered effectively and align with existing approaches.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - Established development and management systems at the education provider will be used for the new programme as well. These systems include annual reviews of individual staff members, and individualised career development pathways developed by mutual agreement between staff and their line managers.
 - These include quarterly appraisals and a university-level performance management and workload monitoring system.
 - We are already familiar with these systems from the education provider's performance review, which took place in 2022-23. The visitors who completed the review found that performance in staff management and development was strong. We consider the standards to be met because the education provider has demonstrated their ability to manage and develop the programme.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The education provider has established a Central Apprenticeship Hub, to co-ordinate relationships between the employers, other clinical partners, and the programme. The staff of this Hub have experience in the practicalities of organising and monitoring placements.
 - We consider the standards met because the education provider have demonstrated an ability to manage and develop strategic relationships with relevant partners.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - All programmes at the education provider are required to co-ordinate with Programme Monitoring Committee that produces an Action Plan for the programme team. The programme team will also supply data and information to the British Dietetics Association (BDA) via their annual monitoring process.
 - Learners will complete annual feedback questionnaires and external examiners will actively contribute to all programme monitoring and evaluation systems.
 - The education provider state that “the process for maintaining quality for the apprenticeship route will mirror the already established routes. There will be separate boards and panels at each stage and year end. All University of Plymouth policies for progression and assessment will be adhered to.”

- We can be confident in the education provider approach in this area as they completed performance review in 2022-23. The visitors in that review concluded that their performance was good. We consider the standards met in this area because the education provider have shown a clear ability to monitor and develop programme quality.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - Audit of employer partners will be carried out via the existing arrangements as laid out in the documentation linked to via the approval request form. The education provider will require employers to demonstrate the suitability of their settings by completing an audit form.
 - Practice quality will also be monitored informally via staff meetings with learners and practice educators, and by a twice-yearly audit of all clinical settings.
 - These arrangements are aligned with existing quality practice at the education provider which have recently been considered appropriate through performance review. We consider the standards are met because the education provider have a clear and effective process for ensuring practice quality.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - Similar mechanisms will be used to gather and implement learner feedback on the new apprenticeship as on the existing HCPC-approved programmes. These include formal mid and end of module feedback and ongoing informal feedback.
 - We can be satisfied with the alignment of the new programme and the existing arrangements at the education provider. Those arrangements are set out in the baseline document and have been recently reviewed through their last performance review process. Learners have regular opportunities to feedback, through both informal and formal mechanisms. These include regular meetings with supervisors and tutors, and termly written surveys.
 - We consider the standards met because there are clear pathways for the education provider to ensure appropriate and useful learner involvement.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The education provider's established service user team will be used for the new programme.
 - The last performance review considered that use of service users by the education provider was effective and appropriate. There is a university-level service user group which co-ordinates and quality assures service user involvement with all healthcare programmes. Specific individuals within faculties have responsibility for working with this group for their programmes. This includes the HCPC-approved programmes. It is clear from the ARF and the baseline document that the new programme will be aligned with these approaches.
 - We consider the standards met because the education provider has demonstrated a defined and appropriate process for ensuring service user involvement.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - The ARF explains how learners on the new programme will have access to all the normal pathways for support, provided at the institutional level. These include study support, finance, religious provision and mental health.
 - Due to the structure of the programme, some special learner financial support streams will not be available to apprentices, but employers will be expected to support apprentices in similar ways.
 - These arrangements are aligned with the existing arrangements at the provider which were considered appropriate and well-performing through performance review. We consider the standards met because the education provider have demonstrated that they will be able to support learners appropriately during the programme.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - As well as the meetings noted under 'Practice quality' above, learners on the programme will have access to the whole suite of support at the education provider if there are concerns about academic performance or professional suitability. The education provider will liaise with employers to ensure that they have a clear understanding of what constitutes suitability for the programme.
 - These arrangements have been considered as part of the 2022-23 performance review and have also been considered through previous approval processes. The new programme will be appropriately aligned with them. We therefore consider the standards met, because the education provider have a clear process for ensuring that learners continue to be suitable persons.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - The approval request form states the arrangements for IPL/E will be broadly in line with the existing arrangements at the education provider.
 - The education provider's general approach to this area is appropriate, as shown through their last performance review. The brief description of how the apprenticeship will handle IPL/E makes it clear that it will be aligned with this approach. Additionally, the apprenticeship format will give opportunities for multi-disciplinary learning that other programmes may not offer. This is because the learners on an apprenticeship spend longer in the workplace. They are also more closely integrated with a workplace because of their existing employment. Learners will still have access to the education provider's "Schwartz Round", an activity designed to increase collaboration across professions.

