

HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR DIETETICS AND NUTRITION

EVALUATION REPORT: NAME OF THE INSTITUTION

This form is ONLY for the use of evaluation of Nutritionist Training Programmes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Definitions of terms	3
1. EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMMES IN DIETETICS FOR REGISTRATION WITH THE HPCSA	4
2. GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAMME COMPILATION FOR EVALUATION (ONLINE/VIRTUAL AND/OR ON-SITE)	6

The following Annexures are for use of the evaluating panel only, but are included here for information purposes of the institution being evaluated and assessed.

ANNEXURE D: RECOMMENDED STRUCTURING OF AN EVALUATION ASSESSMENT REPORT	9
ANNEXURE E: TIMELINES	16
ANNEXURE F: RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING FORM FOR DNB	20
ANNEXURE G: APPLICATION FOR LEAVE NOT TO ATTEND A MEETING	22
ANNEXURE H: CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATORS	23
ANNEXURE I: ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION PANEL	27
ANNEXURE J: DNB BLOOMS TAXONOMY: PROPOSED PERCENTAGE ALLOCATION PER YEAR GROUP	30

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ALL USERS OF THIS DOCUMENT:

Please do not change the numbering system of the document. If there is no information for a specific point, please indicate with **Not Applicable** (NA).

DEFINITION OF TERMS

	<i>Approval</i>	<i>The recognition of professional programmes of study by the approving body. It is the recognition of academic and clinical quality by an impartial body, in this instance, the HPCSA. Graduates of approved programmes are eligible for registration with the HPCSA, a legal requirement to practice the profession in South Africa. Approval status for an institution is valid for 5 years.</i>
1	<i>Criteria for Programme Approval</i>	<i>Acts, Regulations, standards, specified by the Professional Board with which an Institution's professional education and training programme must comply in order to be approved.</i>
2	<i>Evaluation Panel</i>	<i>A team of experts appointed by the Board to evaluate an institution's professional education and training programme and facilities to determine whether they meet the Criteria for Programme Approval. The panel members are external to the educational Institution.</i>
3	<i>Institution</i>	<i>An organization of Higher Education, offering a professional programme of education and training that leads to registration with the HPCSA.</i>
4	<i>Minister</i>	<i>The Minister of Health of South Africa</i>
5	<i>Programme approval</i>	<i>Determination by the Professional Board of whether an Institution's professional programme of education and training meets the Criteria for Programme Approval for registration of its graduates with the HPCSA.</i>
6	<i>Programme evaluation</i>	<i>Processes undertaken by the Board (once every 5 years or as indicated) to assess whether an Institution's professional programme of education and training meets the Criteria for Programme Approval for education and training in the profession.</i>
7	<i>Professional Board</i>	<i>A Professional Board as defined in the Health Professions Act number 56 of 1974.</i>
8	<i>Self-evaluation/ review</i>	<i>A process undertaken by an Institution's professional programme of education and training to assess whether it meets the Criteria for Programme Approval.</i>
9	<i>Site visit</i>	<i>A visit to an Institution's professional programme of education and training undertaken by the Evaluation panel for the purpose of programme evaluation. It typically involves interviews with students, staff and the leadership; observation of student academic and clinical learning opportunities/ activities; visits to clinical training facilities; review of programme resources and documentation.</i>
10	<i>Site visit plan</i>	<i>A schedule of activities which the Evaluation panel will undertake during the site visit to an Institution.</i>
11	<i>Training facility</i>	<i>An organisation that offers professional practice / clinical training to students during formal periods of study.</i>

1 EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMMES IN NUTRITION FOR REGISTRATION AS NUTRITIONIST AT HPCSA

The general goal of evaluation is to exercise control over the quality of education and training in nutrition, and to serve as proof of the standard of performance of graduates from an approved programme. According to "HPCSA guidelines for evaluation of education and training institutions" (7 April 2011), the purpose of evaluation is as follows:

To promote excellence in educational preparation while assuring the public that graduates of approved programmes are educated in a core set of knowledge and skills required for competent, safe, ethical, effective, and independent professional practice. Evaluation requires Professional Boards to ensure the quality of education and training programmes as a facet of public protection. The Health Professions Act, and Boards' regulations, criteria and standards identify basic elements that must exist in all approved education programmes.

1.1 APPROACH

A revised system for evaluation has been implemented from 2013 that describes the process of evaluation of the provider (University/Institution) of the training programme in nutrition (refer to Annexure A for a more extensive rationale and justification of this approach).

1.2 EVALUATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

1.2.1 The evaluation process consists firstly of the completion of two documents by the provider/head (or co-ordinator) of Department of Human Nutrition/Nutrition) (Annexure B & C)

These Annexures (B & C) should be completed according to the timeline provided in Annexure E.

After submission of Annexure B and C to the Secretariat of the Professional Board for Dietetics and Nutrition (DNB) the distribution of duplicates to the evaluation panel will commence.

