

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Chester
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition and Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietitian
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Jennifer Caldwell (Occupational therapist) Tracy Clephan (Dietitian)
HPC executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	24 May 2011

Section two: Submission details

The following documents were provided as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's report for one year ago
- External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
 - Assessment and Re-assessment in Practice Placement
 - Attendance and Absence Policy 2011
 - BDA Accreditation letter
 - Programme Leader's CV
 - Clinical Sciences Resources
 - Faculty Business Plan 2009-10, 2010-11

- Handbook of Professional Programmes
- JPT Terms of Reference
- Revalidation Report 2010
- Quality Monitoring and Enhancement Report – Revalidation 2010
- Quality Monitoring Procedure 2010
- Strategy for Placement Self-sufficiency and Enhancement of Quality 2010
- Student Experience Visit Guide
- Student Complaints Procedure
- Programme Specifications 2010
- Professional Suitability Procedure

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in section four.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme

3.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-01	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Chester - BSc (Hons) DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors noted concerns had been raised regarding the staff recruitment for the Department. The Revalidation report stated that there would be a concern only if “the staff on temporary contracts are not made permanent” (10. Resource Requirements). No additional information regarding plans to make contracts permanent had been provided. A statement was also included suggesting the use of PhD scholarships to “fill the staffing gaps” however this was described as not being a viable option due to a lack of “financial support”. The visitors were reassured that other options were being considered but concerned that no solutions to the staffing problems had been found. The visitors were unable to determine that staffing levels of the programme were adequate to deliver an effective programme. The visitors noted that the programme has not been visited by the HPC before. The visitors considered an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors noted concerns had been raised regarding the staff recruitment for the Department (Revalidation report 2010). The visitors received a list of staff for the Department (Department of Clinical Sciences Overview of Resources). The visitors noted they could not determine which staff members were teaching on which modules and of what proportion of time they spent on each module. The visitors were unable to determine whether subject areas were being taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors noted that the programme has not been visited by the HPC before. The visitors feel an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Reason: The visitors noted from the documents provided there was mention of ongoing plans for “required alterations” (Business plan 2010-11, 3.2.5 The University Environment) for the dietetics programmes. These changes have not been submitted to the HPC through the major change process and no further evidence for these changes were included with this annual monitoring submission. In light of the planned changes to the resources for the programme the visitors considered a visit to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: The visitors noted from the Annual undergraduate programme monitoring report 2009-10 that there was mention of the “full implementation of the attendance and absence policy and procedure in the Dietetics programme”

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-01	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Chester - BSc (Hons) DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

(4. Curriculum development/enhancement). No further evidence was provided. The visitors were concerned from this information that the attendance and absence policies had not been observed in the past and although could now be fully implemented the visitors were uncertain as to the details and any changes. The visitors also noted from the documents a revalidation of the programme including programme specifications and modules had been planned (the Annual undergraduate programme monitoring report 2009-10 4. Curriculum development/enhancement). In light of the changes to the overall programme - both regulation changes and programme content changes, the visitors determined an approval visit to be the most appropriate means to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted from the Annual undergraduate programme monitoring report 2009-10) that the programme has undergone a revalidation of the programme which enabled them to amend and update specifications and module descriptors (4. Curriculum development/enhancement). These changes have not been submitted to the HPC through the major change process and no further evidence for these changes were included with this annual monitoring submission. The visitors feel an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the documents provided the visitors could not determine where the programme would ensure students understood the implications of the HPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics. The standards of education and training mapping document included by the education provider references the programme specification document as evidence this standard is met. From the programme specification documents’ learning outcomes and module descriptors the visitors struggled to find where the programme taught the students about the HPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics. As one of our new standards introduced in September 2009 this has not previously been assessed by visitors. In light of this and the other concerns the visitors had from this annual monitoring submission, the visitors feel an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: As part of the documents submitted for this annual monitoring submission the education provider included a Student Experience Visits Guide Dietetic Practice Placements. This document detailed that the education provider will “cease its 3 year quality monitoring visits [of placements] and replace with a

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-01	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Chester - BSc (Hons) DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Student Experience Visit". The visitors were concerned with how the programme team would maintain overall responsibility for placements and ensure they are appropriate for students to use. The visitors feel an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted from the Annual undergraduate Programme monitoring report 2009-10) that the programme has undergone a revalidation of the programme which enabled them to amend and update specifications and module descriptors (4. Curriculum development/enhancement). These changes have not been submitted to the HPC through the major change process and no further evidence for these changes were included with this annual monitoring submission. The visitors feel an approval visit to the programme to be the most appropriate means to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitors noted from the Responses to external examiners reports 2009-10 that the external examiner had noted concerns with the Dissertation module. They stated that there was "greater inconsistency in the approach to marking within the module". The education providers' response to this comment noted this "will be taken into consideration in the context of planned development in the module" as part of the revalidation in 2010. The visitors were concerned that the development of the modules could have significantly impacted on how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and so an approval visit is the most appropriate means of determining whether this standard continues to be met.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-06-01	d	EDU	RPT	AM report Chester - BSc (Hons) DT - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None