- We consider the standards met because the education provider has clearly set out an appropriate approach to ensuring that learners have access to IPL/E.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider has specific policies around EDI, which all programmes are required to follow. EDI policy compliance is part of annual programme review, and programmes which need to improve performance in this area are given clear actions. There is a specific department at the education provider dedicated to support learners with additional needs.
 - The recent performance review found that the programme had strong EDI policies in place, which were closely followed and informed the education provider's actions.
 - We can therefore be confident that the proposed programme's alignment will enable the relevant standards to be met.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - The education provider has in place a number of policies around assessment and moderation, designed to ensure that learners' work and achievement is considered in a fair way. For example, there is an Anonymous marking policy and an Extenuating circumstances policy. All programmes are required to follow these policies and report their compliance during reviews. Clear guidance is issued for learners around these policies.
 - No concerns were raised around assessment in the recent performance review for the education provider. The information provided strongly suggests that the apprenticeship's alignment with current practice will be appropriate, with changes made as necessary.
 - We consider the standards met because the education provider has demonstrated that they can ensure objectivity in assessment.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - Monitoring of learner progress will involve the established mechanisms in place at the education provider. These were considered through performance review and found to be effective and appropriate. For example, all learner marks go through a Subject Assessment Panel and Award Assessment Board.
 - The approach used for this area appears appropriate and is aligned closely with existing provision. We consider the relevant standards met because the education provider has an appropriate defined process for moving learners through the programme.
- **Appeals –**

- Learners will have access to appeals through the normal pathways governed by appropriate policies. The apprenticeship will not use different approaches in this area and therefore we can be confident that there is alignment between the apprenticeship and the existing provision.
- We consider the standards met because the policies in this area give learners access to an appropriate appeals process which will ensure that they are assessed in a fair way.

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

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) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian	15 learners, 1 cohort per year	08/09/2025

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.

The education provider's submission was sufficiently complete and detailed that we did not require quality activity. We did ask some questions in a virtual meeting but these questions were focused on clarifying existing evidence rather than requesting additional documentation. We therefore considered that they did not constitute quality activity.

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 was considered through stage 1 of the process.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions –**
 - In their submission, the education provider set out the selection and entry criteria for the programme (2.2). These included GCSE and A-level (or A-level equivalent) requirements, with science-related subjects preferred. Applicants are required to have an Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, and occupational health clearance. A minimum age of 18 for participation in the programme is noted. These requirements are set out in the programme specification and the programme approval document, both of which were included in the documentation. We were also provided with a link to a website for the programme, which made the information available to potential applicants.
 - We considered that this was good and appropriate evidence. We did ask the education provider to clarify one point. The education provider's existing Level 6 Dietetics programme has a foundation year pathway, and we were not clear whether that would also apply to this programme, the apprenticeship. They clarified that this would not be the case.
 - Following the clarification, we considered that the relevant standard was met, because the education provider had demonstrated that all relevant information about the programme would be available in appropriate channels.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership –**
 - The education provider submitted Operational Specifications, an approval document and a programme handbook section. These documents set out how they intended to collaborate with the employer partners for the programme. Specifically, they describe in detail how they will maintain communication with learners and practice educators during the programme, through regular scheduled meetings and ad hoc meetings. At the strategic level, the approval document describes the collaboration between the education provider and stakeholders to date, and the future plans for such meetings – quarterly.