1.2.2 The external assessment will be done by a panel of experts (evaluation panel), consisting of 3-4 persons of which at least one (1) will be a member from a Higher Education Institution, to be appointed by the DNB

- The evaluation panel will review the completed Annexures B and C and will establish if any additional information and/or documentation is required **prior** to the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) (University and training facilities included).
- The evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) will take place over a period of three (3) days which will be allocated to the assessment of the program and day four (4) will be allocated to report writing by the panel and follow up of additional questions and aspects which needs clarity (see 2.3 for more details). Access to the venue and documentation on day four (4) is required. The Chairperson of the Education, Training and Registration (ETR) Committee and the Head of Department (HOD) of the university will finalise the date of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) as soon as possible after or at the first Education, Training and Registration Committee meeting of the Board for the year, and a soon as an evaluation panel has been appointed.

- Extra ordinary criteria for changing of evaluation dates:
 - Student unrest
 - Emergency situations
 - Change of Board members/evaluation panel

1.2.3 After the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site), the evaluation panel compiles a report to be submitted to the Education, Training and Registration Committee of the DNB according to the timeline in Annexure E, where after the report will be returned to the evaluated institution for further comments and clarification of additional questions by the panel (*via* the DNB secretariat). The report and comments will then be re-submitted by the evaluated institution to the secretariat of the DNB for attention of the evaluation panel for a recommendation to the Education, Training and Registration Committee of the DNB, and subsequently to the Professional Board for confirmation of the approval (and period of approval of the training programme).

The evaluation panel should include the following sections in its report (i.e. Evaluation and Accreditation Assessment Report: electronic format): Refer to Annexure D

- (i) An executive summary of the self–assessment report (SAR) (Annexure B & C) submitted by the evaluated institution in electronic format.
- (ii) A report on the progress of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site), highlighting findings of special importance (according to Annexure D)
- (iii) An overall assessment of the evaluated institution with a recommendation and motivation for:
 - Approval
 - re-approval
 - provisional approval
 - no approval, and
 - recommendations for improved performance if necessary, highlighting special features and recommending/congratulating the department (Annexure F).

2 GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAMME COMPILATION FOR EVALUATION (VIRTUAL/ONLINE AND/OR ON-SITE) AT THE INSTITUTION

2.1 PRINCIPLE GUIDELINES

- 2.1.1 The Institution concerned must appoint a co-ordinator to facilitate the evaluation panel's visit.
- 2.1.2 The co-ordinator must communicate with the institutional Quality Control Department informing them of the pending dates for the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) by the DNB.
- 2.1.3 The institutional Quality Control Department may appoint a member to attend the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)

2.2 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONVENOR (DNB panel)

- 2.2.1. The Convener (of the evaluation panel), prior to the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site), supplies the co-ordinator with a proposed programme (see 2.3), where the co-ordinator can also make recommendations. The programme should be finalised in time for the co-ordinator (Institution) to arrange meetings with the institution staff ahead of time.
- 2.2.2 The Convener, **prior to the** evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site), develops a Draft Report (according to Annexure D) from the information supplied by the evaluated Institution (University).

-The Draft Report is sent (e-mailed) to all appointed evaluation panel members (DNB), prior to the visit by the appointed convener of the specific panel (see Annexure E for timelines).

-Evaluation panel members comment on and make additions to the Draft Report and submit it to the Convener **before the** evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) **takes place**. The Draft Report should be populated through this process prior to the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site).

-This Draft Report acts as a basis for the identification of further relevant information to be gathered during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site). The Draft Report also acts as a matrix or template to develop the Final Report.

(For this action [2.2.2] no input from the institution is needed. Any questions arising when compiling the Draft Report will be noted by the Convener and panel members and clarified during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site).

2.3 *PROPOSED PROGRAMME FOR THE EVALUATION (VIRTUAL/ONLINE AND/OR ON-SITE)

**Tea breaks and lunches also need to be included in the final programme as well as time, usually a whole day, for evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) (see 2.4), studying and discussion of the exhibitions.*

** Do not add the names of the evaluation panel on the program, as it may change on short notice.

	Task	*Agenda / **Name of interviewee	Allocation of time (approximate)
2.3.1	Evaluation Panel meeting on arrival at Institution		
i	Finalising the programme (Institutional co-ordinator to attend where possible). Co-ordinator to have class lists available for convener to choose students for 2.3.10 (indicate class representative on the class list).		2 hours

	Task	*Agenda / **Name of interviewee	Allocation of time (approximate)
ii	Identify individual members of the Department/Faculty that the Evaluation Panel wish to interview personally.		
iii	Agreement on responsibilities and divide panel members for training and teaching facility visits, which usually takes place simultaneously.		
iv	Discussion: Draft Report (Refer to <i>Guidelines for programme compilation for evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)</i> in 2.1 and 2.2). Identify strengths and weaknesses, problem areas and specific activities to be encouraged. Define areas for special attention during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) and share notes on questions to be asked.		
2.3.2	Initial meeting with the Head of the School (HOD)/Dean of the Faculty/Senior Management of the School/Faculty	School/Faculty management and structures	1 hour
2.3.3	Individual meeting with the Head of Department	Departmental management and structures	45 min
2.3.4	Meeting with Chairperson Research and members of the Research Committee	Research focus areas and outputs, students' role in research	30 min
2.3.5	Meeting with the Chairperson of the Education/Curriculum Development Committee	The curriculum, teaching and learning and assessment that relates to the curriculum	2 hours
2.3.6	Meeting with programme manager (or HOD if it is the same person) on subjects/modules offered by " service/support " departments (e.g. chemistry or microbiology). Individual meetings with relevant staff should be arranged	The curriculum, teaching and learning and assessment of "service/support" modules that relate to the curriculum	1 hour
2.3.7	Meeting with programme manager (or HOD if it is the same person) on subjects/modules offered by the Dietetic department. Individual meetings with relevant academic and support staff should be arranged.	The curriculum, teaching and learning and assessment that relate to the curriculum as well as support given to each module.	2 hours
2.3.8	Meeting with the Chairperson and members of Human Resources Development Committee or Unit/Centre responsible for Academic Development.	Human resource development/academic development that relate to education and training	30 min
2.3.9	Formal meeting with recent graduates (3-6 graduates).	Feedback on experience with the curriculum (strong and weak points)	1 hour working lunch
2.3.10	Individual meeting with student class representatives and two other class members from each year of the programme (at least three students per year group; 1 st to 4 th years) (4 groups)	Open agenda	2-3 hours
2.3.11	Meeting with representatives of all managerial levels of therapeutic, foodservice and community based training facilities.	Open agenda	1 hour
2.3.12	Training facilities of all the departments (Hospitals; Clinics and Community Hospitals/Clinics; Foodservice	Evaluation panel will divide into 3 groups and visit the training	3-5 hours

