Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Nutrition/Dietetics
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of HPC register	Dietetics
Name and profession of HPC visitors	Pauline Douglas (Dietitian) Peter Ruddy (Biomedical scientist)
HPC executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	24 March 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

- HPC Approval letter June 2010
- L1, 2 and 3 Student Forum meeting reports 09-10
- Annual Programmes Review 08-09 Appendix 4
- Annual Programmes Review 09-10 Appendix 4
- Annual Programmes Review 08-09 Appendix 6b
- Annual Programmes Review 09-10 Appendix a,b,c
- University of Surrey Approval Process for Dietetic Placements

- Student's Reflecting on Placement form
- Process for collecting and acting upon Student evaluation of Practice Placement form
- Example of Network Student Training Minutes
- Board of Studies Minutes March 2009, June 2009 and Jan 2010
- Handbook for Academic representatives
- Draft Undergraduate Academic Regulations
- Academic Standards Guidelines Section D
- University Agreement (for dietetic students at point of entry to Programme)
- Level 1 Handbook
- C placement portfolio - extracts

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.

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors learnt that there had been restructuring within the biosciences faculty and that this would 'result in vacant posts not being filled and the loss of colleagues contributing to the teaching of the … nutrition/dietetics' (Annual programme review, 2008-09, section 16). Section 16 goes on to say that 'the losses will however raise our student to staff ratio and it has been suggested some might have implications for the accreditation of the Nutrition/Dietetics programme'. The visitors realise that these comments were from 2008-09 but they will need to review this in more detail to ensure that the programme continues to have a secure place in the business plan.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors noted in the Nutrition programme review meeting notes from September 2009 and September 2010, there had been changes to the module organisers for some modules. The visitors were not provided with a revised management structure for the programme and with the clarification sought about the staffing levels for the programme (as outlined in the reason for SET 3.5), they were unable to determine whether there were effective systems in place to manage the programme and that the people involved have the skills and expertise to work within these systems. The visitors will need to review this in more detail.

3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: From their review of the documentation submitted, the visitors noted the minutes from a number of annual review meetings (eg Annual programmes review 09-10) as evidence of how the education provider meets this standard. From their review of these minutes the visitors could see that meetings are held on a regular basis and feedback from the external examiner and the student forum is discussed. The visitors could see the action points resulting from the external examiner comments. However, they were unable to determine action points from the student forum feedback and were therefore unsure how this feedback was taken into account as part of the monitoring and evaluation systems (see the comments against SET 3.8 for further information). The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was being met and will therefore need to review this in more detail.

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

Reason: From the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider the visitors noted that there had been a 'Reduction in staffing to 11.7 WTE [work time equivalent], of which 3.7 WTE are Dietitian's'. The visitors were aware of a major change which had been submitted in January 2010 (confirmation of ongoing approval was granted in June 2010) but noted that the submission had

stated that there had been a 'Reduction in staffing of Nutrition Division (from 17.4 WTE to 12.5 WTE)'. From this information it appeared to the visitors that there had been a further reduction in staffing levels. They also noted that in both the major change and annual monitoring submission there had been an increase in the number of students on the programme. To ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme, the visitors need to review this in more detail.

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

Reason: From the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider the visitors noted that there had been a 'Reduction in staffing to 11.7 WTE, of which 3.7 WTE are Dietitian's'. The visitors were aware of a major change which had been submitted in January 2010 (confirmation of ongoing approval was granted in June 2010) but noted that the submission had stated that there had been a 'Reduction in staffing of Nutrition Division (from 17.4 WTE to 12.5 WTE)'. From this information it appeared to the visitors that there had been a further reduction in staffing levels and they were unsure of the current number of Dietitians teaching on the programme. They also noted that in both the major change and annual monitoring submission there had been an increase in the number of students on the programme. To ensure that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge the visitors need to review this in more detail.

