

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning
Date submission received	06 January 2020
Case reference	CAS-15892-P4V5B6

### 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.....	6

### 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:

Joanna Finney	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 August 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04556

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)

Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04566

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

The education provider intends to introduce a new degree apprenticeship route, which will be based on the existing BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice programme. The main difference will be that the new route will have an End Point Assessment towards the end of the third year of the programme. The education provider intends to use the current level of up to 55 learners as a maximum number across both the 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
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.

#### **2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Reason:** The education provider provided documentation explaining the minimum criteria requirements for learners to join the degree apprenticeship programme. The evidence also stated the admissions process will be overlooked by the admissions team which involves learners filling out a written agreement indicating support from their employers, whilst interviews will be carried out by employers within their partner trusts. From this information, the visitors were not clear at what stage of the admissions process, learners' eligibility against the education providers minimum entry and selection criteria, will be assessed and determined. For example, it was not clear if the relevant employers check this before signing the written agreement or whether this will be done by the admissions team. The visitors were also not sure how information regarding this programme will be made available to potential applicants, such as via the website. From this, the visitors could not determine the admissions process including who was involved at what stage and how learners will have the information they require in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence regarding where information regarding the proposed programme will be made available to the applicant prior to them applying for this programme. Additionally, the evidence must demonstrate how the employers and education provider are involved in the admissions process.

### **3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the mapping document that learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship route will be given priority over the existing programme, when it comes to accommodating the cohort size of up to 55 learners across both programmes. The mapping document stated there has been a high number of applicants showing interest in the proposed apprenticeship programme. Based on this, the visitors were not clear of the effect of giving preference to applicants for the degree apprenticeship route on applications to the existing programme and whether this could lead to drop in learner numbers. The visitors were therefore unclear if there was a possible risk to the ongoing sustainability of the existing programme. The visitors did not receive information about how the education provider intends to manage the number of learners across the two programmes to ensure sustainability for both. The visitors therefore require additional evidence which demonstrates the future sustainability of both programmes.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit additional evidence which demonstrates the sustainability of both programmes.

### **3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.**

**Reason:** With regards to the proposed degree apprenticeship programme, it was stated in the mapping document that individuals who are identified by the local trusts will be able to apply to this programme. From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors could not determine whether agreements were already in place with the local trusts to outline how both parties would work together, particularly in terms of support and resources for learners, and the provision of learners to the programme. On Page 17 of ITEM 5, the visitors noted the list of employers with whom the education provider had had discussions with about the proposed degree apprenticeship programme. The visitors could not see any confirmation of a formal agreement between these employers

and the education provider, such as letters of intent or memorandums of understanding (MOU). Based on this, it was not clear to the visitors how employers and the education provider employers will work together to ensure the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence which demonstrates the work which will take place between the employers and education provider to ensure the degree apprenticeship programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit additional evidence which demonstrates how employers and the education provider with work together to ensure the degree apprenticeship is a sustainable and fit for purpose programme.

### **3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

**Reason:** The education provider stated in the mapping document that learners on the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will be based at practice-based learning for four days a week, and attend lectures one day per week at the education provider's campus. From reviewing ITEM 5, the visitors noted some of the employers names who have shown interest in being involved are based in London, Peterborough and Cheltenham. The visitors recognised that this might represent a significant amount of travelling for learners from the mentioned cities to the education provider's campus, for one day a week. From reviewing the evidence submitted, the visitors could not identify what support or access to resources will be offered to learners who might undertake this amount of travelling, or those who might find travelling financially challenging. With the education provider's proposals to give preference to learners on the degree apprenticeship route, the visitors were unclear if more learners may end up at practice educators further from Cambridge. Based on this, the visitors could not determine what systems will be in place to assess how resources will be used and how effective and accessible will they will be for learners travelling greater distances one day a week. Therefore, the education provider must provide additional evidence about how it will ensure learners who might have to travel greater distances to attend lectures, will have access to the necessary resources and be given the necessary support.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence of the systems in place to ensure all learners on the degree apprenticeship programme will have access to the necessary resources and support if they are required to travel greater distances to attend lectures on campus one day a week.

### **3.15 There must be a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints.**

**Reason:** For the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider stated there are no changes to this standard, as per the mapping document. With the current proposed model for this programme, learners will spend more time within the work environment compared to learners on the existing programme. As learners on the degree apprenticeship route will be employees and therefore bound by employer policies, there will be different employer led policies in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints. From the evidence, the visitors could not determine if the learners will apply the education provider policy or their employer complaints policy. As part of this, the visitors were unclear how the process for dealing with learner complaints will be handled, including the follow up actions and who takes responsibility

for the actions. For example, what is the process and who is involved, when a learner wants to raise a complaint while undertaking on the job training within their place of work. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure there is a thorough and effective process in place for receiving and responding to learner complaints, for the degree apprenticeship programme.

**Suggested evidence:** With regards to the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must demonstrate:

- the complaints process learners should follow, including who is responsible for each stage; and
- how learners are made aware of the process to follow, including the follow on steps.

### **3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.**

**Reason:** In relation to the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider evidenced the 'Practice Document' which demonstrated information regarding raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. The mapping document stated that if necessary, learners can be removed from practice-based learning if a concern is raised which might affect the quality of their learning experience. It was also stated that any learner who is removed is supported throughout the process by an academic mentor. As the proposed degree apprenticeship programme will involve learners who will be employees, the visitors could not determine if it was possible to remove an employee from their workplace. The visitors noted this document had been specifically developed for learners on the existing programme. This standard is about helping learners to recognise situations where service users may be at risk and supporting them to raise any concerns, and making sure action is undertaken in response to those concerns. As the visitors were unable to identify the process for the degree apprenticeship programme, the education provider must clarify the process for how learners raise a concern about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

**Suggested evidence:** The education provider must submit additional evidence demonstrating the process in place on the degree apprenticeship programme for learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

## **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 21 May 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).