

## HCPC major change process report

Education provider	University of Leicester
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, Full time Operating Department Practitioner (Integrated Degree), Work based learning
Date submission received	15 November 2019
Case reference	CAS-15797-Y0C8M6

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment .....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review .....	3
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	5

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the major change process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programmes detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Joanne Thomas	Operating department practitioner
Tony Scripps	Operating department practitioner
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	MC04511

Programme name	Operating Department Practitioner (Integrated Degree)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 April 2020

Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04528

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes identified to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process. The education provider was adding a degree apprenticeship route.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### **2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.**

**Reason:** For this standard the education provider offered a narrative of how potential learners would be apply to apply through their employer organisations. They stated that potential applicants would have access to all necessary information, and would be expected to demonstrate a clear understanding of the programme and its aims. However, this narrative was not supported by evidence so the visitors were not clear about the details of this process, for example what information would be supplied, at what stage, and whose responsibility this would be. Similarly, they were not clear about

the specific understandings that applicants would be expected to demonstrate in the admissions process.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence to demonstrate:

- How the education provider will ensure that the information available to potential applicants is complete and accurate, and provided at an appropriate stage;
- What understandings applicants will be expected to demonstrate during the admissions process; and
- Who will be responsible for the provision of information and the assessment of applicants.

### **3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.**

**Reason:** For this standard, the education provider provided a narrative explaining that the programme would be registered with the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IATA), and would be subject to QAA inspection. However, the visitors considered that this did not provide sufficient detail to enable them to make a decision about whether the standard was met. They did note that the education provider intended to use the monitoring and evaluation systems already in place on the existing approved programme. However, because the apprenticeship has a different structure, which would see learners spending a lot more time in practice-based learning with their sponsoring employers, it was not clear that the existing systems would be suitable. The visitors did not see evidence relating to the detail of how the education provider would monitor and evaluate while learners were with employers. They understood about the IATA registration but considered that more detail was required on how exactly this would enable appropriate monitoring.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating how the education provider will ensure that practice-based learning settings will be appropriately monitored and evaluated.

### **3.9 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.**

**Reason:** For this standard, the visitors understood that an extra 0.5 FTE of staff time would be added for the apprenticeship route. However, they were not clear what number of learners the education provider intended to recruit on to the programme, and what upper limit the education provider was seeking approval for. They were also unsure from the evidence provided what extra workload the education provider was anticipating for staff as a result of the degree apprenticeship route, and how they would ensure that staff understood the potentially different requirements on the apprenticeship. They were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether the standard was met.

**Suggested evidence:** Evidence demonstrating that there will be sufficient extra staff time available for the degree apprenticeship to cover all the requirements.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 25 March 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).