Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	12-13 December 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Alan Mount (ODP Visitor) Colin Keiley (ODP Visitor)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Daljit Mahoon Osama Ammar (Observer)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Ken Mason (Chair, Academic Quality and Standards Unit) Lorna Marie Burrow (Secretary, Quality Team, Faculty of Health) Roger King (External Assessor, Thames Valley University) Andrew Taaffe (Internal panel member) Vicki Culpin (Internal panel member) Nick Clark (AODP representative, HSHS Ltd) Liz Edwards (Observer, Quality Team)

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	☒	☐	☐

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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	20

ALL CONDITIONS MET

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

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to remove references to the HPC in relation to English language entry requirements.

Reason: In the submitted documentation reference is made to a list of various English language qualifications that are acceptable for entry to the programme, but describes them as being approved by the HPC. Though the HPC requirement for registration is an IELTS score of 7.0 with no less than 6.5 in any component, the entry requirements for pre-registration programmes of study are not specified as the documentation suggests.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising material used for the programme to clearly articulate students are subject to an 'enhanced' Criminal Records Bureau check. The programme team should also include in the documentation information relating the process of monitoring criminal records and how it is undertaken.

Reason: In the submitted documentation information is provided about criminal records checks but does not clearly indicate that it would be an 'enhanced' check. The Visitors also felt through discussion that appropriate protocols for monitoring criminal records were in place but needed to be made explicit in the documentation.

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include further information on the health check requirement and make explicit in the Course handbook that students' health will be a requirement for registration with the HPC and that changes in health status should be reported to the programme team through the appropriate channel.

Reason: The Visitors felt the Course handbook provided information about self-declaration of changes to criminal records and that similar information should be provided on matters of occupational health to ensure students are able to meet the Standards of Proficiency at the end of the programme.

2.2.4 apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to clearly articulate the qualifications required for entry to the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that further study may be required to provide the relevant academic background in the case of the NVQ qualifications listed as meeting entry requirements. In order to make any additional requirements clear to applicants, the Visitors felt this should be made explicit in the documentation.

2.2.5 apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team must submit the AP(E)L policy applied to the programme for non-standard entry.

Reason: Through discussion, the re-validation panel required changes to the wording applied to the programme to bring the policy in line with that of the wider University. The Visitors considered that as a result of these changes the AP(E)L policy will require perousal as it has not yet been seen in its final draft.

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.

Condition: The programme team must submit role profiles and information of the subjects and modules which the members of staff will be teaching/delivering on the DipHE programme. Details of the intended clinical link areas and personal tutor workload should also be provided.

Reason: Although students indicated the programme team were readily available to support students, the Visitors felt that in order to avoid key staff dependency the workload on staff needs to be determined.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include the form utilised to obtain consent from students.

Reason: Though the team indicated a consent process was in place, no documentary evidence was provided to the panel to allow the Visitors to consider this standard has been met.

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 programme team must redraft and re-submit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process for monitoring attendance in the University and placement setting.

Reason: The documentation indicated that attendance is required for 100% of the programme, and through discussion the protocol for monitoring sickness and non-attendance was outlined; however, the Visitors felt the process should be made explicit in the documentation.

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation, including the mapping document for the Standards of Proficiency. The redrafted mapping document should clearly indicate where the Standards of Proficiency are being met in the attainment of clinical competencies.

Reason: It became apparent the assessment tool used in placement for the second and third year students has not been fully developed to become a finalised document. Further, some issues of delivery in years two and three were also not in a final state. Accordingly, the Visitors did not feel able at this time to effectively state whether the learning outcomes ensured the Standards of Proficiency were being met.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation and advertising materials used for the programme to amend misuse of terminology related to the HPC and the AODP.

Reason: In some instances the documentation did not clearly indicate the programme led to "eligibility" to register with the HPC. There were also instances of referencing "statutory" registration and the registration of the qualification rather than the

individual. Finally, the distinction between the regulatory and professional body was not made clear in several instances in the documentation.

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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to include an indication of the IPL strategy and current implementation in the programme.

Reason: In order to be able to determine accurately the impact of the inter-professional learning on the programme, the Visitors feel a clearer indication of how the strategy is implemented for the programme will need to be assessed.

SET 5. *Practice placements standards*

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of available mentors at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination of the adequacy of the number, qualifications and experience of the mentors without this information.

5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to clearly articulate the process of monitoring and recording placement experience.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent the process for recording this information is subject to change as it moves to fall in line with a divisional process. As a result, the Visitors feel unable to consider this standard as met until able to assess the new process of record keeping.

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition: The programme team must submit the list of available mentors at each placement.

Reason: The Visitors were unable to view the list of mentors available at each placement at the approval event and feel unable to make a determination whether mentors had attended the placement educator training.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the audit tool used for placement environments to include confirmation that placement environments operate under appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discrimination polices.

Reason: The audit tool was submitted to the Visitors at the end of the approval event and after subsequent analysis it has been determined that the document does not currently ensure that a placement environment has in place appropriate equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practise safely and effectively.

6.3 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external reference frameworks can be measured.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation for the programme to include updated module descriptors and placement assessment schedules for all three years of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent that the placement assessment schedules for the second and third years of the programme were being drafted. The Visitor's felt unable to assess the above standards as the learning outcomes could not be definitively linked to assessment. Further, the Visitors wished to determine how tutors would ensure in some modules that students, when given choice, would be directed to evidence appropriate additional learning outcomes.

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 definitive documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards will not lead to eligibility to register with the HPC

Reason: Through discussion, it became clear University of Central Lancashire regulations permitted aegrotat awards, but that the documentation did not clearly state that this award would not lead to registration.

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 definitive documentation to clearly articulate that at least one external examiner must be appropriately registered with the HPC.

Reason: Though the current external examiner is registered with the HPC, in order to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard, the definitive documentation will need to be amended to include the stipulation for registration.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 16th April 2007
Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 28th March 2007
Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

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

Recommendation: The programme team should review the resource requirements in the clinical skills laboratories to enhance student learning opportunities.

Reason: The Visitors recognised that budgetary restrictions made certain resource purchases difficult; however, it was considered that alternatives to expensive equipment, such as an anaesthetic machine or operating table, can be located to enhance student learning opportunities.

SET 4. *Curriculum Standards*

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider redrafting the course handbook to replicate information from the nursing handbook that has relevance to ODP students.

Deleted: 2007-05-01
Deleted: 2007-01-03
Deleted: Draft
Inserted: 2007-05-01
Deleted: c
Inserted: c
Inserted: Final
Deleted: b
Deleted: Final

Note this is the change tracking margin box.

Reason: Though the documentation provided to students was considered effective in providing information, the Visitors felt the identity of the ODP students would be strengthened by producing a key document for them to use and reference for all matters.

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:

       Alan Mount

       Colin Keiley

Date: 15/12/06

ALL CONDITIONS MET