	Task	*Agenda / **Name of interviewee	Allocation of time (approximate)
	Management) giving opportunity to see practical work by students in progress and to meet informally with members of the hospital /community /foodservices /private sector staff.	facilities simultaneously, with a relevant staff member as guide.	
2.1.13	Courtesy feedback session with School Director, program leader/manager and Dean of the Faculty	Preliminary highlights and possible recommendations (first impressions)	30 min – 1 hour (end of day 3 or on day 4)
2.3.14	Report writing (day 4 evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site))	Access to all documents and a venue where the panel can work for the day will be appreciated.	6-8 hours (day 4 of evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site))

2.4 EXHIBITIONS/TRAINING AND TEACHING FACILITY VISITS TO BE ARRANGED

- 2.4.1 Exhibition of study guides, assessments and examination papers etc. to support self-assessment documentation.
- 2.4.2 Exhibition of students' work such as portfolios, assignments etc.
- 2.4.3 Teaching facilities, lecture and seminar rooms.
- 2.4.4 Computer laboratory facility
- 2.4.5 Skills laboratory facility
- 2.4.6 Library facilities

HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR DIETETICS AND NUTRITION

RECOMMENDED STRUCTURING OF AN EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR NUTRITIONIST TRAINING PROGRAMME

Name of University	
Name of Faculty	
Name of School (if applicable)	
Name of Department	
Name of undergraduate programme (as registered with SAQA)	
SAQA registration number and year of registration	
Qualification delivered	
Questionnaire (Annexure B) completed by:	
Questionnaire (Annexure C) completed by:	
Date of completion of the report Self-Assessment Report by the HEI's	
Date submitted to the PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR DIETETICS AND NUTRITION	

VISITING PANEL MEMBERS

Names

THE MAIN TASKS OF THE VISITING PANEL

- To analyse the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) prior to the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) of the Institution.
- To gather evidence during the Institution evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)

- To write the Quality Assessment Report (Annexure D)
- To recommend approval/ re-approval/ provisional approval or no approval

PROGRAMME

A brief summary of the Education and Training programme and information on Committees, groups and persons interviewed during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) to be given and/ or the programme of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) could be attached as an annexure to the document.

EVALUATION OF THE SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE SCHOOL OR DEPARTMENT

Comments on the comprehensiveness, quality, etc.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1.1 MANAGEMENT/ GOVERNANCE/ SUPERVISORY STRUCTURES WITHIN THE INSTITUTION

- 1.1.1 Management and organisational structures
- 1.1.2 Supervisory structures

1.2. STUDENT AND STAFF PROFILE

- 1.2.1 Entrance requirements and selection procedures (entry qualification and description of selection procedures)
- 1.2.2 Number of students i.e. actual numbers enrolled over the past five full academic years (from previous evaluation until current) according to gender and ethnic distribution per study year; undergraduate and post-graduate.
- 1.2.3 Number of students that graduated for the past five full academic years.
- 1.2.4 Envisaged (planned) student enrolment numbers for the next five years (per year).
- 1.2.5 Transformation strategy used to market the programme to diversify the student population.
- 1.2.6 Academic/teaching staff profile (according to rank and qualification)
- 1.2.7 The overall student: staff ratio.
- 1.2.8 Research and publication profile of staff for the past 5 years.

1.3 QUALIFICATION, PROGRAMME, CURRICULUM, CONTENT AND ORGANISATIONAL DESIGN

- 1.3.1 Curriculum design and philosophy
 - 1.3.1.1 Educational and curriculum design philosophy;
 - 1.3.1.2 The teaching, learning and assessment policy of the Faculty, School or Department.
- 1.3.2 Programme and details:
 - 1.3.2.1 Time allocated for reflection and self-study.
 - 1.3.2.2 Duration of the programme.
 - 1.3.2.3 Number of credits.
 - 1.3.2.4 National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Level of the programme.
- 1.3.3 Content of the programme offered (teacher-centred or student-centred; discipline-based or integrated; content-driven or outcomes-based, knowledge (facts) acquisition or problem-driven; community- or hospital based; etc.)
- 1.3.4 Special features/emphases of the programme.
- 1.3.5 Structures in place to manage curriculum design/development and review; innovation in curriculum development and review.
- 1.3.6 Role of students and alumni in the curriculum development and review processes.
- 1.3.7 Interdepartmental co-operation in curriculum development.
- 1.3.8 Is a community-based and primary health care approach reflected in the programme design?

