**hcpc** health & care professions council

**Visitors' report**

| Name of education provider | University of Huddersfield |
|---|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Operating department practitioner |
| Date of visit | 21 – 22 February 2013 |

## Contents

## 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. The HCPC is a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. The HCPC currently regulates 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 practioner' 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 9 May 2013. At the Committee meeting on 9 May 2013, the programme was approved. This means the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures 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 reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body 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 and the professional body, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of HCPC visitors and profession | Penny Joyce (Operating department practitioner) |
| | Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| HCPC observer | Maria Burke |
| Proposed student numbers | 60 per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | September 2013 |
| Chair | Carl Meddings (University of Huddersfield) |
| Secretary | Sue Ford (University of Huddersfield) |
| Members of the joint panel | Janet Hargreaves (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Martyn Walker (Internal Panel Member) |
| | Hazel Parkinson (External Panel Member) |
| | Deborah Robinson (External Panel Member) |
| | Helen Booth (College of Operating Department Practice) |

## 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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Descriptions of the modules | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Practice placement handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Student handbook | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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. However HCPC did review external examiners' report from the last two years for the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme.

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 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programme team | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Placements providers and educators/mentors | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Students | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Learning resources | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms) | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

The HCPC met with students from the DipHE Operating Department Practice programme 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 assured 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 their 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 4 SETs.

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

Conditions


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

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to ensure terminology used is accurate and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

**Reason:** The documentation submitted by the education provider contained incorrect terminology, the programme handbook on page 49 states 'the HPC require evidence of the student completing a minimum of 3000 course hours' and on page 65 under appendix two student agreement, it states 'I understand I am required to record at least 3000hrs of appropriate attendance for Professional and Statutory Body requirements'. The visitors noted other instances of incorrect terminology used throughout the documentation submitted. The HCPC does not have any specific requirements for attendance of students in the clinical or academic setting. Such incorrect statements could create confusion and mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, to ensure that the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for applicants and students.

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

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of any changes to the programme documentation to ensure it effectively supports student learning in all settings.

**Reason:** Through reviewing programme documentation the visitors were aware the documentation will be provided to students to support their learning in all settings. However, the visitors noted in discussion with the joint panel that the education provider's internal panel and the professional body have set certain conditions on the programme as part of the validation process. As part of these conditions several aspects of the programme documentation may be changed to fit the professional body and education providers' requirements. In particular the education provider's internal panel and the professional body highlighted areas in the module descriptors for the programme that will need amendments to meet conditions set. The visitors noted that if the programme documentation changes as a result of the professional body and education provider's conditions this may affect how the programme meets this standard. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide finalised programme documentation to ensure this standard is met.

**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 evidence to show formal protocols to obtain informed consent for when students participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical and clinical teaching.

**Reason:** The visitors noted through discussions with the students and the programme team that verbal consent had been sought for participation as a service user in practical simulation and role play activities. But there were no formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors considered that without consent protocols in place it would be hard to mitigate any risk involved in trainees participating as service users. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participating within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### 4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standard of proficiency (SOP);
**1b.3** be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and carers
   - be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7.0 of the International English Language Testing System, with no element below 6.5

**Reason:** In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the admission policy states 'You should offer the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) at a score of 6.5 with no lower than 6.0 in any single component'. The visitors were unable to determine how the learning outcomes ensure students are able to meet standards of proficiency 1b.3 upon completion of the programme. Through discussion with the programme team it was clarified that the modules on the programme do not cover skills which will ensure this standard of proficiency is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate mechanisms are in place to ensure that the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet standard of proficiency 1b.3.

### 6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award policy.

Recommendations


**5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Recommendation:** The programme team may wish to consider monitoring development of assessors in practice placements for the final year of the programme.

**Reason:** From discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that all practice placements assessors are suitable to access students on their placements. The education provider provides training to practice placement assessors and holds their professional records. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors also noted during discussions it was evident that in the final year of this programme the programme team will require suitable assessors in practice placements to assess more complex skills. The visitors recommend the programme team carefully monitor the development of suitable assessors for the more complex skills in final year of the programme in practice placements.


Penny Joyce
Andrew Steel