

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Greenwich
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner, Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner, Part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship), Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship), Part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College), Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College), Part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College), Full time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College), Part time
Approval visit date	11-12 February 2021
Case reference	CAS-16224-Z4S8K2

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review	6
Section 5: Visitors' recommendation.....	11

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 approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) 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). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). 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:

David Bevan	Operating department practitioner
Shaaron Pratt	Radiographer - Diagnostic radiographer
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

There were other groups involved with the approval process as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Jennifer Marie	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Greenwich
Jonathan Gascoigne	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Greenwich
Debora Almeida	External panel member	Bournemouth University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at relevant campuses of University of Greenwich
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02276

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at relevant campuses of University of Greenwich
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02277

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at relevant campuses of University of Greenwich
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02280

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at relevant campuses of University of Greenwich
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02281

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at the 'Truro and Penwith College' campus
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02340

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at the 'Truro and Penwith College' campus
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02341

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at the 'Truro and Penwith College' campus
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02342

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2021
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15 shared across the programmes at the 'Truro and Penwith College' campus
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02343

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

The education provider proposes to deliver full and part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes, at their campus in Greenwich, London. These programmes would have up to 15 learners across the programmes.

The education provider also proposes to deliver the same programmes with their partner Truro and Penwith College. Again, the proposal is to have up to 15 learners across the programmes.

The University of Greenwich retains overall responsibility for the delivery, design and award of the qualifications for all the programmes.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for 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.

Type of evidence	Submitted	Comments
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes	
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes	
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes	
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes	
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes	
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes	
Internal quality monitoring documentation	No	As these programmes have not yet commenced, this was not required

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider decided to move this event to a virtual (or remote) approval visit. In the table below, we have noted the meeting held, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that standards related to learners' involvement had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to meet this group
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	Visitors were able to determine through the programme documentation, that standards related to service users and carers had been met.
Facilities and resources	Not Required	As the visit was virtual and the visitors were able to determine through the programme

		documentation, that standards related to resources had been met, they decided it was unnecessary to have a virtual tour of the facilities and resources.
Senior staff	Yes	Visitors met the respective senior team members from University of Greenwich and their partner, Truro and Penwith College
Practice educators	Yes	Visitors met the respective practice educators for University of Greenwich and their partner, Truro and Penwith College
Programme team	Yes	Visitors met the respective programme team members from University of Greenwich and their partner, Truro and Penwith College

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the virtual approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 April 2021.

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.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the required information about the programmes, and their relevant pathways, is available to potential applicants, so that they can make an informed decision about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: For the proposed BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes, the visitors reviewed the "D6 programme document". The visitors noted that information regarding entry requirements, additional costs on the programmes, requirements for

criminal conviction checks and health requirements were available. The visitors considered this was an internal document available to the education provider and for the HCPC approval process review and as such could not see how applicants would have access to this information prior to securing a place on the relevant programmes.

For the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) programmes, the visitors reviewed information contained within the 'Final_Apprenticeship_Doc' document. The visitors found relevant information similar to the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes, with additional aspects such as the applicants' interview process and the end point assessment. The visitors noted this was again an internal document with the education provider and as such were not clear how applicants, who are employees working within a practice-based learning setting, will have access to relevant information for the proposed programmes.

The weblink provided in the mapping document contained information regarding the Paramedic programme and not the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner nor BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) programmes.

At the visit, the education provider provided a draft document which they aim to publish on the website, as information for potential applicants. The visitors noted that information, such as entry and selection criteria, English language requirements and criminal conviction checks were not contained within this draft document. In addition, the fee for the relevant programmes was stated as yet to be confirmed.

It was not clear if this draft document applied to the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner or the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) programmes. It was also not clear whether this information was for the relevant programmes' to be delivered at the Greenwich campus or the partner college in Cornwall. For example, the visitors could not find any information relevant to the degree apprenticeship programmes, such as the end point assessment or interview selection process. The programme team confirmed this is in draft form and is yet to be updated and agreed.