- 1.3.9 Quality of curriculum documents available such as study guides with an organisational and study component containing learning outcomes and references of reading material.

1.4 AIM, RATIONAL, PURPOSE AND OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAMME

- 1.4.1 Aim/broad purpose of the programme (macro-level).
- 1.4.2 The exit-level outcomes of the programme (what capabilities constitute the overall competence?)
- 1.4.3 Specific outcomes (in terms of knowledge, skills & attitudes; abilities and ethical behaviour) students must demonstrate to be considered capable in terms of exit-level outcomes.
- 1.4.4 What materials/aids do students receive (e.g. study guides, student manuals, portfolios, training kits, etc.) to ensure that constructive learning is taking place for the duration of the programme?
- 1.4.5 How was the burden of factual overload (curriculum load) reduced without sacrificing quality?
- 1.4.6 Programme content integration and design:
 - 1.4.6.1 Vertical and horizontal.
 - 1.4.6.2 If the programme is still strictly discipline-based with no (*or almost no*) vertical and horizontal integration, please justify that approach while taking into consideration the university, faculty and programme aims, objectives and philosophy?

1.5 KNOWLEDGE BASIS OF STANDARDS OF THIS PROGRAMME (TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT) AND HOW IT RELATES TO GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES (Annexure B)

- 1.5.1 Teaching, Learning and Assessment
 - 1.5.1.1 The teaching, learning and assessment philosophy of the School/Department.
 - 1.5.1.2 Innovation in teaching and learning and assessment (focus on independent learning, group work, multi-professional co-operation).
 - 1.5.1.3 Instructional methods and techniques mostly used for teaching and learning.
- 1.5.2 Extent to which resource-based learning is utilised (e.g. use of library, internet, etc.).
- 1.5.3 Special regulations to ensure quality of the end-product and development of students' generic skills (e.g. communication, writing, reading and information gathering skills, etc.).
- 1.5.4 Systems used for the assessment of student learning (e.g. *diagnostic, formative, summative and evaluative assessment).
- 1.5.5 Assessment of students' achievements in terms of generic skills? (e.g. students' level of computer literacy).
- 1.5.6 Assessment criteria employed in the academic and practice setting.
- 1.5.7 Were the assessment criteria known to students as well as staff? How were they informed? Relevancy of assessment modalities utilized.
- 1.5.8 Does the assessment system encourage appropriate learning skills and reduce emphasis on uncritical acquisition of facts (rote learning)? How do you know/ensure that?
- 1.5.9 Does the assessment structure reflect the educational approach (e.g. subject specific, integrated assessment in an integrated programme; problem-based assessment in a problem-based approach)?
- 1.5.10 Structures or moderation systems (processes) in place to ensure fair, valid and reliable external evaluation and examination for the programme (modules).
- 1.5.11 Academic staff development regarding teaching, learning and assessment practices.

1.6 STUDENT DEVELOPMENT, SUPPORT AND GUIDANCE

- 1.6.1 The relevancy and comprehensiveness of the yearly induction/orientation programme for enrolled students at university and programme level
- 1.6.2 Briefly describe:

- 1.6.2.1 The systems which are in place to ensure that students have sufficient academic support during the early years
- 1.6.2.2 The mentoring/tutoring (or similar) system in place whereby senior students/lecturers act as mentors to students
- 1.6.3 Systems in place to ensure that students have sufficient personal support from Faculty, School or Department in both the early years and the practice training (experiential learning in hospitals or communities).
- 1.6.4 Mechanisms in place to identify students with academic and/or personal problems, and how these problems are approached.
- 1.6.5 The development of students' generic skills; also refer to the resources and modules that are used for the development of these skills (Section F in Annexure B).
- 1.6.6 The programme/department/division ensure that students are properly exposed (intra and extra curricula) to practise nutrition in a diverse society.
- 1.6.7 Generic skills set for students developed in the practice (WIL) setting:
 - 1.6.7.1 Professional conduct and role modelling.
 - 1.6.7.2 Working as a team (including multi-professional team work).
 - 1.6.7.3 Attention to bio-psycho-social (human rights) elements of patient/clients care.
 - 1.6.7.4 Promotion of the concept of integrated and holistic patient/client care.
 - 1.6.7.5 Equipment of students to deal with patients with highly infectious diseases (measures in place).

1.7. RESOURCES

- 1.7.1 The availability of resources (e.g. libraries, information technology/computer centres, practice teaching and learning facilities such as hospitals, clinics, community, skills laboratory, food labs, food software IT, etc.) to facilitate student learning.
- 1.7.2 Resources (equipment) available for teaching/training for Therapeutic Nutrition, Community Service, and Foodservice Management.
- 1.7.3 **Practice settings and other physical facilities** in terms of appropriateness, efficiency, accessibility and effectiveness.
- 1.7.4 Teaching venues/group rooms and related facilities/services in terms of suitability and appropriateness, size and accessibility, fitness for the purpose etc.
- 1.7.5 To what extent does the provision or lack of provision of facilities and equipment influence teaching, learning, research and services in the School or Department? Briefly reflect (refer to 5.1).
- 1.7.6 Student administration and support facilities (e.g. health clinic, academic assistance, etc) (Detailed information should be available during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site))

1.8 FINANCES

- 1.8.1 Operational financial situation in the School or Department with reference to dependence on state subsidies (e.g. Clinical Training Grant), provincial health department support, own funding, etc.
- 1.8.2 The impact of the financial situation on the educational process delivery of the programme.

