
Approval process report

University of Portsmouth, Operating Department Practice, 2023-24

Executive Summary

This is a report of the ongoing process to approve the Operating Department Practice programme at the University of Portsmouth. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme are fit to practice.

We have

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Reviewed the programme against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme is approved.

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. This approval was not referred from another process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the programme is approved.
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The provider's next performance review will be in the 2026-27 academic year. The education provider is currently applying for the Supplementary and Independent Prescribing programme to be approved for September 2024.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards	3
Our regulatory approach	3
The approval process	3
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: Institution-level assessment	4
The education provider context	4
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	5
The route through stage 1	8
Admissions.....	8
Management and governance	9
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	10
Learners.....	11
Outcomes from stage 1	13
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	14
Programmes considered through this assessment.....	14
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	14
Quality themes identified for further exploration	14
Section 4: Findings.....	15
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	15
Section 5: Referrals.....	18
Recommendations.....	18
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	18
Assessment panel recommendation.....	18
Appendix 1 – summary report	20
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	22

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meets our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which 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.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the 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 takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Alexander Harmer	Lead visitor, Operating department practitioner
Joanna Finney	Lead visitor, Operating department practitioner
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers five HCPC-approved programmes across five professions. It is a Higher Education Institute (HEI) and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2015.

The education provider is made up of five faculties and there are several schools that sit within each faculty. The HCPC approved programmes are based in the Faculty of Science and Health, which consists of eight schools and the programmes are spread across three of these schools. Most of the programmes are in the School of Health and Care Professions, except for the physiotherapy programme, which is based in the School of Sport, Health and Exercise Science.

Alongside the approval of this proposed programme, the education provider is currently engaged with the approval process for the Supplementary and Independent Prescribing programme. The proposed start date for both programmes is September 2024.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2016
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2015
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2022
	Practitioner psychologist	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2016
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2017

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
------------	-----------	-------	------	------------

<p>Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers</p>	<p>286</p>	<p>296</p>	<p>2023</p>	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.</p> <p>We reviewed the education provider's documentation and assessed if there were sufficient resources to deliver the programme. The visitors were satisfied with the information provided.</p>
<p>Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>4%</p>	<p>2020-21</p>	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 1%.</p>

				We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	93%	93%	2020-21	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered based on HCPC-related subjects</p> <p>The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider’s performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has been maintained.</p>
Learner positivity score	75.4%	78.3%	2022	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year’s data point, the education provider’s performance has improved by 3%.</p>
HCPC performance review cycle length	N/A	5 years	2021-22	The education provider engaged with the performance review process in 2021-22 and were given a five year monitoring period.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - Information related to admissions is available on the education providers website. The Admissions policy and procedure outlines the institution wide policies covering information for applicants. The proposed programme is a degree apprenticeship. Employers will therefore be involved with the recruitment and selection process and will apply the policies and procedures outlined in the Apprenticeship Policy Framework 2021.
 - There are programme specific policies which apply to individual disciplines, which can be found on the programme specific webpages. The information includes programme applicant guides, programme information and programme specifications.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - Relevant entry requirements are available on the education provider's website. The admissions policy outlines the English language, character and health requirements.
 - For all HCPC approved programmes, applicants are required to complete criminal conviction checks via the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), and occupational health checks. For the proposed programme this will be managed by the employer. Applicants will also be required to undertake values based interviews.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**
 - The education provider uses the Accredited Prior (Experiential) Learning Policy to assess applicants' prior learning and experience.
 - This policy applies to most of the HCPC approved programmes and all applications are considered on an individual basis. Applicants for the proposed programme will be required to complete an assessment to demonstrate existing knowledge.

