

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	9–10 June 2015

Contents

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

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 27 August 2015. At the Committee meeting, 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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Doug Emery (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University)

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. The visitors did review external examiners' reports from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice.

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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three 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 did not make any recommendations 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 of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for the programme and how students will meet the HCPC requirements upon successful completion of the programme.

Reason: The visitors noted that there was a discrepancy in the documentation regarding the IELTS requirements for the programme. For example the ODP Recruitment Handbook states “If English is not the first language an IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent” whereas the definitive document, page 13 states “If English is not your first language you must have an IELTS score of 6.5 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent”. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that there was some uncertainty around the IELTS entry requirements for the programme and this was currently being looked into. The visitors noted that without confirmation of the IELTS requirements for the programme they are unable to make a judgement on this standard being met. In addition to this, the visitors noted that, should the IELTS requirements reflect those stated in the definitive document (IELTS score of 7.0 with a minimum of 5.5 in all skills or equivalent) they will need to see further evidence of how the programme ensures that students will be brought up to an IELTS level 7.0 with a minimum of 6.5 in all skills or equivalent upon successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to clarify the IELTS entry requirements for the programme, and, if necessary, how students will be supported to reach the appropriate level upon graduation.

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure accurate reflection of the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) requirements for the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided and in meetings throughout the visit, the visitors were able to see that DBS checks were a compulsory part of the admissions process and were also satisfied with the process for applying this. However, the visitors noted that page 5 of the ODP Recruitment Handbook states “...provide us with a copy of DBS Enhanced Disclosure Certificate if requested”. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that DBS checks were compulsory for the programme, they noted that this information could be misleading to an applicant or student on the programme. In particular it was noted that the current wording could suggest that DBS requirements were not compulsory. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that the wording and terminology accurately reflects the requirements of the programme and the HCPC.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the learning outcomes for the Enhanced Perioperative Practice module.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that on page 120 of the definitive document, one of tasks states “taking the student from the competent student practitioner to the final enhance practitioner ready for registration who will be able to; Practice Anaesthesia”. The visitors were unsure as to the scope of this statement, and, in particular, were concerned that this could suggest that a student will have to deliver anaesthesia to meet this particular learning outcome. They also noted that it is not within the scope of safe and effective practice for operating department practitioners to deliver anaesthetic. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that this was an error in the documentation and that student would not be expected to deliver anaesthesia to meet this particular learning outcome. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that this was an error in the documentation, they noted that this statement could be misleading to both students and practice placement educators. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the learning outcomes for the Advanced Perioperative Practice module to ensure that they reflect the desired learning outcomes of the programme and the scope of safe and effective practice for operating department practitioners.

Clare Bates
Penny Joyce
Andrew Steel