
Approval process report

Sheffield Hallam University, operating department practice / dietetics,
2021-22

Executive Summary

This is a report on the approval process undertaken to review the operating department practice and dietetics degree apprenticeship programmes at Sheffield Hallam University.

Through our review, we were satisfied that the education provider continues to meet our institution-wide standards and that both programmes meet all programme level standards of education and training. There were no conditions set and no issues referred.

This report will now be considered by our Education and Training Panel on 28 February, who will make a final decision on programme approval.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Previous consideration | Not applicable. This approval process was not referred to from another process interaction. |
| Decision | The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide whether the programme(s) are approved. |
| Next steps | Subject to the Panel's decision, the programme will commence in March 2023. |

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 |
| The route through stage 1 | 6 |
| Admissions | 7 |
| Management and governance..... | 7 |
| Quality, monitoring, and evaluation | 8 |
| Learners..... | 9 |
| Outcomes from stage 1 | 11 |
| Section 3: Programme-level assessment..... | 11 |
| Programmes considered through this assessment..... | 11 |
| Stage 2 assessment – provider submission..... | 11 |
| Quality themes identified for further exploration..... | 11 |
| Quality theme 1 – process to ensure suitability of practice educators | 11 |
| Quality theme 2 – process of ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning | 12 |
| Quality theme 3 – ensuring adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff..... | 13 |
| Quality theme 4 – ensuring adequate resources available to support learning.. | 13 |
| Section 4: Findings | 14 |
| Conditions..... | 14 |
| Overall findings on how standards are met | 14 |
| Section 5: Referrals | 17 |
| Recommendations | 17 |
| Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes..... | 18 |
| Assessment panel recommendation | 18 |
| Education and Training Committee decision | 18 |
| Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution | 19 |

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:

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Fiona McCullough | Lead visitor, dietitian |
| Luke Ewart | Lead visitor, operating department practitioner |
| Temilolu Odunaike | Education Quality Officer |

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider delivers 19 HCPC-approved programmes across seven professions. It is a Higher Education Institution (HEI) and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1994.

The education provider has a long history of delivering HCPC approved programmes, dating back to 1994 when their oldest programme had its first intake. The provider has maintained a high quality in their delivery of HCPC approved programmes over the past few decades. As a large HEI, all their programmes have consistently met our standards through engagements with our monitoring processes and no significant issues have been picked up from any of their recent engagements with our processes.

The education provider is one of the nine HEIs delivering HCPC approved programmes in the Yorkshire and Humber region. As a large provider, they contribute a huge number of Allied Health Professions (AHP) graduates every year which helps in ensuring adequate supply of allied health professionals in the region. There are no known challenges within the region at the moment. However, as with other regions in the country, ensuring capacity of practice-based learning for all learners remains a key focus.

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 |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|
| Pre-registration | Art Therapist | <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2022 |
| | Dietitian | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2019 |
| | Occupational therapist | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1994 |
| | Operating Department Practitioner | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2015 |
| | Paramedic | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2017 |
| | Physiotherapist | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 1997 |
| | Radiographer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate | 2002 |
| Post-registration | Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing | | 2014 | |

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 | Benchmark | Value | Date | Commentary |
|------------|-----------|-------|------|------------|
|------------|-----------|-------|------|------------|

| | | | | |
|---|-------|--------|---------|--|
| Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers | 985 | 755 | 2022 | The number of learners on our records vary from the enrolled numbers by -23%. We have not identified this as an issue given the difference appears to spread across several of the 19 approved programmes delivered by the education provider. Also, through our review, the visitors are satisfied that learner numbers are within a range that allows all standards to continue to be met. |
| Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing | 3% | 1% | 2019-20 | The data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) shows the percentage of learners not continuing is significantly lower than the benchmark. This is a good score which would imply the majority of learners are satisfied with their studies. |
| Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study | 94% | 97% | 2019-20 | This is another indicator from HESA to show the education provider is performing well as this value exceeds the benchmark. |
| Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award | N/A | Silver | 2017 | A silver award is good. However, we are aware that TEF are replacing this award with a new scheme and as such may not provide an up-to-date reflection of teaching quality. |
| National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27) | 74.5% | 69.1% | 2022 | The NSS score is lower than the benchmark and shows a 5% drop from the previous year. However, from our review, we have not identified any issues that could give rise to concerns around how learners are supported. |

