

Visitors Report-final-LMU-APP01633.pdf

Observations on visitors report by Leeds Beckett University BScH Dietetics CDT.

Condition:

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence which demonstrates that, as the programme transitions from four years to three years in duration, that there will continue to be an appropriate number of placements.

Reason: When reviewing the submission and the information at the visit, the visitors noted that, as part of the changes to the duration of the programme from four years to three years, there would be one year where there would be two final year cohorts running in parallel. The programme team stated that this would happen in the academic year 2019-2020. The programme and senior team acknowledged the potential challenges this may cause and stated that they had made provisions, including running a smaller first cohort and sourcing additional placements. The senior team stated that the exact number of students would be agreed in a meeting in January, and with that an action plan would be created to ensure that there would be an adequate number of placements to fulfil the student capacity. Without the numbers of students in the first cohort or the action plan for academic year 2019-2020, the visitors could not determine that for this academic year, the number of placements would be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. As such, further evidence is required to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Area of Challenge or Reason:

The CDT believe the reason behind the condition relating to SET 5.2 to be factually incomplete and would like the wording of the reasons supporting the condition to be expanded to more accurately reflect the demands on Practice Placements and the academic year in which this will occur. The reasoning given to support the condition focuses on the completion of academic work by students in both the final year of the current 4 year course and the new 3 year course (2019/20). It does not appear to capture the requirement for additional placement provision that will be needed during the preceding academic year (2018/19) as both of these cohorts will be undertaking Practice Placement concurrently in May 2019.

The CDT agree with the condition for SET 5.2 but would ask that the HCPC consider inserting an additional sentence to provide clarification of this in the reasoning given. This will allow us then to specifically address the matter and demonstrate that we have met the condition to the satisfaction of the HCPC.

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Name of education provider | Leeds Beckett University |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Dietetics |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Dietitian |
| Date of visit | 14 – 15 December 2016 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 10 |

Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'dietitian' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 31 January 2017 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 February 2017. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 20 February 2017. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 23 March 2017.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name and role of HCPC visitors | Susan Lennie (Dietitian) Fiona McCullough (Dietitian) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Alex Urquhart |
| HCPC observer | Niall Gooch |
| Proposed student numbers | 45 per cohort, one cohort per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | 1 September 2017 |
| First approved intake | 1 September 1994 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | 1 September 2017 |
| Chair | Sue Sherwin (Leeds Beckett University) |
| Secretary | Elizabeth Phizackerley-Sugden (Leeds Beckett University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Julia Grainger (Internal panel member) Pamela Smith (External panel member) Gill Phillips (Internal panel member) |

Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators / mentors | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Service users and carers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The Education provider is required to provide further evidence which demonstrates that, as the programme transitions from four years to three years in duration, there will be the resources available to ensure that the programme will continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: When reviewing the submission and the information at the visit, the visitors noted that, as part of the changes to the duration of the programme from four years to three years, there would be one year where there would be two final year cohorts running in parallel. The programme team stated that this would happen in the academic year 2019-2020. The programme and senior team acknowledged the potential challenges this may cause and stated that they had made provisions, including running a smaller first cohort. The senior team stated that the exact number would be agreed in a meeting in January, and, along with the confirmed number, an action plan would be created to ensure that all cohorts would have sufficient resources in place, and as such have a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors were unable to determine, without confirmation of the number of students being run in the first cohort, or the action plan for managing academic year 2019-2020, whether the programme would continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan to ensure that adequate resources would be in place for all cohorts. As such the visitors request additional evidence which confirms the number of students in the first cohort of the three year programme, and evidence as to how the education provider will resource academic year 2019-2020 to ensure that the programme will continue to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence which demonstrates that, as the programme transitions from four years to three years in duration, there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: When reviewing the submission and the information at the visit, the visitors noted that, as part of the changes to the duration of the programme from four years to three years, there would be one year where there would be two final year cohorts running in parallel. The programme team stated that this would happen in the academic year 2019-2020. The programme and senior team acknowledged the potential challenges this may cause and stated that they had made provisions, including running a smaller first cohort and recruiting fixed term staff. The senior team stated that the exact number of students would be agreed in a meeting in January, and an action plan would be created to ensure that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme as the programme transitions from four years to three years. Without the numbers of students in the first cohort or the action plan for academic year 2019-2020, the visitors could not determine that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. As such further evidence is required to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence which demonstrates that, as the programme transitions from four years to three years in duration, the resources to support student learning in all settings will continue to be effectively used.