1.9. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- 1.9.1 Research support services for staff, *as well as the* academic staff support and development resources and facilities in terms of applicability, appropriateness, sufficiency, efficiency and effectiveness, etc.
- 1.9.2 Training given to staff in programme/curriculum design, instructional strategies and methods, assessment, student support, and other related matters. Indicate the frequency of training sessions, and whether these are optional or compulsory.

- 1.9.3 Training of on-site supervisors (involved in the training of under-graduate students) in educational methods and techniques; assessment of students, student counselling and support.
- 1.9.4 Initiatives undertaken to promote teaching-learning as a valuable activity, and whether and how teaching-learning excellence is rewarded.
- 1.9.5 Initiatives to promote educational (teaching-learning) research, and whether and how this is recognised and rewarded.
- 1.9.6 Initiatives to promote community engagement and whether and how this is recognised and rewarded
- 1.9.7 Other initiatives/interventions in the field of academic staff development and support in the Faculty, School or Department, and who takes responsibility for these activities.

1.10. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT

- 1.10.1 Mechanisms/structures in place for assessing and enhancement of the **quality** of -
 - teaching and learning in the Faculty, School or Department;
 - teaching and learning in a clinical context (i.e. in hospitals, community, foodservice, etc.);
 - instructional materials;
 - student support and development;
 - staff development; and
 - assessment procedures.
- 1.10.2 **Remedial/developmental** actions taken in each of these when quality is found to be lacking/improvement is required:
 - teaching and learning in the Faculty, School or Department;
 - teaching and learning in a clinical context (i.e. in hospitals, community, foodservice etc);
 - instructional materials;
 - student support and development;
 - staff development; and
 - assessment procedures.
- 1.10.3 Is this self-evaluation documents (Annexure B and C) with a view to evaluation, the only self-evaluation exercise of the programme? Describe any other self-evaluation processes in place in the Faculty, School or Department.

1.11 HUMAN RIGHTS, ETHICS AND MEDICAL LAW

- 1.11.1 Give evidence of the inclusion of the “Proposed core curriculum on Human Rights, Ethics and Medical Law for Health Care Practitioners” (**Human Rights Core Curriculum -Dhais FINALE EDITION 10.11.061: 2 September 2011**). You may refer to Annexure B- Section G. Evidence should be made available during the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) **Descriptive notes about the interviews with all year groups (at least 3 students per group to ensure anonymity). Include the following information (not an exhaustive list):**
 - Is proper study guides available?
 - Handbooks and reference material?
 - Access to computers while at the training site?
 - Accommodation?
 - How far do they travel each day?
 - Is there proper supervision at the training facility?

- How regularly does the lecturer visit?
- Do they have regular meetings with the academic staff at the university?
- How regularly do they submit assignments? In what format?
- When do they receive their marked assignments back?
- Do they have the opportunity to evaluate the program?
- Time allocated to the specific topic, is it enough? Do they learn what they are supposed to learn?
- Etc.....

1.13 Descriptive notes about the interviews with all staff members and accredited training staff at training sites for the different training areas (*Therapeutic Nutrition, Foodservice Management, Community Nutrition, and Research*)

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Comments on strengths and weaknesses: specific mention of commendable features of the programme; recommendation as to the enhancement of the quality of the programme.

Commendable features:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

Recommendations:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING APPROVAL

Period of approval to be specified:

Option	Mark one applicable selection	Date of decision	Motivation
Recommend approval (new programmes)			
Recommended re-approval			
Provisional approval			
No approval			

Signatures:

Panel member 1: _____

Date: _____

Panel member 2: _____

Date: _____

Panel member 3: _____

Date: _____

Panel member 4: _____

Date: _____

THE EVALUATION PROCESS WITH TIMEFRAMES

All parties (university and Board) must abide by the timeframes specified in the programme:

PRE-PROGRAMME EVALUATION: University Name:			ALLOCATED DATE OF EVALUATION:
Responsibility	Action	Time frames	Remarks/Date schedule
Professional Board	Schedule each institution's education and training programme for evaluation at least once during its 5 year term of office	First meeting post inauguration of the Board	
	Schedule the particular institution's programme evaluation and site visits to occur during the Institution's academic year	During July of each year for the next year, before the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site).	
	Select and constitute the pool of evaluators for the panel	Within the first year of its term of office	
	Appoint the members of the evaluation panel	At the last Education, Training and Registration Committee meeting of the year before the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	
Board administration	Notify the Institution & provide guidelines. Notify the members of the evaluation panel of appointments & send Code of Conduct	Four months before the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	
Evaluators	Accept /Decline appointment Sign Code of Conduct	Within twenty working days (1 month) of receipt of notification	

