

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	London Metropolitan University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Dietetics, Full time
Date submission received	14 March 2018
Case reference	CAS-13097-M8B4D7

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation .....	5

### Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Paul Bates	Paramedic
Tracy Clephan	Dietitian
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Dietetics
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Dietitian
First intake	01 September 2018
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 10
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC03622

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider informed the HCPC that they intend to introduce a three-year counterpart to the existing four-year BSc (Hons) Dietetics and Nutrition. The proposed three-year BSc (Hons) Dietetics programme will be taught alongside the current four-year programme, using mostly the same modules, with some other modules a variant of those from the currently approved BSc and MSc / PG Dip programmes.

**Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment**

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

<b>Required documentation</b>	<b>Submitted</b>
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

**Section 4: Outcome from first review**

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

**Further evidence required**

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

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

**Reason:** From the evidence submitted, the visitors were not able to see how the education provider would ensure an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff on the new programme. There were going to be another 10 learners per cohort on the new programme, with a resulting cumulative increase of 30 learners over the whole 3 years. From the documentation the visitors were not clear that there was going to be an increase in staffing to meet this increase, and indeed they noted that there was apparently going to be a reduction of one FTE. They therefore require further evidence of what staffing arrangements the education provider will have in place to deliver the new programme effectively.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing that the education provider has increased staffing appropriately to meet the increase in learner numbers, or has a plan for doing so, or has some other plan for ensuring that there are enough appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver the programme effectively.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the evidence provided for this standard. However, it was not clear to them how this specific programme would involve service users. They were aware that the existing BSc and MSc / PG Dip programmes will have had to demonstrate that they met this standard, but for this new programme they could not see an appropriate level of detail regarding the involvement of service users and carers, including the education provider's strategy for deciding which service users and carers were most appropriate. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing clear plans for service user and carer involvement, or showing the education provider's rationale for which service users and carers are most appropriate.

### **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:** From the evidence submitted – the “Table indicating designate and multivalent modules” and “BSc Dietetics Course Catalogue” it was not clear to the visitors exactly which modules would be used in the new programme, and the sequence in which they would be presented. They also noted that the mapping document submitted with the evidence did not mention any changes to the curriculum, when there appeared to be a number of such changes. They were therefore unclear about how the learning outcomes will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians. They therefore require the education provider to clarify which specific modules will be included in the new programme, and in what order, and how the relevant learning outcomes will ensure that the SOPs are met.

**Suggested evidence:** A mapping document showing how the SOPs will be met by the learning outcomes of specific modules on the programme, and module descriptors for the modules which will be included on the new programme.

### **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:** From the evidence submitted – the “Table indicating designate and multivalent modules” and “BSc Dietetics Course Catalogue” it was not clear to the visitors exactly which modules would be used in the new programme, and therefore they were not able to see what assessment strategy and design would be used. They also noted that the mapping document submitted with the evidence did not mention any changes to assessment, even though it appeared that there would be changes to assessment strategy and design on the new programme. They were therefore unclear about how the assessment strategy and design will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for dietitians. They therefore

require the education provider to clarify what the assessment strategy and design will be used on the new programme, and how this will ensure that the SOPs are met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence showing the assessment strategy and design for the programme, and how this will enable learners to meet the SOPs for dietitians.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 05 July 2018 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).