

## Education and Training Committee – 22 September 2009

### Birmingham City University – Foundation Degree Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) - full time accelerated

#### Executive summary

##### **Introduction**

At the meeting of the Education and Training Panel in July 2009, the Panel received information regarding the Foundation Degree Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) full time and full time accelerated programmes delivered by Birmingham City University.

The Panel was asked to consider the approval of visitor reports' from the approval visit conducted on 2-3 June 2009. These reports were presented along with observations submitted by the education provider for both pathways. The decision notice contained in Appendix 1 outlines the decisions and directions made by the Panel regarding the full time accelerated pathway.

Following the Panel meeting, the education provider has requested to withdraw the full time accelerated programme from the approval process. This request was confirmed in writing by the Associate Dean for the relevant faculty on 6 August 2009.

##### **Decision**

The Committee is requested to note the document. No decision is required.

##### **Background information**

None

##### **Resource implications**

None

##### **Financial implications**

None

##### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Decision Notice – Foundation degree Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) full time accelerated, 29 July 2009

##### **Date of paper**

September 2009

## Appendix 1

### Health Professions Council

#### Education and Training Committee Panel

**Programmes in respect of which approval/ongoing approval is recommended subject to conditions, where the education provider has made observations on the visitors' report**

<b>Name of programme</b>	<b>Fd Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science)</b>
<b>Name of education provider</b>	<b>Birmingham City University</b>
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	<b>Full time accelerated</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>29 July 2009</b>

**Panel :**  
**Alan Mount, Chair**  
**John Donaghy**  
**Jeff Seneviratne**  
**Eileen Thornton**  
**Diane Waller**

#### **Guidance for Panel Chairs**

In determining whether to accept a Visitors' report (including the conditions and recommendations in the report), the Panel must reach its decision on the basis of the evidence put before it, in the form of the HPC Visitors' report and any observations on the report made by the education provider.

The Visitors' report is only a recommendation and the Panel may depart from that recommendation where it is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so.

The Panel must reach its own decision and give reasons for that decision. If the Panel wishes to amend the report, it should give reasons for each amendment.

<b>Decision:</b>
The Visitors' report should be amended as follows:  Condition 2.1 should be amended to delete the reference to accreditation or validation of the programmes.  Condition 3.1 should be amended to refer to the education provider's own

language and state that there were two cohorts on the unapproved programme.

Condition 3.2 should be retained as drafted by the visitors but the reason amended.

Condition 5.2 should be retained but the reason amended to read:

'The visitors were provided with a list of mentors used for the programme. The visitors also met with students who advised placement provision on the programme was adequate but found it difficult at times to access their mentors and assessors. The programme team advised that the placement sites must cater for student paramedics from a variety of higher education institutions across the region.

The visitors need to be satisfied that given the proposed increase to student cohort numbers, there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at all placement sites. The visitors require further evidence of the workload of the assessors and mentors with specific reference to the number of students they are responsible for teaching from higher education institutions across the West Midlands region.'

The Panel agreed that, if the conditions are met, the HPC should approve the programme for a period of one year.

## Reasons

The Panel was satisfied that condition 2.1 should be amended for accuracy.

The Panel was satisfied that condition 3.1 should be amended to accurately reflect the education provider's own language and for accuracy.

The Panel was satisfied that condition 3.2 was included in the light of information received by the Visitors during the process of preparing their report. The reason should be amended to explain that subsequently information had come to light that two cohorts of students had taken the accelerated programme.

The Panel was satisfied that the reason for condition 5.2 should be amended as it was not necessary for a list of assessors and mentors at each placement site to be submitted by the education provider.

The Panel agreed that HPC should approve the programme for a period of one year as the education provider intended to only run the programme for a period of one year.

**Signed: Alan Mount (Chairman of the Panel)**