Board administration	Send members of the panel documents reflecting the Criteria for Evaluation	Within a week of receipt of acceptance & Code of Conduct	
Education Institution	Submits to Board Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Review Report • Proposed (Draft) virtual/online or on-site evaluation Plan • Academic and Clinic Schedules 	Six weeks prior to evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	
Board administration	Submits to the evaluation panel the institution's documents i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Review Report • Proposed Plan (virtual/online and/or on-site evaluation) • Academic and Clinic Schedules 	Within two days of receipt from the institution, but at least five weeks prior to the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	
Evaluation Panel	Reviews institutions documents, consult other members of the panel and make suggestions for amendments to the institution's virtual/online and/or on-site evaluation Plan	At least three weeks before the date of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site).	
Board administration	Communicates evaluation panel's suggestions for amendments to the virtual/online or on-site evaluation Plan to the Institution	At least two weeks before the date of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	
DURING PROGRAMME EVALUATION			
Board Secretariat	Facilitates communication between all parties	As soon as possible	
Evaluation Panel	Conducts and programme evaluation, (virtual/online and/or on-site)	First three days of evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)	

POST EVALUATION		
Evaluation Panel	Drafts report	Fourth day of evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)
	Submit to Board Secretariat the final report on the programme evaluation	Within two weeks of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site)
Board administration	Sends the institutions a copy of the final report on the programme evaluation	The institution should respond to the final draft withing three weeks of receipt thereof. Should the institution have a problem with this timeframe, they should inform the Board Management of the final date of submission attainable, in writing. No more that 2 weeks extention for final comments will be granted.
Education Institution	Review and respond to DNB, in writing, to the factual correctness of the report, and add any additional information of importance.	Within two weeks of receipt
Chairperson (Convenor of assessment panel)	Return comments to the Convenor of the panel for consideration and finalization of the report.	Within two weeks following receipt of the comments.
Professional Board	Review reports and meet (teleconference or e-mail) to determine evaluation status	Within two weeks of receipt of the institution's report
Board administration	Notify institution of the Board's decision also submit a pro-forma invoice to the institution	Within two weeks of the Education Committee meeting
Education Institution	Submits a plan of action, indicating how matters arising will be addressed, specifying timeframes and resource allocation	Within <u>one month</u> of receipt of the Board's decision and letter of approval

Professional Board	Review and approve the Plan of Action	Within two weeks of receipt of the plan	
Education Institution	Implement Plan of Action	As soon as is possible	
Professional Board	Follow up on dated recommendations	As indicated in recommendations	

For official use only

RECOMMENDATIONS' TRACKING FORM FOR DNB

SECTION A

Name of University/Institution	
Name of Faculty	
Name of School (if applicable)	
Name of Department (if applicable)	
Name of undergraduate programme (as registered with SAQA)	
SAQA registration number	
Qualification delivered	
Questionnaire (Annexure B) completed by:	
Questionnaire (Annexure C) completed by:	
Date of completion of the final report for DNB	
Name of Convenor	
Names of Evaluation team	

SECTION B

(*Add lines as needed in the table)

PANEL'S RECOMMENDATIONS	DATE SUBMITTED TO ETR COMMITTEE	COMMENTS

SECTION C

(*Add lines as needed in the table)

ETR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	DATE SUBMITTED TO PANEL	COMMENTS

SECTION D

REPORTING FRAMEWORK

(*Add lines as needed in the table)

NAME OF UNIVERSITY	REQUESTED INFORMATION	DATE	RESPONSE FROM THE UNIVERSITY	DATE	COMMENTS

SECTION E

PERIOD OF APPROVAL TO BE SPECIFIED:

	*Option (period of approval to be indicated)	Date of decision	Additional comments as needed
Recommend approval (new programmes)			
Recommended re-approval (previously approved programmes)			
Provisional approval (previously approved programmes)			
No approval (previously approved programmes)			

*Mark one applicable selection

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE NOT TO ATTEND THE PROGRAMME EVALUATION
(VIRTUAL/ONLINE AND/OR ON-SITE)**

PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR DIETETICS AND NUTRITION PROFESSIONS

This application form is to be completed by the evaluation panel member in an event where such member is not able to attend the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) scheduled.

Dear Convener

Please receive the application for leave not to attend the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) scheduled as follows:

Name of the Training Institution to be evaluated	
Date	
Venue	
The reason/s for application for leave not to attend the evaluation is/are as follows	

The form to be submitted to the Convener 14 days before the meeting.

Name of Applicant:

Signature

Date:

Recommended/Not recommended: _____

Comment: _____

Name of Convener

Signature

Date

THE PROFESSIONAL BOARD FOR DIETETICS AND NUTRITION

HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL OF SOUTH AFRICA

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE EVALUATORS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

A. PURPOSE

- A.1 In order to give practical effect to the expected behaviour while in the employ of the HPCSA during the evaluation period.
- A.2 The Code aims to act as a guideline to evaluators on conduct expected of them from an ethical point of view, both in their individual conduct and in their relationship with others. Compliance with the Code can be expected to enhance professionalism and help to ensure confidence in the service provided to Education and Training Institutions.
- A.3 The primary purpose of the Code is a positive one, viz. to promote exemplary conduct.

B. INTRODUCTION

- B.1 The need exists to provide direction to evaluators with regard to their relationship with other evaluators and the Education and Training Institutions and to indicate the spirit in which evaluators should perform their duties, what should be done to avoid conflicts of interest and what is expected of them in terms of their personal conduct at Education and Training Institutions.

