

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Anglia Ruskin University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	29 - 30 March 2017

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## 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 operating department practitioner 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 approval of the programme. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 June 2017. At the Committee meeting on 6 July 2017, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether 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 validated 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	Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Ruth Baker (Practitioner psychologist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	55 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	28 August 2017
Chair	Peter Crabtree (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Joanne Wood (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Pam Page (Internal Panel Member) Alan Mount (External Panel Member) Luke McAndrew (Student 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 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 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. 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 be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard for prescribing has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.**

**Condition:** The education provider is required to clarify the academic entry criteria, including the UCAS points required.

**Reason:** When reviewing the evidence the visitors noted a variation of the academic entry criteria. On pages 4 and 7 of the admissions and recruitment document that the number of UCAS points required for entry on to the programme is 80. However on page 44 of the Supplementary Information Form (SIF), it stated that 160 UCAS points are required. In discussion with the programme team it was confirmed that due to the new UCAS point tariff, the entry requirement for this programme is 80 UCAS points and that the information in the admissions and recruitment document was correct. Due to the variation of information in the documentary evidence, the visitors could not determine the academic entry criteria for entry onto the programme. Therefore further evidence is required to clarify the academic entry criteria for entry onto the programme.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the language used is correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of terminology which is not accurate. For example, on pages 5, 7, 71, 128, 185 and 242 of the practice document it states that it is an HCPC requirement that students 'keep an ongoing record of achievement', however this is not an HCPC requirement. The visitors also noted that on the website, it is stated that 'As this is an NHS profession diploma, leading to registration with the Health and Care Professions Council... you'll need to be familiar with the NHS constitution and NHS values.' The visitors noted that familiarity with the NHS constitution or NHS values are not a requirement of HCPC and that this may not be clear from this statement. As such, the visitors require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect information and terminology and ensure it communicates accurate information on the resources available to students. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users on the programme.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team on the tour of resources, the visitors understood that students may, on rare occasions, participate as service users. When meeting with students the visitors heard that students were unclear about when they

may have participated as service users on the programme. As such the visitors could not see how students are made aware of the occasions where they may participate as a service user or how the education provider ensures that the students have an understanding of informed consent, including the right to withdraw consent. University and programme-specific student consent forms were tabled at the programme team meeting and the visitors understood that the forms will be given to students at the induction week of the programme. However the visitors could not see evidence of how the education provider ensures student understanding of the situations where their consent applies and therefore where they can withdraw. As such the visitors require information to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that the students are aware of the instances where they may participate as a service users and where their informed consent applies.

### **3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify the mandatory attendance requirements for the programme, how attendance is monitored, the consequences for not meeting the requirements and how this information is effectively communicated to students and staff.

**Reason:** In a review of Document one: course information, on page 42, the visitors noted that students are 'expected to attend all taught sessions for the modules' and attend practice 'averaging 24 to 32 hours per week'. The visitors also noted, on page 42, that there is a faculty attendance policy which is detailed in each individual module guide, however the visitors could not find this information in the module guides. In discussions with the programme team the visitors understood that a university wide policy on attendance does not exist however the programme uses its own policy on attendance. It was confirmed that the programme attendance policy requires attendance at all taught sessions for the modules and attendance at practice 'averaging 24 to 32 hours per week. In discussion with the students, the visitors understood that students were given the opportunity to 'make up' any hours they may have missed by attending extra placement hours and so they felt supported to complete this requirement. However the visitors could not determine whether 100 per cent attendance is mandatory across the programme and if so, how this is effectively monitored, or what the consequences for not meeting the requirement are, and how this is effectively communicated to students and staff. As such the visitors require evidence which clarifies the attendance requirement across the programme, associated monitoring mechanisms and how this is effectively communicated to students and staff.

### **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, including the number or retakes allowed and how this is communicated to students on the programme

**Reason:** The visitors considered the programme documentation however they could not identify how many times a student would be able to fail or complete any aspect of the programme and still progress throughout the programme. In their discussion with

students and practice placement educators the visitors noted that there were differing views regarding how many times a student may fail or repeat any aspect of the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that following a failed attempt at any aspect of the programme the students would be allowed to retake the assessment, if a student fails the re-sit then they must take a re-sit with hours. This means that the student must attend the learning hours associated with that assessment, which the visitors understood to mean retaking the module. If a student were to fail the 're-sit with hours' they could then resit once more without hours. However, in discussion with the students, the visitors heard that students did not fully understand how it is possible to fail the programme. As such, the visitors could not identify, from the available evidence, how many times a student would be able to repeat any aspect of the programme before they are unable to continue on the programme or how this information is clearly communicated to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to specify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, including the number of retakes allowed and how this is communicated to students on the programme. .

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider keep under review future service user involvement in this programme.

**Reason:** The visitors met a service user who was involved in the development of a previous programme and service users who will be involved in programme delivery from the start of the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard was met at threshold level. From discussions with the service users and carers and the programme team, the visitors understood the plans to involve service users and carers in the programme, in a variety of ways, including the delivery of communication session; checking of programme documentation, attendance at two stakeholder meetings and two classroom visits whereby students will create action plans for scenarios presented to them by service users and carers. The visitors would encourage the education provider to document and implement these plans to involve service users so that their personal experience of care is directly used further in the programme and service user involvement and recruitment is kept under review.

Julie Weir  
Ruth Baker  
Christine Morgan