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**
 - A range of policies outline the admissions process and information available for applicants. These are set at institution level and will apply to the new programmes. For example, the Apprenticeship Delivery Guide outlines programme specific information for apprenticeships. It also outlines the involvement of the Employer Partnership Manager who works with employers and applicants before they apply to the programmes.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health**
 - There are institution wide policies and support available for applicants who first language is not English. In addition, institution wide policies relate to Occupational Health Screening and the necessary immunisations required of applicants to join programmes. The Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service Criminal Record policy outlines the institution wide policies, including information about the submission of valid identity documentation. Information about all of these is contained in the online prospectus and will apply to the new programmes.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)**
 - The Recognition of prior learning policy is an institution wide policy and will apply to the new programmes. In addition, for degree apprenticeship programmes, an initial skills scan is undertaken. If significant new learning is not identified, then the applicant will be considered through the Recognition of prior learning policy so their individual study plan can be adjusted.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion**
 - A range of policies outline the institution wide approach to equality, diversity and inclusion. For example, the Equality Objectives 2021-2024, Sheffield Hallam Equality Objectives and the University Admissions Policy. The institution ensures that any staff involved in recruitment undertakes the necessary training, as well as monitoring the admissions activity. These policies will apply to the new provision.

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**
 - A range of plans and frameworks are in place to ensure the institution delivers provision to thresholds required for entry to the Register. These are set at institution level and will apply to the new programmes. Some of these are contained in the Online prospectus, College Business Plan, Academic Work Planning and the Apprenticeship Delivery Guide.
- **Sustainability of provision**
 - The Academic Work Planning (AWP) policy ensures an appropriate work force of academic and professional service staff across the institute. The institute's Strategic Portfolio Board oversees the future development of programmes and works with College Portfolio Groups to develop programmes which meet the strategic intent of the institute. In addition, working relationships are maintained with practice-based learning partners. These are institution wide policies and will apply to the new programmes.
- **Effective programme delivery**
 - Working with the Head of Finance, the Head of Department considers the developing business needs for the institution and cases for staffing, whether for replacement or new staff. These policies will apply to the new programmes.
- **Effective staff management and development**
 - A range of staffing and recruitment policies apply across the institution. For example, the Additional hours policy, Engaging a specialist visiting lecturer or associate lecturer and Temporary additional responsibility allowance. These policies will apply to the new programmes.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level**
 - A range of policies outline the institution wide approach to managing partnerships. There are different committees set up to oversee the creation and management of educational partnerships including the UK Partnerships Committee and the Global Partnerships Committee. These policies will apply to the new programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - The Academic Quality Framework is an institution wide approach to ensure academic quality. Examples of areas covered by the framework include:
 1. Criteria for Assessing Quality and Standards at Validation
 2. Validation Panels – Constitution, Terms of Reference and Criteria for Nomination
 3. Annual Review and Annual Quality Review
 4. External Examiners and Roles and Responsibilities

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

The Academic Quality Framework will also apply to the new provision.

- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - There is a range of institution wide policies that ensure practice quality. Some of these include Health and Safety, Audit, Placement evaluations, Reporting concerns, Concerns, Data protection and Inclusivity. It is clear how the education provider works with placement providers to ensure safety in practice placement for all learners. All of these policies will apply to the new programmes.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - The Hallam Model, Hallam language for learning 2021-22 and Working with student reps are all institution wide policies covering how learners are involved at this institution. For example, learners are involved in the development of the programmes through workshops to generate discussion and ideas about programme design and then at a later point to feedback about that design. Learners are also involved in programme delivery and management. These would also apply to the new programmes.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - Service user and carer involvement is included in the Academic Quality Framework which is set at institution level and covers areas such as the Criteria for Assessing Quality and Standards at Validation; Validation Panels – Constitution, Terms of Reference, and Criteria for Nomination; and Patient and Public Involvement Teaching and Learning Framework (due Feb 2022). The Hallam Model is also an institution wide approach to involving service users and carers. All of these will apply to the new programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - The education provider has existing frameworks to support all learners. Some of which include the Hallam Help Framework, Academic Advice Framework and Student Charter. There are also policies that support learners' mental health and wellbeing at institution level. Learners on the new programmes would also have access to this support in the same way.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - There are several regulations in place to ensure ongoing suitability of learners. Some of which include Disciplinary Regulations for Students; Academic Conduct Regulation; and Student Fitness to Practise Regulations. The Apprenticeship Delivery Guide outlines an additional process of apprentices having quarterly reviews conducted with a work-based learning coach employed by the education provider. This is set at institution level and will also apply to the new programmes.

- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - Interprofessional education is introduced at the start of all programmes. This works alongside the careers and employability offer where learners are guided to recognise the skills they develop by learning with, from and about each other. The education provider noted that the Hallam model is a university wide strategy built around principles of engage, thrive, challenge and collaborate. The Hallam model alongside other strategies and principles to ensure IPL/E are set at institution level and will apply to the new programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) –**
 - The EDI policies and strategies are set at institution level. The education provider adopts several strategies and policies that allow for inclusion. They have a learning package available to all staff that allows them to consider a range of topics such as protected characteristics, safe and inclusive online environments, supporting international students, disabled students and being a mature student. All of the EDI policies will apply to the new programmes and materials will also be available to staff on the new programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - There are several policies in place to ensure objectivity in assessments. Some of these include Standard Assessment Regulations, External Examining policies and policies around learner conduct. The policies and procedures are applied across the whole of the institution including internal and external moderation at programme level. The External Examiner processes contribute to the maintenance of threshold academic standards through the annual appointment of, engagement with, and responding to External Examiners. They will apply to the new programmes in the same manner.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - Policies around learners' progression and achievement are set at institution level and will apply to the new provision. The online prospectus illustrates all the programmes providing eligibility for application for registration with the HCPC. There is clear guidance provided on absence reporting. Placement learning expectations are well laid out and Student fitness to practice regulations apply to learners studying on programmes which lead to a professional qualification where there are statutory or professional or regulatory body requirements relating to health or behaviour or attitudes.
- **Appeals –**
 - Policies such as the Appeals Policy and procedure is an institution wide policy that ensures learners' appeals are dealt with in a fair and timely way. The Appeals Policy and Procedure will also apply to the new provision.

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 (Degree Apprenticeship) | Distance Learning | Dietetics | 20 learners, once per year | March 2023 |
| BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship) | Work based learning | Operating department practice | 15 learners, once per year | March 2023 |

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.

BSc (Hons) Dietetics (Degree Apprenticeship)

Quality theme 1 – process to ensure suitability of practice educators

Area for further exploration: We understood training is provided for practice educators, including clinical supervisory skills training. However, without evidence demonstrating up-to-date information on the relevant knowledge, skills and

experience of the practice educators, the visitors were unable to determine how the practice educators' suitability to support and develop learners is ensured.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: To further explore this area, we requested further email clarification. We considered this the most effective way for us to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider described how practice educators' knowledge, skills and experience are assessed to ensure they are relevant. As the learners are employees of Dietetic Departments in NHS Trusts, their training is supervised by a work-based mentor in conjunction with the programme leader who meets with them regularly. We noted two systems that are being used to keep records of the practice educators that would be supporting learners in practice-based learning. These included the Practice Assessment Record and Evaluation (PARE) for the Yorkshire and the Humber Region and Placement Education Management System (PEMS) for other regions. The education provider outlined a range of mechanisms through which they are able to determine the suitability of practice educators. These include the community of practice (PARE and PEMS), educational audit process, Educator Register and through learner evaluation of their learning experience. We understood the educational audits would help identify best practice, areas for improvement, and put in place any actions needed.

The education provider also submitted screenshots showing the most recent training updates for the Employer Trusts they intend to work with, and we understood this information will help inform prioritisation of learning needs and address them. In conclusion, the education provider informed us they will work with Trusts to ensure an up-to-date and current record of training is available via their PARE and PEMS databases within the first year of delivery.

We were satisfied with the clarification provided and considered the quality activity has fully addressed the issues raised.

BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship)

Quality theme 2 – process of ensuring availability and capacity of practice-based learning

Area for further exploration: The visitors noted evidence of administrative procedures, but these were not all related to practice-based learning or how the education provider ensured the availability and capacity of this type of learning. The visitors requested further evidence such as placement audits to understand how these feed into the process.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We sought further information as noted above to give us a better understanding of the education provider's process.

Outcomes of exploration: We were informed that the Operating Department Practice team currently meet quarterly with their practice providers to discuss both academic and practice-based learning developments on their existing BSc programme. We understood this arrangement would extend to the degree

apprenticeship provision. The education provider added that audits of all placements are conducted biannually for all their practice providers and that further audits will be completed to ensure practice-based learning meets the requirements of the new provision.

In addition, practice-based learning information can also be provided via the PARE system. Although learners on the existing BSc programme are able to provide evaluation after each practice-based learning period, for the new learners, we understood this will be done periodically as their placement pattern is different. These placement evaluations will be reviewed and feed into placement discussions during the quarterly education provider/practice provider meetings.

The education provider also submitted additional information on areas that will be covered in practice-based learning, and we were informed that these would also be available via the Work Based Mentor website by the time the programme commences.