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted the reports from levels 1, 2 and 3 (2009/2010) of the student forum. In the minutes from the Level 2 forum in Jan 2010, the visitors noted that students felt 'there were insufficient textbooks for some modules'. The visitors also read in the minutes from the Level 3 forum meeting on 28 October 2010, the students felt there was 'continued dissatisfaction with the timetabling/admin' which included 'missed lectures because of confusion with timetable'; 'lecturers not turning up to scheduled lectures' and 'rooms too small for the number of students'. The visitors were unable to locate in the documentation submitted, whether these concerns had been discussed and/or addressed. They were therefore unable to determine whether this student feedback was an accurate reflection of the resources. To be able to determine whether the resources to support student learning in all setting are effectively used, the visitors will need to review this in more detail.

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

Reason: From their review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted the reports from levels 1, 2 and 3 (2009/2010) of the student forum. In the minutes from the Level 2 forum in Jan 2010, students felt 'there were insufficient textbooks for some modules'. The visitors also read in the minutes from the Level 3 forum meeting on 28 October 2010, the students felt there was 'continued dissatisfaction with the timetabling/admin' which included 'missed lectures because of confusion with timetable'; 'lecturers not turning up to scheduled lectures' and 'rooms too small for the number of students'. The visitors were unable to locate in the other documentation submitted, whether these concerns had been discussed and/or addressed. They were therefore unable to determine whether this student feedback was an accurate reflection of the resources. To be able to determine whether the resources to support student learning in all settings effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme, the visitors will need to review this in more detail.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Reason: From their review of the documentation submitted the visitors noted the reports from levels 1, 2 and 3 (2009/2010) of the student forum. In the minutes from the Level 2 forum in Jan 2010, the students felt 'there were insufficient textbooks for some modules'. The visitors also noted that in the minutes from the Level 3 forum meeting on 28 October 2010, the students felt that 'not enough computers were available at all times' and there was 'continued dissatisfaction with the timetabling/admin' which included 'missed lectures because of confusion with timetable'; 'lecturers not turning up to scheduled lectures' and 'rooms too small for the number of students'. The visitors were unable to locate in other documentation submitted, whether these concerns had been discussed and/or addressed. They were therefore unable to determine whether this student feedback was an accurate reflection of the learning resources. To be able to determine whether the learning resources, including the IT facilities, are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff, the visitors will need to review this in more detail.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document the visitors were informed that currently the 'reports of level 1, 2 and 3 student forums [are] reported to the Board of Studies' and Student Academic representatives are in place to meet this standard. However, from the information received the visitors were unable to identify the process which a student would follow to raise a complaint to the student forum or how students were informed about the process. In the SETs mapping document, the visitors were also directed to pages 25 – 30 of the draft Undergraduate Academic Regulations for 2011-2012 which discussed Complaints about learning opportunities. As the annual monitoring process is a retrospective review of the last two academic years (2008/09 and 2009/10) the visitors were unable to review this as it is due to be finalised and introduced in a

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2011-01-26	g	EDU	PPR	AM Report	Final	Public
					DD: None	RD: None

future academic year. The visitors were unable to determine the student complaints process which the education provider currently has in place and will need to review this in more detail.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Reason: Within the SETs mapping document the visitors were informed that evidence for this standard could be found in the Academic standards guidelines, section D 3 and 4, pages 6 – 8. The visitors could clearly see in these university wide regulations that a process for dealing with concerns about a students' professional-related conduct should be in place. However the visitors could not determine how this translated into a process at the programme level and how this was communicated to students. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met and will need to review this in more detail.

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 their review of the documentation the visitors noted that a new level 1 module for Nutrition/Dietetics students, entitled BMS1002 Practical Biochemistry, had been run for the first time (Annual programme review, 2008/09, section 5). The visitors did not receive further information about this new module and to ensure that learning outcomes of the programme continue to allow someone to meet the standards of proficiency on successful completion of the programme, the visitors will need to review this in more detail.

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the external examiner's reports from 2008/09 and 2009/10. From the 2009/10 report, the visitors learnt that the examiner felt they had limited time to review the level 3 exam papers as they 'were not available for moderation until the day of the examination board (22/06/10)'. The visitors felt that should there have been any concerns when the examiner reviewed these papers, the timing would not have allowed the external examiner to fully complete this requirement of their role. The visitors did note that in their response to the external examiner report for 2009/10, the education provider has implemented a number of changes to how external moderation takes place. The visitors did not receive any further details about this. In order to ensure that there continues to be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment, the visitors will need to review this in more detail.