The programme team also confirmed their intention to upload relevant information on their website with clear differentiation between the different programmes, including signposting awareness of the programmes' delivery to be undertaken at the Greenwich campus and their partner Truro and Penwith College (TAPC) in Cornwall. As visitors have not seen this information, they were unable to determine whether applicants will have all the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up an offer of a place on the programmes, at either the Greenwich campus or their partner TAPC. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide up to date information with appropriate content regarding the proposed programmes, including the relevant pathways. Additionally, the education provider must clarify how they will ensure relevant information relating to all programmes is made available to potential applicants. From this, the visitors will be able to determine whether applicants for the proposed programmes, will have the relevant information they need to make an informed choice about taking up the offer of a place on the relevant programmes offered at Greenwich campus or their partner TAPC.

2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Condition: For the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes, the education provider must demonstrate how the admissions procedures clearly outline to applicants what the health requirements are.

Reason: In their review of the documentation for this standard, the visitors noted that applicants with a conditional offer for the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes need to attend an Occupational Health (OH) appointment as part of their registration process. The OH appointment is arranged by the education provider and applicants need to obtain clearance, prior to commencement on the programmes.

From their review of the documentation, the visitors were clear that an OH appointment is part of the application process but it was not clear what the OH assessment would be taking into consideration nor what health requirements the applicants needed to demonstrate as part of this. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were informed that information about health requirements, such as immunisations and OH processes, would normally be communicated to applicants as it is currently done as per other existing programmes. However, the visitors noted that requirements such as immunisation, were not made explicit within the documentation. As such, the visitors could not ascertain how applicants would know what the health requirements were, and the process they needed to engage in to determine whether they comply with the requirements for the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes. As such, the visitors require further information about what the health requirements are for these programmes, and how this is communicated to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the process in place to appoint an appropriately qualified and experienced person to hold overall professional responsibility for the programme, or their replacement if this becomes necessary.

Reason: It was mentioned in the mapping document that in the first instance, the programmes will be led by an experienced Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) registrant with a theatre background, supported by the newly appointed Operating Department Practitioner (ODP) staff. The visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae (CV) of the person holding overall responsibility for the programmes, plus the job description and person specification submitted as evidence for this standard. From discussions at the visit, the visitors understood the indicated programme lead will be responsible for leading of the proposed programmes at Greenwich only and this appointment is an interim measure. However, the visitors could not gather if the education provider will continue with the interim appointment post commencement of the programmes or their plans to recruit a permanent appointment. The roles, responsibilities and requirements for the professional lead were clear within the person specification and job description, such as having HCPC registration as an ODP. However, the visitors could not see that the clear process which would be followed to identify and secure a suitable person if it becomes necessary to do so in future.

During the TAPC programme team meeting, the visitors were informed of the appointment of a separate programme lead who will be leading the proposed

programmes at TAPC. It was stated that the new programme lead has relevant experience of leading an ODP programme in a similar role, previously at another education provider. However, without seeing any documentary evidence regarding the appointment process of the new programme lead at TAPC, the visitors could not make a judgement on what qualifications and experience or recruitment process were considered when appointing for this position. For example, the visitors were unsure whether the process at TAPC followed the same steps as the process undertaken at the Greenwich campus. During further discussions, it was made clear that the senior team is responsible for programme lead appointments but the appointment process was not clearly articulated nor explained within the documentation submitted. For example: it was unclear whether possible suitable replacements in future, will be made internally or externally. As such, the visitors could not see if there was a clear process in place to identify a suitable person for this role, or secure a replacement if it becomes necessary to do so in the future. Based on this, the visitors could not make a judgement if this standard has been met.

Therefore, the education provider must clearly articulate the process in place at the Greenwich campus and TAPC to identify an appropriately qualified and experienced person, and if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement

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

3.10 Subject areas must be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place, with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver effective programmes.

Reason: From reviewing the 16 CVs evidenced for these two standards, the visitors noted there is a range of staff from different professions which included nurses, midwives, paramedics, independent prescribers, and speech and language therapists. It was also stated in the mapping document that there is an intention to recruit additional ODP staff, to form part of the teaching team on these programmes. Within the documentation, it was clear to the visitors which staff member will be responsible for teaching the relevant list of modules mentioned, though it was not clearly stated in this list, where each staff member was based. However, it was stated there was one link tutor for TAPC which the visitors considered was unclear as it could possibly mean the remainder of staff will be teaching only at the Greenwich campus. Without having further information as to who will be involved in teaching at Greenwich campus and TAPC, it was not possible to determine whether there will be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver effective programmes at the education provider and their partner TAPC.