Reason When reviewing the submission and the information at the visit, the visitors noted that, as part of the changes to the duration of the programme from four years to three years, there would be one year where there would be two final year cohorts running in parallel. The programme team stated that this would happen in the academic year 2019-2020. The programme and senior team acknowledged the potential challenges this may cause and stated that they had made provisions, including running a smaller first cohort and increasing resources available to students. The senior team stated that the exact number of students would be agreed in a meeting in January, and an action plan would be created to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used as the programme transitions from a four year programme to a three year programme. Without the numbers of students in the first cohort or the action plan for academic year 2019-2020, the visitors could not determine that the resources to support student learning in all settings will be effectively used. As such further evidence is required to demonstrate that the standard is met.

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

Condition: The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that correct references are made to the role and requirements of the HCPC, to ensure that the materials to support student learning in all settings are effectively used.

Reason: When reviewing the evidence provided, the visitors noted instances where there was an incorrect reference to the HCPC as a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB). For example, the programme specification, on page 32 stated that to comply with the requirements of the HCPC, the pass mark for modules is 40 per cent. The visitors note that this is an incorrect statement, as the HCPC does not stipulate the required pass marks for programmes. In addition, the module descriptors state that to comply with PSRB requirements, the attendance requirement is 80 per cent. The visitors note that the HCPC does not set a specific requirement for an attendance requirement of 80 per cent. The visitors note that these incorrect statements about the HCPC might potentially mislead students about the requirements of the HCPC. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that the materials to support student learning, including the programme specification and modules descriptors, accurately reflect the role and requirements of the HCPC, so that they are effectively used to support student learning.

3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate that the appropriate protocols are used to obtain the consent from students

when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, including the student's right to withdraw consent.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors considered the student consent form used by the programme team to gain consent from students for practical teaching. The visitors could clearly determine that the form obtained consent from students and that they understood the protocols for consent. However, the form did not say that a student could withdraw their consent throughout the programme or detail any alternative arrangements which could be made if a student did not give consent. When meeting with the students and the programme team, the students and the team explained that there is an understanding that consent could be withdrawn at any point throughout the programme. However, as this was not explicitly stated on the consent form or any associated guidance, the visitors note that there is a potential risk that a student may not realise that they are able to withdraw consent at any time. As such the visitors require additional evidence that demonstrates the protocols which stipulates that a student can withdraw consent at any point throughout the programme, and that in this situation alternative arrangements would be made to ensure any learning outcomes would be met.

5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence which demonstrates that, as the programme transitions from four years to three years in duration, that there will continue to be an appropriate number of placements.

Reason: When reviewing the submission and the information at the visit, the visitors noted that, as part of the changes to the duration of the programme from four years to three years, there would be one year where there would be two final year cohorts running in parallel. The programme team stated that this would happen in the academic year 2019-2020. The programme and senior team acknowledged the potential challenges this may cause and stated that they had made provisions, including running a smaller first cohort and sourcing additional placements. The senior team stated that the exact number of students would be agreed in a meeting in January, and with that an action plan would be created to ensure that there would be an adequate number of placements to fulfil the student capacity. Without the numbers of students in the first cohort or the action plan for academic year 2019-2020, the visitors could not determine that for this academic year, the number of placements would be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. As such, further evidence is required to demonstrate that this standard is met.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The Education provider is required to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the register.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the evidence submitted prior to the visit and could not find any reference to the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register. During the visit, the programme team explained that an

aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register, and some draft wording was tabled at the visit which clearly stated the requirements. However, the visitors did not see the requirements stated in the assessment regulations. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Recommendations

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider enhancing the information on the module descriptors to ensure that they effectively reflect the content that is being delivered.

Reason: When reviewing the module descriptors, the visitors noted that they included all the information about the learning outcomes, curriculum content and learning resources and were satisfied that the standard was met. However the visitors noted that information about the underpinning life science and nutrition science content that would be delivered as part of the modules was not detailed. During a meeting with the programme team it was established that this content was delivered across the modules, and as such the visitors were satisfied that the content would be delivered in the revised modules. However they noted that without it being indicated in the module descriptors, there was a potential that students may not be able to fully prepare for learning. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider consider enhancing the information on the module descriptors to ensure that they fully reflect the content that is being delivered.

Susan Lennie
Fiona McCullough
Kathleen Taylor