C. APPOINTMENT AS EVALUATORS

- C.1 Evaluators are expected to conduct themselves in accordance with the highest standards of ethical, moral and professional behaviour during all phases of the evaluation. Each evaluator must review, sign this Code of Conduct and submit it to the Education and Training Division together with the written acceptance of the appointment to an Evaluation Panel prior to receiving any documentation from the Institution.
- C.2 Evaluators need to accept or decline the appointment formally by responding to the Education and Training Division in writing within 20 working days of receiving the initial appointment.

D. DECLINING THE APPOINTMENT AND RESIGNATION AS EVALUATOR

- D.1 Should the invited evaluator wish to decline the appointment; this should be done timeously in writing to the Evaluation convener and Education and Training Division;
- D.2 Should the evaluator wish to resign from the Committee; this should be done in writing to the Education, Training and Registration Committee chairperson and Education and Training Division as soon as possible.

E. APPLICATION FOR LEAVE NOT TO ATTEND A MEETING

- E.1 If an evaluator is not able to attend the evaluation, a leave form not to attend the meeting must be completed

F. DOCUMENTS TO NOTE

- F.1 Evaluators are expected to study and attest to having read the following documents namely:
- i. guideline of the evaluation process document,
 - ii. documents to be provided by the Board as received from the training institution prior to the evaluation;
 - iii. template for compilation of the evaluation report; and
 - iv. expected evaluation report time frames;

G.1 CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROTOCOL OF COMMUNICATION

- G.1.1 The evaluators will not discuss the report directly with the Institution or any other outside party at any time before, during or after finalisation of the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) – all communications will be *via* the Board/ Board Secretariat.
- G.1.2 The evaluators are obliged to share all information influencing the evaluation outcome, either verbally or *via* the written report, with the DNB and/or Education, Training and Registration Committee should they be required to do so.

G.2 RELATIONSHIP WITH THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

An evaluator –

- G.2.1 will serve the Education and Training Institutions in a courteous, unbiased and impartial manner in order to create confidence in the Education and Training Institutions service;
- G.2.3 is helpful and reasonably accessible in her or his dealings with the Education and Training Institution at all times treating members of the Education and Training Institution as customers who are entitled to receive high standards of service and courtesy;
- G.2.4 has regard for the circumstances and concerns of the Education and Training Institutions in performing her or his official duties and in the making of decisions affecting them;
- G.2.5 is committed through timely service to the development and improvement of all Education and Training Institutions;
- G.2.6 does not unfairly discriminate against any member of the Education and Training Institutions on account of race, gender, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, political persuasion, conscience, belief, culture or language;
- G.2.7 does not unfairly discriminate against the Education and Training Institution on account of how their programme was compiled and which modules were included to address the outcomes set by the DNB;
- G.2.8 will refrain from making any recommendations, comments or derogatory remarks (orally or in writing) to the Education and Training Institution regarding the shortcomings of the programme specifically during the evaluation period;

G.3 RELATIONSHIP AMONG EVALUATORS

An evaluator –

- G.3.1 should be courteous and co-operate fully with other evaluators to advance the Education and Training Institutions interests;

- G.3.2 refrains from abusing his or her authority and/or influence on another evaluator, nor is influenced to abuse her or his authority;
- G.3.3 uses the appropriate channels to air her or his grievances or to direct representations;
- G.3.4 deals fairly, professionally and equitably with other evaluators, irrespective of race, gender, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, political persuasion, conscience, belief, culture or language.

H.1 PERFORMANCE OF EVALUATION DUTIES

An evaluator –

- H.1.1 strives to achieve the objectives of her or his duties cost-effectively and in the Education and Training Institutions' interest;
- H.1.2 is creative in thought and in the execution of her or his duties, seeks innovative ways to solve problems and enhances effectiveness and efficiency within the context of the law;
- H.1.3 is punctual in the execution of her or his duties;
- H.1.4 executes her or his duties in a professional and ethical manner at all times;
- H.1.5 does not engage in any transaction or action that is in conflict with or infringes on the execution of her or his official duties;
- H.1.6 will recuse herself or himself from any official action or decision-making process which may result in improper personal gain and this should be properly declared by the evaluator;
- H.1.7 accepts the responsibility to avail herself or himself for ongoing training and self-development throughout her or his elected period;
- H.1.8 is honest and accountable in the indirect spending of Education and Training Institutions' funds (e.g. transport hired for the occasion: do not drive more than necessary) and uses the Education and Training Institutions services property and other resources effectively, efficiently, and only for authorized official purposes;
- H.1.9 promotes sound, efficient, effective, transparent and accountable administration;
- H.1.10 in the course of her or his official duties, shall report to the appropriate authorities, fraud, corruption, nepotism, mal-administration and any other act which constitutes an offence, or which is prejudicial to the Education and Training Institutions;
- H.1.11 shall evaluate the programme on its merits (i.e. does it meet board requirements and set entry level outcomes as a whole, and not on account of the number of a specific set of modules included in the programme) and give honest and impartial recommendation, advice, based on all available relevant information, to the committee or Professional Board, (refer to SGB documents);
- H.1.12 shall take into account the recommendations drafted by the previous evaluators, as a starting point to evaluate if change and growth has taken place;
- H.1.13 shall refrain from comparing the Institution being evaluated with any other one presenting the same or similar programme, either verbally or in writing;
- H.1.14 shall respect differences (i.e. that methods of attaining and meeting outcome requirements are variable and the methods used to reach the outcomes are the right of the programme owner or the institution).