At the visit, the senior team and programme team mentioned that two additional ODP staff have been recruited, with one each to be part of the teaching team at the Greenwich campus and TAPC. Additionally, it was stated by the senior team that the education provider and their partner TAPC have the commitment and financial resources to approve further ODP teaching staff appointments, subject to HCPC approval of the proposed programmes in Greenwich and TAPC. The programme teams also stated that they intend to use some hourly paid ODP lecturers and involve some of

the practice-based learning staff, to contribute to the teaching activities at the Greenwich campus and TAPC. As the visitors were unable to see the qualifications or experience of the two new ODP staff appointed, they could not determine whether the new staff are appropriately qualified and experienced. Though the evidence submitted contained job descriptions of ODP lecturers, there was no confirmation provided regarding an exact total number of further staff to be recruited, including the timelines. It was also not made clear what contingency plans are in place, if the recruitment of additional staff is not complete by the September 2021 start.

Additionally, from discussions held at the visit, the visitors were unclear what experience and knowledge was required of individuals working as an hourly-paid lecturer for them to be suitable, so they are well-equipped to take part in teaching and to support learning in the subject areas they are involved in.

Considering the above mentioned aspects, the visitors were not clear how many staff will be involved in teaching at each site, how many staff are yet to be recruited and what qualifications and experience the newly appointed ODP staff will possess. The visitors therefore considered the standards were not met, as they could not determine whether there are an appropriate number of staff who are able and equipped to deliver the programmes effectively at across the sites at Greenwich and TAPC, and that staff have the necessary knowledge and expertise to deliver their parts of the programmes effectively. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate and confirm:

- how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff in place to deliver the proposed programmes effectively for all learners at Greenwich and TAPC, by September 2021 start. This should include contingency plans in place, should they not recruit staff in time for September 2021;
- clarity about the ODP profession specific staff numbers they intend to recruit, including the timelines for Greenwich and TAPC. This should include information regarding their required knowledge and experience; and
- what qualifications and experience will be considered for utilising hourly paid lecturers or practice-based learning staff to teach on the relevant programmes.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: For all the relevant proposed programmes at the University of Greenwich campus, the education provider must define what they consider as an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced practice-based learning staff.

Reason: It was stated in the mapping document that practice educator numbers are discussed and agreed as part of the practice education provider placement audits. There was also reference to a 'Practice Based Learning' document, as evidence for this standard. From their review, the visitors noted detailed information regarding the practice-based learning environment, roles and responsibilities of practice educators, learning and assessment during placements, allocation of placement and various other policies. On page 48 of the document, the visitors noted it contained a generic audit form containing tick boxes, to confirm aspects such as whether there are enough practice educators to support the agreed maximum capacity of learners. It was noted that this form was used for all HCPC approved programmes and information had to be confirmed by the Placement Manager and Education Lead for the relevant programmes. However, the documentation did not provide specifics about practice educator numbers

or what the education provider considered to be a suitable number for staff involved in practice-based learning, for the number of learners across the proposed programmes.

During the practice educators meeting for the programmes delivered in Greenwich, the visitors were informed about the preparation that has been undertaken for the proposed programmes. It was also stated that the practice educators are confident of providing the necessary support to learners on the proposed programmes, considering the relevant experience their relevant Trust and hospitals have of dealing with ODP learners from other education providers in London.

The visitors considered there was information within the documentation, which was also clearly articulated at the visit, regarding how practice educators are selected. However, from the discussions held, the visitors could not determine what the education provider considered to be a suitable number of staff for the proposed number of learners they wish to recruit across all the programmes in Greenwich. The visitors were therefore unclear how the education provider ensured there was enough support for learners to take part in safe and effective practice-based learning. Therefore, the education provider must clarify and define what they consider as an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced practice-based learning staff for the proposed BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) programmes at Greenwich. From this, the visitors will be able to determine if this standard is met for the programmes based at the Greenwich campus.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 26 May 2021 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#)