- These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider demonstrates they are committed to equality, diversity and inclusion and has an Equality and Diversity policy that applies to all individuals.
 - In addition to this, the University of Portsmouth Access and Participation Plan supports learners with accessing the appropriate services, which ensures any additional learning requirements are supported.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹ –**
 - The Academic Regulations provide details of the academic awards and any variations. Academic Registry are responsible for overseeing this policy and ensure the delivery of the provision is to the expected threshold level of entry to the Register for all programmes.
 - External examiners are appointed and are involved with all assessment processes and regular reviews of the programmes
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - The Risk Management Policy 2021-22 ensures the sustainability of programmes and applies to all programmes at all levels. The policy acts as a mechanism to mitigate risk and therefore identifies, analyses and manages risk. The sustainability of the proposed programme has been considered through this policy.
 - In addition to the Risk Management Policy, there is also a University Strategy 2020-2025 and Vision 2030, which supports the development of partnerships locally and nationally. The sustainability of the proposed programme has been considered through this strategy.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - The education provider ensures they recruit appropriately qualified staff who are HCPC registered professionals.

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- All programmes are required to follow the Curriculum Framework Specification to ensure the quality and currency of the programmes. In addition to this, the Apprenticeship Team will ensure the requirements outlined in the Apprenticeship Policy Framework 2021 are being met. This will include reviewing the quality of the programme and ensuring the objectives of the framework are being met.
- These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - The Initial and Continuing Professional Development Policy requires all staff to engage with the personal development review process and identify their development needs to ensure knowledge and skills remain current. Through this process they are provided with further opportunities to develop their careers both internally and externally.
 - Staff involved with the delivery of the proposed programme will also be required to undertake training linked to apprenticeship and Ofsted requirements.
 - The Curriculum Framework Specification is used to ensure the curriculum for all programmes remains current. This involves experienced and qualified staff reviewing the curriculum and making necessary changes or amendments accordingly.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The Academic Partnerships Policy applies to all programmes, however there are some variations with the partnerships across the programmes based on the requirements of the individual programmes.
 - Learners on the proposed programme will be supported through the tripartite agreements. These agreements will be between the employer, apprentice and the education provider and will outline the responsibilities of each stakeholder.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - The policies to monitor the quality of the programmes are outlined in the Annual Monitoring and Academic Review Policy and the Policy for Approval, Modification and Closure of Academic Provision. These policies ensure the continuous improvement of programmes.
 - For the proposed programme, the quality of the degree apprenticeship programme will be monitored through the Apprenticeship Quality Management Board and the Quality Improvement Plan. In addition to

this, the Quarterly Progress Review Boards will identify any issues and address them.

