Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Plymouth
Name and titles of programme(s)	Dip HE Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	28 February – 1st March 2007
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Norma Brook (Educationalist) Julie Weir (Clinician)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar, Education Officer Sam Mars, Policy Officer (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ruth Pellow, Acting Associate Dean of Faculty of Health and Social Work (Chair) Lisa Williams (Secretary) ? (Administrative Assistant) Paul Wicker, Edgehill University (External Assessor) John Tarrant, Bournemouth University (External Assessor) Penny Joyce, University of Portsmouth (CODP representative)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☒
New profession to the HPC	☒

Confirmation of meetings held

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators	☒	☐	☐
Students (current or past as appropriate)	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation of facilities inspected

	Yes	No	N/A

Library learning centre	☒	☐	☐
IT facilities	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation	☒	☐	☐

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	Yes	No	N/A
1 **Annual Monitoring Visitors' Report for academic year 2005-2006 raised concern over standards of education and training 2, 5 and 6.**	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	30

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for an Enhanced Criminal Records Bureau check to be completed as a component of the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation referred to the criminal records check and it was clearly part of the entry criteria for the programme. However, the documentation did not indicate the criminal records check would be "enhanced" and the Visitors felt that the requirement would be clearer in the documentation if it was separated under a different heading from occupational health checks.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the regional nature of the delivery of the programme. In particular an explanation and a rationale must be provided for the concurrent delivery of three modules from the first year of the programme at the centre at Truro.

Reason: In discussion with students and the programme team it became clear that eight students per cohort received lectures for three first year modules from staff at the centre in Truro. This arrangement was not made clear in the programme documentation. The Visitors felt that, in order to make a determination of how effectively the programme is managed, further information regarding the regional nature of delivery would be required. An overview of the teaching of academic content, staff involvement and learning and teaching resources would assist the Visitors in making their determination.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the placement audit pro-forma and a description of the process of approving and monitoring placement provision.

Reason: Through discussion, it was clear that the programme team and the practice quality development department were working to ensure practice placement standards and were developing the quality mechanisms to improve the process in future. However, in the documentation it was not made clear how the process currently operated and the Visitors felt the programme documentation must clearly explain how practice placement standards are maintained.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate and illustrate the relationship and the process of collaboration between the programme team and practice placement educators. In particular, this redraft will require the updating of the flowchart featured on page 13 of the reference document A15.

Reason: Through discussion with the practice placement educators and the associate dean for practice quality development, it was clear that there would be imminent changes to the relationship between the practice educators and the programme team owing to changes in the roles of the existing practice clinical educators and the link tutor. In order to ensure the arrangements for collaboration for the September 2007 cohort continued to the meet this standard of education and training, the Visitors felt the new arrangement, once agreed, must be submitted to the HPC.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the marking scheme/criteria for assessment of the practice portfolio.

Reason: The Visitors felt that the assessment of practice competencies which formed a component of the portfolio was clear in the submitted documentation. However, it was felt by the Visitors that the assessment process of additional components of the portfolio, such as reflective evidence, was not sufficiently and must be included in the programme documentation.

6.7.3 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the title of the aegrotat award that will not lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Through discussion it became clear the award title for an aegrotat degree would be Diploma of Higher Education in Health Studies, however this was not made clear the documentation, which only made reference to the Certificate of Higher Education if students had not achieved sufficient credit for the diploma award.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: The documentation made it clear that the current external examiner was appropriate registered. However, the Visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14th May 2007
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

For approval of the report: 31st May 2007
For approval of the programme: 5th July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in placeto deliver an effective programme.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The University of Plymouth should consider accelerating the appointment of a lecturer/practitioner who is a registered operating department practitioner.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme was adequately resourced and had sufficient profession specific input. However, the Visitors felt that the programme team would be better able to support ODP students with the inclusion of more operating department practitioners on the academic staff delivering the programme and offering personal tutor support.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider separating personal development profile elements of the portfolio from the practice assessment documents.

Reason: In discussion with the students, it became apparent that the volume of information in the portfolio was at time considered cumbersome and over-complicated to complete. The Visitors suggest that by dividing the two elements of personal development profile and practice assessment documents, these feelings towards the portfolio might be adequately addressed.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The programme should report any future changes to the interprofessional learning strategy to the HPC through the appropriate monitoring process.

Reason: In light of the changes occurring throughout the faculty with regard to interprofessional learning, the Visitors felt the programme team should ensure that HPC is kept up to date with the changes in the strategy and the impact upon this programme.

Commendations

The Visitors commend the strong relationship between the practice placement educators and the programme team. This relationship was strongly evidenced in discussion and by the

innovation by the programme team and support provided by the placement providers in the production and dissemination of a DVD-ROM to help address the issue of placement educators not being able to find the time to attend regular updates at the university, which is common to placement-driven programmes.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

> **Norma Brook**
>
> **Julie Weir**

Date: **2nd March 2007**