- With regard to how the education provider would use collaboration with the employers to ensure appropriate capacity, we considered that the evidence submitted, in the form of an Onboarding Agreement for apprentices, demonstrated that they had a mechanism for ensuring appropriate capacity. Learners would not be able to start the programme unless the agreement was in place. We did ask the education provider to clarify how they would ensure that the new programme did not affect capacity on the existing Level 6 and Level 7 dietetics provision. The education provider explained that they had regular meetings with practice-based learning providers to discuss capacity and that individual programmes were responsible for monitoring the available capacity for their own programmes.
- As regards staffing, the education provider submitted staff CVs to support the narrative stating that they had 5.1FTE available for the new programme. We considered that this evidence demonstrated that they had sufficient qualified and experienced staff to deliver the programme appropriately.
- In light of all of the above, we consider that the standards in SET 3 are met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The education provider submitted a Module Records Document, a Programme Specification – which included a mapping against the British Dietetics Association curriculum guidance – and the Programme Handbook. They mapped the programme learning outcomes against the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs), and against the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). They also benchmarked the programme against other relevant sets of standards, including: the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education’s (QAAHE) Dietetics standards, the NHS Knowledge and Skills Framework and the Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours (KSB) standards for apprentices.
 - The Programme Handbook and the Programme Specification set out the education provider’s approach to integrating theory and practice, and the learning and teaching methods. In conjunction with the approval document and the module specifications, these documents explain the education provider’s approach to evidence-based and autonomous practice.
 - We reviewed this evidence and considered that all the relevant standards were met, as the education provider had aligned the curriculum with all relevant guidance and standards. They had set out an appropriately diverse range of teaching and learning activities and had made it clear which parts of the programme would enable the learners to practise autonomously, appropriately and according to the relevant evidence base.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider submitted module descriptors, a programme specification, an operational specification, a programme handbook and

the approval document. These laid out where different areas of knowledge and clinical competency were delivered in practice-based learning, and how they were integrated with the rest of the programme. They also explained the detail of grading by practice educators and how this would be moderated by academic staff on the programme.

- Additionally, the education provider submitted their degree apprenticeship Onboarding document, which explained the relationship between the education provider and the employer partners. In particular, this evidence explained how the education provider would assure themselves that the staff supervising learners in the employer setting, the clinical placements, were appropriately qualified and experienced, and that there were enough of them. This is achieved through regular meetings between the programme team and practice educators, through regulator training sessions and through initial agreements signed at the start of the programme.
- We considered the relevant standards are met. This is because the education provider has demonstrated that clinical learning is appropriately integrated into the programme, that it is appropriately structured to meet programme needs, and that the education provider can ensure appropriate staffing in practice-based learning.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The education provider set out their assessment strategy in the programme specification, the approval document and the programme handbook. The End Point Assessment (EPA) is integrated appropriately into the assessment and the mapping documents in the submission set out which learning outcomes – and therefore which SOPs – are assessed in which modules of the programme. The same documents also outline how the SCPEs are integrated into the modules and assessed using a variety of methods.
 - The same evidence is also cited by the education provider to demonstrate that their assessment methods are appropriate to measuring the learning outcomes. The education provider state that all of the following are used:
 - Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCEs);
 - case-based learning assessments;
 - professional discussion;
 - workplace competency evaluations;
 - reflective portfolios;
 - tripartite reviews, i.e. collaborative discussions between learner, education provider and employer.
 - We consider the standards are met, because the education provider has demonstrated that assessment on the programme will appropriately test learners' knowledge and competence, as defined in the SOPs and SCPEs. They have also shown that they have an appropriately diverse range of assessments by which learners will have appropriate opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

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

- Library and electronic resource centre
- Virtual learning environment for learners to submit work and to liaise with programme staff and practice educators
- Workplace resources including access to NHS Trust libraries and study spaces

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: 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.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

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 observations 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 accepted the visitor's recommendation that the programme should receive approval.

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 Plymouth	CAS-01589-JOV0W2	Sarah Illingworth Fiona McCullough	Through this assessment, we determined that quality activity was not required, as the education provider had made a thorough submission. We did have a virtual meeting with the education provider to clarify certain points related to the submission.	Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library and electronic resource centre • Virtual learning environment for learners to submit work and to liaise with programme staff and practice educators • Workplace resources including access to NHS Trust libraries and study spaces
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Dietetics			Full time	Apprenticeship

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	FT (Full time)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2020
BSc (Hons) Podiatry	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/09/2005
MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	PT (Part time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
BSc (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/02/2004
MDiet (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/08/2022
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2008
MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2013
Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2013
MOccTh (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2020
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Apprenticeship Route	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			19/09/2022
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/08/2018
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2004
MPhysio (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020

PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2021
Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)	FLX (Flexible)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2023
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography with Ultrasound Fundamentals	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2024
Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2019
Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2019