- H.1.15 engagement with students should be contextualised;
- H.1.16 needs to be sensitive to the confidentiality of information made available and insights gained during the evaluation process, and relay all such information to the Education, Training and Registration Committee and/or DNB which functions within the boundaries of confidentiality;
- H.1.17 channel all communication (general, sensitive and confidential) regarding the evaluation report and process through the Education, Training and Registration Committee of the Board; and
- H.1.18 communicate the recommendations and findings of the evaluation process in the form of an evaluation report submitted and contributed to the Education and Training Division for deliberation and consideration by the Education, Training and Registration Committee and/or the Board.

I.1 CONFLICT OF INTEREST - PERSONAL CONDUCT AND PRIVATE INTERESTS

An evaluator --

- I.1.2 shall be objective, fair and impartial to the evaluation. Recusal is expected if there is any conflict of interest;
- I.1.3 does not use her or his official position to obtain private gifts or benefits for herself or himself during the performance of her or his official duties nor does she or he accept any gifts or benefits when offered as these may be construed as bribes;
- I.1.4 does not use or disclose any official information for personal gain or the gain of others;
- I.1.5 formally accepts/acknowledges his/her appointment.

I, _____, accept my appointment as an evaluator of the Professional Board for Dietetics and Nutrition for the program offered by _____ (institution) and hereby attest that I read and understood the code of conduct and will adhere with the provisions of the document and that I am confident that I am competent to conduct an evaluation.

That I have been provided with the confidentiality statement which I have signed and submitted together with the code of conduct to the HPCSA Education and Training Division.

Signed in _____, on _____

Date _____ 202

Evaluator (Full Name and Surname) _____

ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

The evaluation panel members are expected and agreed in writing to conduct themselves in accordance with the highest standards of ethical, moral and professional behaviour during all phases of the process and at all times.

With regards to the Programme Evaluation and evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site), please take some time to assess the Evaluation Panel to help the Professional Board for Dietetics and Nutrition (DNB) to improve on the quality of service delivery. The Institution (Nutrition staff members) can assess the Evaluation Panel members individually, or as a team. If you give a score of 1-3 please motivate your score. This information will be handled with the utmost confidentiality and will only be made available to the Education, Training and Registration Committee of the DNB, **AFTER** the final report outcome and letter of approval has been submitted to the University/Institution.

**See legend for answers at bottom of page*

Question	Did they?	*1	*2	*3	*4	*5
1	Treat peers, staff, students and the management of the university with courtesy and respect?					
Remarks:						
2	Exercise punctuality at all times?					
Remarks:						
3	Maintain strict confidentiality? The results and outcomes of the process may only be discussed with the Education and Training Division, the Education, Training and Registration (ETR) Committee of the Board or the Board itself.					
Remarks:						
4	Conduct the evaluation in an objective, fair and impartial manner?					
Remarks:						
5	Evaluate the programme on its merit, <i>i.e.</i> does it meet the Board specified minimum outcomes criteria/ requirements as set in the assessment document and not according to the range of modules included in the programme?					
Remarks:						
6	Evaluate the programme (<i>i.e.</i> nature of learning opportunities provided by programme) and not individual students' performance?					
Remarks:						
7	Respect differences? (<i>i.e.</i> that the method of attaining and meeting outcome requirements are variable at different institutions and the methods used to reach the outcomes are the right of the programme owner or the institution, and not the DNB or ETR committee or evaluation panel).					
Remarks:						
8	Refrain from comparing the evaluated institution with panel member's own training institution or other training programmes across the country?					

Remarks:						
9	Refrain from continuously offered own advice to the programme/ institution?					
Remarks:						
10	Recuse him/her in the event of a conflict of interest?					

*1 = Very poor performance; 2 = poor performance, 3 = adequate performance; 4 = good performance; 5 = outstanding performance

Please indicate any other information or details of events regarding the evaluation (virtual/online and/or on-site) you would like to bring to the attention of the Education, Training and Registration Committee and the DNB, which would need further investigation and action:

Institution/University

Date of evaluation

Signature (Voluntary)

Date

DNB BLOOMS TAXONOMY: PROPOSED PERCENTAGE ALLOCATION PER YEAR GROUP



We have included the new Blooms Taxonomy. Furthermore, we propose that combined Bloom’s levels, which are a more user-friendly approach to use, is employed.

Please check and provide analysis for all tests as well as examinations to show that the desired level of assessment for each year level as per Bloom’s Taxonomy has been achieved.

Table 1: Proposed guidelines per year of study.

	1 st year (NQF level 5)	2 nd year (NQF level 6)	3 rd year (NQF level 7)	4 th year (NQF level 8)
Level 1 Remembering and Understanding	75-85 % (NQF =80%)	55 - 65% (NQF =60%)	35-45% (NQF =40%)	15-25% (NQF =20%)
Level 2 Applying and analyzing	10 - 15% (NQF =10%)	15 – 25% (NQF =30%)	35 - 45% (NQF =40%)	45- 55% (NQF =50%)
Level 3 Evaluating and Creating	0-5% (NQF =10%)	5-15% (NQF =10%)	15- 25% (NQF =20%)	25 -35% (NQF =30%)