- These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - The Code of Practice for Work-Based and Placement Learning outlines a range of principles that must be applied to all work-based or placement learning. The code ensures standards and quality are consistently maintained with all experiences across all programmes. There are some variations on how it is applied, which is normally the duration of placements and the experience required. As part of this process, all placements are reviewed twice a year.
 - The education provider is committed to ensuring sufficient support is in place for learners and that all learners have access to an academic tutor.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - Learners are involved and represented at the Student Voice Committees and Board of Studies. This provides learners with a platform where their views and experiences are heard and considered and informs future changes to the programmes. The Student Voice Policy supports this involvement strategically across all programmes and emphasises the importance of learner involvement.
 - There is a requirement for module evaluations to be completed by all learners for all programmes. The completion of these evaluation forms enables the education provider to capture both positive and negative aspects of the learner experience and make necessary improvements.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The School of Health and Care Professions Service User and Carer Strategy supports the involvement of service users and carers with all HCPC programmes.
 - There is a nominated Lead for the Service User Participation and Advisory (SUPA) Group, who is responsible for coordinating service user and carer involvement across the School.
 - This policy is a School level policy and has been adopted by all HCPC approved programmes and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - There are a range of policies to support learners, such as the Student Wellbeing and Mental Health Policy, academic skills support and learning support tutors. The Student Complaints Procedure is also available to learners.
 - All learners are allocated a Personal Academic Tutor to provide them with pastoral and academic support, which includes referral to specific support services. This tutor supports learners through the duration of the programme.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - The suitability of learners is considered through the Admissions Policy and through the Fitness to Study Policy and Procedure. Learners are also expected to adhere to the Code of Student Behaviour and are required to complete annual declarations to confirm there have been no changes with their circumstances.
 - The process to complain about a learner is outlined in the Apprenticeship Policy Framework 2021. Learners on the proposed programme will be employed and therefore any complaints or disciplinary issues will be managed through their employers.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - Interprofessional learning policies are profession specific and there is an established working group within the school to support this area. This group is made up of academics from across the school who are involved with health care education. The purpose of this group is to create interprofessional learning opportunities for learners across the health care programmes.
 - They recognise the importance of learning across professions and have outlined the policy for this in the Apprenticeship Policy Framework 2021. Learners on the proposed programme will therefore be provided with opportunities to work within multidisciplinary teams.
 - The interprofessional learning approach is used for the current health care programmes will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider's Equality and Diversity Policy statement demonstrates their commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion. This policy is embedded across all the programmes.
 - There are a range of other policies to promote this area and support learners, such as the Access and Participation plan, Dignity and Respect policy, Religion and Belief policy and Gender identity and expression policy.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: We have noted the interprofessional learning policies are profession specific. At the moment, there is no indication if the education provider has any plans to develop interprofessional learning policies at the institution level. If the education provider chooses to develop such policies regarding at an institution level, this should be considered further and referred to their next performance review in 2026-27.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - Programmes are aligned to the Curriculum Framework Specification, which is outlined in the Assessment for Learning policy. To ensure further consistency and transparency, the Examination and Assessment Regulations are applied across all programmes.
 - External Examiners are involved with all elements of assessments and provide independent input into the assessments to ensure quality and academic standards are maintained.
 - For the proposed programme learners will be required to complete their end point assessment. Guidance for this assessment is outlined in the Apprenticeship Policy Framework 2021 and End Point Assessment Procedure 2023.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - The Student Engagement and Attendance Monitoring policy identifies and monitors learners at risk and aims to support learners with this.
 - The Examination and Assessment regulations apply to all programmes with regards to progression and achievement, with the exception of some specific variations for some of the professional courses. This is to ensure Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirements are met.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.
- **Appeals –**
 - The appeals procedure is available in the Examination and Assessment Regulations and applies to all programmes. It is also included in the School of Health and Care Professions handbook.
 - These policies are set at institution level and will apply to the proposed programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- The staff team consists of one Programme Lead, two full time senior teaching fellows, one part time teaching fellow and one sessional teaching fellow. One senior teaching fellow will lead on admissions for the programme and the other will lead on placements.
- Some resources will be shared with the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, which has been running since 2016, however they have also received funding from the Office for Students that they will use to develop resources further.
- The education provider offers a range of facilities to support the programme. These include a large, dedicated space for simulation practice that includes two ward areas. This is supported by a team of experienced technicians and learners can access these facilities for self-directed practice. There is also a virtual learning environment that has recently been updated.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Degree Apprenticeship in Operating Department Practice	Full time	Operating Department Practice	1 cohort per year of 15-20 learners.	24/09/24

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding and our assessment, there were no areas we needed to explore via quality activity.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
 - The selection and entry criteria were clear and set at an appropriate level for an apprenticeship programme. The Degree Apprenticeship Operating Department Practice leaflet outlined the criteria, which included maths and English requirements. Additional information relating to the criteria was available on the education providers website.
 - The evidence demonstrated there were clear and appropriate academic and professional entry requirements.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
 - There was clear evidence of the education provider collaborating with practice education providers. This involved NHS England, Integrated Care Systems (ICS) and local providers. Regular discussions were had with the professional liaison group, which included stakeholders who provided support with the development of the proposed programme.
 - Due to the nature of this programme, learners will already be in employment when they commence the programme. Availability and capacity of practice-based learning will therefore not be an issue, as they will be supported by their employer and agreements will be made in advance of them commencing the programme.
 - The education provider demonstrated there were an adequate number of staff to deliver the programme who were HCPC registered. There

was clear evidence of a multi-disciplinary team with a range of experience, which consisted of Operating Department Practitioners, Radiographers, Paramedics and Nurses.