We were satisfied with the additional information provided and considered the quality activity adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 3 – ensuring adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff

Area for further exploration: The visitors noted the education provider's staff curricula vitae (CVs) that were submitted. However, given practice educators would also be involved in the teaching aspect of the programme, the visitors considered they needed evidence that demonstrates the staff numbers are adequate and that they have the relevant qualifications and experience appropriate to the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We requested additional evidence as noted above. We considered this the most effective way for the education provider to address the issue raised.

Outcomes of exploration: We understood from the education provider's response to the quality activity that they currently have proposed numbers from several practice providers but could not provide details until these are confirmed. The education provider explained that practice educators that will be involved in the teaching aspect of the programme would be asked to provide their CVs once they have an established learner from that site. The education provider will then audit the practice educator once confirmed and gain the relevant CVs of those involved in teaching activities. The education provider also intends to work closely with the practice educators to aid their personal development towards teaching in the future and provide resources to deliver equity across all practice-based learning sites. We were satisfied with the additional information provided and considered the quality activity adequately addressed the issues raised.

Quality theme 4 – ensuring adequate resources available to support learning

Area for further exploration: We noted module descriptors outlined the content and learning objectives, but not the resources or accessibility of these to all learners and educators. Therefore, we requested that the education provider submit further evidence that demonstrates the programme is adequately resourced and that the

resources are available and accessible to all learners and educators. We considered this necessary so we can be assured the resources would effectively support the required learning and teaching activities on the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We requested additional evidence as noted above. We considered this the most effective way for the education provider to address the issue raised.

Outcomes of exploration: We understood the practice-based learning sites are currently being developed to provide resources to support teaching and learning. The education provider noted they will also be using their Blackboard online resources for the learners. Learners will have access to the education provider's resources, which includes an extensive library as well as many online resources, so distance is not an issue.

Both learners and educators will have access to several resources to aid learning and teaching. There are also resources on the website dedicated to mentor development. We understood this is in the development phase but will be ready prior to the commencement of the new programme.

This additional information provided the clarification and the reassurance needed around staffing and resources. Therefore, we were satisfied the quality activity has adequately addressed the issues raised.

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** –
 - Entry requirements for both programmes are clearly outlined in their individual course descriptors.
 - The Dietetics programme entry requirements give room for widening participation into a dietetics career pathway by welcoming applicants from a diverse educational background. Credit is given to equivalent qualifications and experience in recognition that applicants may have worked as dietetic assistants or in similar roles for several years gaining work-based learning experience.
 - Operating Department Practice places are offered subject to successful clearance through the Disclosure and Barring Service, Occupational Health and the education provider's pre-admission declaration for health and social care programmes.
 - The visitors considered that the information submitted for both programmes demonstrate appropriate selection and entry requirements. Therefore, they considered the relevant standard in this SET area met.

- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
 - For the Dietetics programme, there is a Dietetic Practice Learning Partnership (DPLP) in place as a regular forum for meeting with Dietetic Practice Educators across South Yorkshire and Derbyshire. The forum helps to support the continual enhancement of the programme and joint working to support pre-registration training and education.
 - As a degree apprenticeship programme, employers are required to supply sufficient practice-based learning capacity for their learner(s). Several employers have expressed interests in the Dietetics programme, with commitment to send one to two learners on the programme.
 - Further information submitted through [quality theme 2](#) for the Operating Department Practice programme further demonstrated how the education providers ensures availability and capacity of practice-based learning.
 - Each learner on the Operating Department Practice programme will have an allocated Academic Advisor who will support them over the duration of the programme and facilitate optimum personal and professional development.
 - As outlined in the initial submission (through staff curricula vitae (CVs)) and through quality activity ([quality theme 3](#) for the Operating Department Practice programme) the education provider has evidenced that there are adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. There is also sufficient evident that there is a range of expertise among the staff members to deliver the programmes effectively.
 - For both programmes, there is evidence that both learners and educators would have access to the resources they need to effectively support learning and teaching on the programmes (see [quality theme 4](#) for the Operating Department Practice programme). As the programmes are fully delivered online, the education provider has evidenced how learners will be supported in a virtual learning environment using Blackboard and other virtual learning resources.

