Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Name and titles of programme(s)	Diploma HE in Operating Department Practice
Mode of Delivery (FT/PT)	FT
Date of Visit	20th - 21st November 2006
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2007
Name of HPC Visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	Stephen Wordsworth (Operating Department Practitioner) David Bevan (Operating Department Practitioner)
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Osama Ammar Chris Hipkins (Observing)
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	Richard Harris (Dean of Quality and Students, University of Bedfordshire) Graeme Naylor (Secretary, Administrator, Quality Procedures, University of Bedfordshire) Kathryn Ellis (Principle Lecturer, Department of Applied Social Studies, University of Bedfordshire)

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New Profession	☒
New programme	☐
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 New Profession to the HPC requiring a full approval visit	☒	☐	☐
2	☐	☐	☒
3	☐	☐	☒

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	**26**

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:

2.1 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

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the advertising and recruitment information. The redrafted information should include more detail on entry requirements and clarification of the relationship between holding the qualification and access to the register.

Reason: The submitted information did not clearly articulate the specific access course applicants must complete to meet entry requirements or that a portfolio submission will be subject to the University of Bedfordshire APeL process. Further, the Visitors felt it was not clear to applicants that completion of the Dip HE leads to eligibility rather than entitlement for registration with the Health Professions Council.

SET 3: *Programme management and resource standards*

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

Condition: The team must redraft and resubmit module descriptors to clearly articulate the module leads and responsibilities within each module.

Reason: Whilst the programme team had submitted modular information and CV's it was still unclear which member of staff held overall responsibility for individual modules

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 resubmit the definitive documents clearly articulating the attendance requirements for both theory and practice elements of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion it became clear there was uncertainty amongst students as to the percentage of hours required for attendance and there was a lack of specific clarity within the documentation.

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the definitive documentation to correct misappropriations of the names of the professional body and statutory regulator.

Reason: The submitted documents mis-referenced key documents relating to the philosophy, values and skills of the HPC. There was a lack of clarity between the role of the professional body (AODP) and the statutory regulator (HPC).

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 an outline strategy for an effective mechanism for monitoring and recording the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at a placement with an indication of when the strategy will be implemented.

Reason: Although a register of placement mentors was available, there was no clear mechanism to effectively monitor on a regular basis the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff during student placement.

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 definitive documentation to clearly articulate the system for monitoring and approving existing and new placements respectively.

Reason: Although evidence was provided to indicate a system was in place to audit placement settings, the Visitors felt the documentation provided did not clearly articulate an effective monitoring system as the regularity and depth of assessment was not made clear. Further, the Visitors were not provided any information regarding the process for approving a new placement environment.

5.7.2 timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the Practice Assessment Documentation (PAD) to include the attendance records for placement hours.

Reason: Through discussion it became apparent a record of placement hours was in use and omitted from the documentation through error, however, the HPC Visitors felt that the current practice of separating the existing documents did not facilitate effective monitoring of the students and this documentation would be most appropriate within the PAD.

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.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the PAD to show evidence of assessment planning and appropriate mentor and student feedback. The PAD should also include evidence of student reflection.

Reason: The Visitors felt that given the discussed difficulty in linking theoretical and competency based learning outcomes in the minds of practice placement mentors and students, the PAD should include both theory and practice learning outcomes to strengthen the integration within the assessment process. The Visitors felt the PAD also provides an opportunity to formally introduce action planning and reflective thinking which were previously undertaken but as separate components.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14th February 2007
Date Visitors' Report submitted to Panel for approval: 1st February 2007
Date Programme submitted to Panel for approval: 28th March 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

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: In light of the strong commitment of the programme team, the Visitors felt that the University of Bedfordshire should consider increasing the number of core staff.

Reason: Although the core programme team evidenced their ability and commitment to effectively lead the programme and support the students, the Visitors determined the risk from key staff dependency to be high and felt this should be managed by consideration of increasing the number of core staff available to the programme.

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

Recommendation: The programme team should explore the learning and teaching opportunities offered by simulation and specialist clinical laboratories.

Reason: In light of the proposed new facilities and the new opportunities this will provide for the programme to develop, the Visitors felt it was prudent to commence preparation prior to the development of the new build.

Commendations.

The HPC representatives were impressed at the high level of support that the programme received. This was evident throughout the visit by the commitment of the programme team, the University staff and the practice placement staff.

The HPC representatives considered that the innovative use of Information Technology for supporting the students was an excellent additional tool for both team and peer development.

The planned provision of the new teaching facilities was seen as a positive move to create an effective system of development and support for both students and practice areas.

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:

> **David Bevan**
>
> **Stephen Wordsworth**

Date: 23/11/06