- The Curriculum Vitae demonstrated the team was made up of experienced educators who were appropriately qualified and had a range of specialist knowledge and expertise, which learners would benefit from.
 - It was noted there were a wide range of resources available to support the effective delivery of the proposed programme. These included the virtual learning environment, teaching facilities, the library and the simulation facilities. In addition to this, there was a learning agreement in place between the education provider and the practice-based learning provider. This agreement ensured learners had access to adequate resources during placement, which maximised their learning.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The mapping document demonstrated the learning outcomes were clearly aligned to the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs).
 - Learners were supported to meet the employers and the HCPC standards of professional behaviours, which included the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Visitors acknowledged these were embedded throughout the programme through specific learning outcomes in each year of study.
 - The proposed programme is aligned to the education providers Hallmark of a University of Portsmouth Graduate. This document sets out principles for learners and outlines the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the programme and provides evidence of where this is embedded.
 - There were appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. The curriculum was reflective of the recent College of Operating Department Practitioners (CODP) curriculum standards. Alongside this the revised SOPs were embedded within clinical practice, which ensured the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. This was further supported with the learners and practice educators working together within the practice setting.
 - A blended approach was taken, which ensured theory and practice were integrated throughout the programme. It was noted that due to the programme being an apprenticeship it reflected more practice, however expectations in relation to self-directed study were also clear.
 - A range of learning and teaching methods were being used, which visitors considered were appropriate. These methods included workshops, simulated case studies, self-directed learning and learning through reflective practice experiences.
 - It was noted how learners on the programme were required to complete a reflective practice assessment three times per year, which

was then further discussed in the quarterly tripartite meetings. The alignment with the Hallmark of a University of Portsmouth Graduate also promoted autonomous and reflective thinking.

- Throughout the programme there are a range of opportunities for learners to access evidence-based practice. The mapping with the College of Operating Department Practitioners (CODP) and the HCPC SOPs supports this further.
 - We have noted the interprofessional learning policies are currently profession specific. However, learners on the apprenticeship programme will have the opportunity to work with multidisciplinary teams in their clinical settings. This will enable learners to learn from other professions.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - Due to the nature of the programme, there was clear evidence of practice-based learning being integral to the programme. As part of the apprenticeship programme learners were required to undertake 80% on the job learning with an outcome of 1080 placement hours over the duration of the course.
 - The structure and duration of practice-based learning demonstrated learners could achieve the learning outcomes and were supported by their employer to do this. In addition to the required placement hours learners completed in practice, it was also noted learners were released by their employer for 280 hours of learning. This consisted of completing academic work and attending planned theory sessions.
 - There was evidence of an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support practice-based learning, which included practice educators. Due to this being an apprenticeship programme, learners were required to have a profession specific practice educator assigned to them when they applied for the programme, which was also part of the admissions process.
 - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
 - **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - It was acknowledged the education provider had a robust and diverse assessment strategy, which provided learners with the opportunity to demonstrate their development and learning. This was evidenced for all three levels of the apprenticeship programme.
 - The module descriptors outlined the learning outcomes and appropriate assessment methods to demonstrate professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. It was noted how the specific learning outcomes were addressed at each level.

- Visitors noted the assessment methods used to measure the learning outcomes were appropriate across the modules.
- The visitors therefore considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

Referrals to next scheduled performance review

Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)

Summary of issue: We have noted the interprofessional learning policies are profession specific. At the moment, there is no indication if the education provider has any plans to develop interprofessional learning policies at the institution level. If the education provider chooses to develop such policies regarding at an institution level, this should be considered further and referred to their next performance review in 2026-27.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- All standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programme is approved.
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2026-27 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Education and Training Committee Panel agreed with the findings of the visitors and were satisfied with the recommendation to approve the programme.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
University of Portsmouth	CAS-01512-N8V0X6	Alexander Harmer & Joanna Finney	<p>Through this assessment, we have noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved. 	<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff team consists of one Programme Lead, two full time senior teaching fellows, one part time teaching fellow and one sessional teaching fellow. One senior teaching fellow will lead on admissions for the programme and the other will lead on placements. Some resources will be shared with the BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice, which has been running since 2016, however they have also received some funding from the Office for Students that

				<p>they will use to develop resources further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider offers a range of facilities to support the programme. These include a large, dedicated space for simulation practice that includes two ward areas. This is supported by a team of experienced technicians and learners can access these facilities for self-directed practice. There is also a virtual learning environment that has recently been updated.
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Degree Apprenticeship in Operating Department Practice				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprenticeship

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/08/2016
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2015
MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-Registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/01/2022
Professional Doctorate in Sport and Exercise Psychology	PT (Part time)	Practitioner psychologist	Sports and exercise psychologist		01/09/2016
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and Medical Imaging	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2017