- Through initial submission as well as quality activity, the visitors were satisfied that all standards within this SET area are met for both programmes.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The module learning outcomes have been mapped to the HCPC's revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians and operating department practitioners, to demonstrate how learners will be able to meet the SOPs upon successful completion of the programmes.
 - Learners on the Dietetics programme are introduced to expectations of professional behaviour from the start of the programme where learners are asked to sign an expectations agreement. This is followed up by discussions of the Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) and SOPs for dietitians. Similarly for the Operating Department Practice programme, there is evidence that professional behaviour and the SCPEs are integral to the modules and practice learning.
 - The British Dietetics Association (BDA) curriculum standards mapping demonstrates how the education provider ensures the curriculum remains current with the philosophy, core values, knowledge and skills of the profession.
 - Theory is taught alongside the practical skills needed to apply this into practice on the Dietetics programme, with practical work embedded in several modules. Online sessions are recorded to support reflection and deeper learning of experiences.
 - There is evidence that the modules on the Operating Department Practice programme support learners in developing and demonstrating the knowledge, skills and behaviours, and fulfilling the duties outlined in the Operating Department Practice Apprenticeship Standard.
 - The Operating Department Practice module descriptors outline the content and learning and teaching objectives, which is appropriate to demonstrate integration of theory and practice and appropriate delivery.
 - The module descriptors for both programmes evidence how enquiry-based approach encourages autonomous and reflective thinking. Evidence of how academic skills are developed to inform teaching and learning on the programmes are also detailed in the module descriptors.
 - There is sufficient evidence to satisfy the visitors that all standards within this SET area are met for both programmes.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - The clinical practice modules demonstrate that practice-based learning is a central part of the programmes and is embedded at each level of the programmes.
 - The information provided in the module descriptors evidence how practice-based learning design ensures that learners are able to meet the learning outcomes and the SOPs for both dietitians and operating department practitioners by the end of the programmes. For example, the Dietetics programme's three practice-based learning takes place in four blocks throughout the programme and are integrated with academic delivery and work-based learning activities.

- A one-day Clinical Supervisor Skills Training is held twice a year to support new staff and those requiring an update. There is also a system of link tutors who visit learners in practice-based learning to review progress, undertake education quality audits and support learner evaluation process.
 - For both programmes, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate adequate number of staff in practice-based learning and that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to support learners in practice.
 - The induction and further training provided as well as further details outlined in [quality theme 1](#) (for the Dietetics programme) demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice educators are suitable and able to support and develop learners in a safe and effective way.
 - The visitors were satisfied that all standards within this SET area are met for both programmes.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The programmes are mapped to the revised (2022) SOPs for dietitians and operating department practitioners. The assessment strategy is designed to enable learners to meet the SOPs upon successful completion of the programmes.
 - The module descriptors outline the content and learning objectives, which is appropriate to demonstrate professional behaviour and the SCPEs.
 - The End Point Assessment (EPA) is integrated, and each module highlights the knowledge, skills and behaviours mapped towards the EPA.
 - The visitors were satisfied that for both programmes, the relevant standards within this SET area have been met.

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

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 programmes 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 programmes are approved.

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitors' recommendation that the programme should receive approval.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

| Name | Mode of study | Profession | Modality | Annotation | First intake date |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| MA Art Psychotherapy Practice | FT (Full time) | Arts therapist | Art therapy | | 01/01/2022 |
| MA Art Psychotherapy Practice | PT (Part time) | Arts therapist | Art therapy | | 01/01/2022 |
| MSc Dietetics | FT (Full time) | Dietitian | | | 01/01/2019 |
| BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy | FT (Full time) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/09/1994 |
| MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) | FT (Full time) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/09/2006 |
| BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) | WBL (Work based learning) | Occupational therapist | | | 01/08/2018 |
| BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice | FT (Full time) | Operating department practitioner | | | 01/09/2015 |
| BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science | FT (Full time) | Paramedic | | | 01/09/2017 |
| BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy | FT (Full time) | Physiotherapist | | | 01/09/1997 |
| MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) | FTA (Full time accelerated) | Physiotherapist | | | 01/01/2017 |
| BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship) | WBL (Work based learning) | Physiotherapist | | | 01/03/2019 |
| BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography | FT (Full time) | Radiographer | Diagnostic radiographer | | 01/09/2002 |
| BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology | FT (Full time) | Radiographer | Therapeutic radiographer | | 01/09/2002 |
| MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice | FT (Full time) | Radiographer | Therapeutic radiographer | | 01/01/2018 |
| BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Degree Apprenticeship) | WBL (Work based learning) | Radiographer | Diagnostic radiographer | | 01/01/2021 |
| BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiography (Degree Apprenticeship) | DL (Distance learning) | Radiographer | Therapeutic radiographer | | 21/03/2022 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--|--|---|------------|
| Non-Medical Prescribing | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing | 01/01/2014 |
| Non-Medical Prescribing | PT (Part time) | | | Supplementary prescribing | 01/01/2014 |
| Non-Medical Prescribing | DL (Distance learning) | | | Supplementary prescribing | 01/09/2020 |