Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	**The University of Wales, Bangor**
Name and titles of programme(s)	**Dip HE Operating Department Practice**
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	**FT**
Date of Visit	**17th – 18th April 2007**
Proposed date of approval to commence	**September 2007**
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	**Mr Derek Adrian Harris –** Director of Radiography Education , University of Portsmouth **Mr Colin Keiley -** Surgical Team Manager, South Manchester University Foundation Trust.
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	**Miss Daljit Mahoon** **Miss Katherine Lock**
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	**Dr David Wright** – (Chair) University of Wales Bangor. **Miss Rachel Ley** – (Secretary) University of Wales Bangor. **Professor K Janet Pritchard** – University of Wales Bangor, Head of School Education **Dr Dei Huws** – University of Wales Bangor, Lecturer, School of Ocean Science. **Dr Ioan Ap Dewi** - University of Wales Bangor, Academic registrar

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	☐
New Profession	☒
Major change to existing programme	☐
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	☐

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	☐	☐	☒
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	9

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

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme Admissions
2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.
6.7.2 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for awards which do not provide eligibility for inclusion onto the Register not to contain any reference to an HPC protected title in their title.
6.7.3 for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register

Condition:
Statements presented within the documentation relating to HPC need to be corrected. This refers to:
1) The reference made for the IELTS level of English on application of 7, which should be on completion of the programme.
2) The statement on page 4 within the student handbook under the attendance policy needs to be amended or removed.
3) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying awards which do not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.
4) A statement needs to be included within the student handbook, clearly specifying the aegrotat awards are not considered within this programme and to not provide eligibility to register with the HPC.

Reason:

1) It is not a requirement for students who do not speak English, on entry to the programme, to have an English language standard of IELTs 7.0. An IELTs level of 6.0 is acceptable providing on completion of the programme the student reaches IELTs 7.0, which is the requirement for them to meet the Standards of Proficiency, requirement under 1.b.4.

2) On page 4 within the student handbook under Attendance Policy, it reads: 'A course requirement, in order for you to be eligible to register with the Health Professions Council (HPC) is that you undertake ands successfully complete ALL of the theoretical and practical elements during the next two years', this is untrue. This is not a specific requirement from the HPC. Our standard on attendance is to ensure that a system of monitoring attendance is in place and students are informed on when attendance is mandatory, ensuring that all students can meet the Standards of Proficiency to be able to practice safely and effectively, on completion of the programme.

3) There was not mention within the documentation provided for students of awards that do not provide eligibility to register. A statement should be included so students are well informed.

4) There was no mention within the documentation provided for students that Aegrotat awards are not considered. A statement should be included so students are well informed.

Condition 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition:
The programme team must produce and submit a paper which demonstrates how in light of the subsequent conditions and recommendations, that the course will be managed effectively in the future.

Reason:
With the prospect of conditions being met and recommendations being considered, enhancements to the programme will be made. Through producing an outline demonstrating how these changes will affect and enhance the management of the programme, it would help to assure the visitors that the programme team understand the implications and their thoughts in specific to the quality and improvements of staffing in the future.

Condition 3:

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

Condition:
The programme team must resubmit a complete set of up to date CVs , demonstrating the programme teams areas of expertise, their relevance to this programme and their roles within it.

Reason:
The visitors found it difficult to gage whether staff had relevant expertises and knowledge for it was not clearly articulated within the CVs that were submitted.

Condition 4:

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition:
The programme team must produce a clear plan, outlining the staff development for each member of the programme team.

Reason:
It was unclear within the documentation and CVs, what the programme team have and are presently doing to ensure their continual professional development is being carried out. Examples need to be provided for each member of the programme team, to enable the visitors to be assured that this set is being met.

Condition 5:

SET 2 Programme Admissions
2.1 The admission procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme.
SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.11 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 course documentation needs to be revised to make it more explicit where attendance is mandatory.

Reason:
After meeting the programme team it became apparent that some students were negotiating holidays during lecture periods. A clearer and consistent outline of where attendance is mandatory needs to be clearly articulated within the documentation.

Condition 6:

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
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.
SET 6. Assessment standards
6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition:
The programme team must revise and submit a mapping document which maps the learning outcomes against the assessments and the HPC Standards of Proficiency.

Reason:

It was not clearly articulated within the documentation how the HPC Standards of Proficiency are being achieved by the students through the learning outcomes and the assessments.

Condition 7:

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

Condition:
The programme team must revise and submit an outline of how autonomous practice and reflective thinking is developed by students within the programme.

Reason:
It was not clear within the documentation how students develop autonomous practice and reflective thinking within the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

SET 2 Programme admissions
2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including:
2.2.2 criminal convictions checks;
2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and
2.2.4 appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Recommendation:
To revise the admissions process, such as the CRB, health checks and the entrance criteria, to consider the appropriateness of 5 GCSEs

Reason:
The visitors felt that the processes for CRB and health checks could be improved and the level of the academic entry standards, consisting of 5 GCSEs could be seen to be quite low.

Recommendation 2:

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation:
The programme team should seriously consider appointing another Operating Department Practitioner

Reason:
At present there are two main members of the team within which there is only one Operating Department Practitioner who is the programme leader. In order to develop the programme and its profession specific knowledge and skills, the Visitors felt the appointment of an additional (Registered) Operating Department Practitioner with the relevant academic qualifications and experience would enhance the development of the programme and assist the programme leader.
Also, even though there is also another member of the team to support the programme leader, concerns were raised that if one where off sick, there is pressure

on the other to manage the workload, which reinforces the positive impact an additional member of staff would make.

Recommendation 3:

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

Recommendation:
The visitors encourage the programme team to accelerate a programme for ICT and library support, such as library returns and use of blackboard.

Reason:
Students needed to be kept informed of library offers and felt blackboard would be a good way of doing this. At present the use of blackboard has not been implemented and flexibility in library returns across sites could be improved. The visitors felt that more use of ICT and exploring extending library opening hours would enhance communication and support students in these areas.

Recommendation 4

SET 4. Curriculum Standards
4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:
The University of Bangor should consider as a matter of urgency the development and implementation of Inter professional learning programmes, relevant to all of the health and social care students.

Reason:
The visitors felt the university has significant opportunities to develop an inter-professional learning programme for all the health and social care students. This would enhance student experience and students would benefit from the exposure to the skills and knowledge for each professional group.

COMMENDATIONS

1) **The diligence and enthusiasm of the programme leader.**

2) **The availability of protected time afforded by the trust hospitals for practice facilitators to support students.**

3) **Obvious enthusiasm and involvement of practice educators on the ethos of the programme.**

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:

Mr Derek Adrian Harris

Mr Colin Keiley

Date: 26/4/07