

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Birmingham City University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	13 – 14 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Condition .....	6
Recommendations.....	7

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 December 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 January 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider considered their re-approval of the programme and the professional body, the College of Social Work (TCSW) considered their endorsement of the programme. The education provider, TCSW and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. Separate reports, produced by the education provider and the TCSW outline their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gary Dicken (Social worker) Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor) Dorothy Smith (Social Worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
HCPC observer	Joy Tweed (HCPC Council member)
Proposed student numbers	90
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Fiona Church (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Jane Binks (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Helen Wenman (The College of Social Work) Aiden Worsley (The College of Social Work) Ash Chand (The College of Social Work) Wilson Muleya (External panel member) Paul Webster (External panel member) Jane Dooley (External panel member) John Okole (External panel member) Rachel Curzon (Internal panel member) Philip Dee (Internal panel member)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal quality documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Admissions documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that one condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made two recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Condition

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to show that their policy for the recruitment of external examiners ensures that at least one external examiner will be appointed, who is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner arrangements. However, the visitors noted that there was insufficient detail concerning the recruitment of external examiners to the programme in the documentation submitted. This standard requires the assessment regulations to clearly articulate the requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be appropriately registered with the HCPC. The visitors therefore require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should produce information that clearly shows how their internal quality assurance policies work together, or if this information exists, make it more readily available.

**Reason:** From reviewing the documentation submitted, and considering discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that the programme has regular monitoring and evaluations systems in place, and therefore that this standard is met. The visitors were also satisfied that the programme's stakeholders know how to engage with monitoring and evaluation systems relevant to their role. However, the visitors noted that it was not always immediately clear how quality assurance policies and procedures worked together. For example, the Quality Day Action Plan (Appendix 7, Social Work Critical Review) shows areas that have been identified for improvement, and statements that improvements have been made, but not the process by which the improvements were made. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider produce an overarching quality assurance policy or mapping document, or, if this document exists, ensure that it is readily available when required. This document should enable stakeholders who are unfamiliar with the programme, for example external reviewers, or new staff or students, to understand how the internal quality assurance procedures work together, and for new stakeholders, how they would go about interacting with the policies.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should further formalise and embed the involvement of their service user and carer group in the programme, develop their communication with the group, and review the group's recruitment policy.

**Reason:** From reviewing the documentation, and from meeting service users and carers and the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that service users and carers were involved in the programme, and therefore that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted several concerns of the service users and carer group which may impact on the way the standard is met in the future.

Firstly, the visitors noted the groups' concerns about the reliance of their involvement on an individual person. The group has always had an individual to contact directly about their involvement in the programme, which they found useful. Currently, this individual is the programme leader. The visitors noted that this reliance on one individual might not constitute sufficient stability for the sustainability of the group's contribution. The group noted that when responsibility has transferred from one individual to another in the past, their level of involvement dropped for a period. The group is satisfied that their involvement is now back to where it was, but was unsure how the programme would facilitate their involvement in the programme to a consistent level should responsibility for facilitating the group's involvement changes again, and was concerned that their involvement would drop to a level below where it is now.

Secondly, the visitors noted that the group were unclear about the payment policy, and the training available to members of the group. The visitors were clear that these

policies exist, and that individuals in the group were remunerated and trained on an individual basis specific to their role, but this was not reflected in the group's understanding of the policies.

Finally, the visitors noted the group's concerns about recruiting new members, along with ensuring that the group has a diverse range of experiences. For example, the group members noted the lack of care leavers involved in the forum. The group were unsure how service users and carers who were interested in joining the group would find out about the group's work (beyond word of mouth), or how they would be appointed to the group.

Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider considers further formalising the service user and carer group's involvement in the programme to decrease reliance on individuals, reviews their communication policies with the group around payment and training, and reviews their recruitment policy for the group.

Gary Dicken  
Sid Jeewa  
Dorothy Smith

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of East Anglia
<b>Programme name</b>	PG Dip Mental Health (incorporating AMHP) Higher Specialist Award
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Work based learning
<b>Type of programme</b>	Approved mental health professional
<b>Date of visit</b>	8 – 9 October 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	9

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using a protected title must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health practitioners (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 November 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 December 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2015.

## Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Goemans (Approved mental health professional) Lynn Heath (Approved mental health professional) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	12 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2015
Chair	Nicola Spalding (University of East Anglia)
Secretary	Robbie Meehan (University of East Anglia)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 44 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining six criterion.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain criteria have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the criterion being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular criterion has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **A.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) procedure for the programme. In particular, how any applications for AP(E)L are assessed and how such requirements and procedures are clearly communicated to applicants.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the information provided to applicants regarding the application for AP(E)L, specifically the generic website information that is provided to applicants. In discussions with the programme team the visitors noted that applicants were assessed on a case by case basis with regards to AP(E)L. The visitors also noted that the ability to receive AP(E)L for aspects of the programme differed depending on which previous modules were taken by potential applicants. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence which clarifies the education provider's requirements regarding AP(E)L. In particular, the visitors require further information clarifying which elements (if any) of the programme an applicant can be exempted from completing through the AP(E)L process, and how this information is clearly communicated to applicants. Any further evidence submitted should also address how any assessment of AP(E)L is carried out by the programme team and the criteria against which any decisions regarding the awarding of AP(E)L are made.

### **B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that the necessary financial resources have been committed and planned to deliver the programme in conjunction with local authority commissioners.

**Reason:** In the programme documentation submitted prior to the visit the visitors noted the education provider's strategic intent regarding the delivery of the programme but no evidence of future funding assured for the AMHP programme. Visitors also noted the Informal Memorandums of Cooperation with Norfolk and Suffolk Local Authorities for twelve months from 2014. At the visit, the visitors noted the programme team had continued discussions with local authorities regarding their intentions to continue commissioning students from their respective organisations to undertake the programme. The visitors were advised that these discussions were progressing well and that there continues to be a clear interest in the programme. However, the visitors noted in the senior team meeting that there was a lack of representation of senior managers from either the university or the partner agencies and that no formal agreements have been made. In discussions with the senior team and placement educators, it was noted that Norfolk County Council and Suffolk County Council have verbally confirmed their intent to continue to commission students onto the programme. Although the visitors were clear there were potential opportunities for commissioned students to undertake the programme, they were unclear if any of these would be likely to be in place for the foreseeable future as there was no formal commitment from either Council. To be satisfied this criterion is met the visitors must be satisfied the education provider has enough support from employers to ensure it has a viable future. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates

a clear intent, on the part of employers, to commission students to undertake the programme in the foreseeable future to be satisfied this criterion is met.

#### **D.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence which clearly articulates the knowledge, skills and experience required to perform the role of placement educators on the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted references to a number of documents submitted by the education provider in relation to how the programme meets this criterion, specifically the Quality Assurance of AMHP Placements and Practice Learning Opportunities Handbook and Portfolio Guidance. The Quality Assurance of AMHP Placements document outlines that there ‘...is no single qualification for being a practice educator or on-site supervisor for an AMHP student’. However, in discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted all placement educators must have completed a 60 credit at Master level module of the Practice Educator qualification in order to supervise AMHP students. Although clarified during the visit, the visitors could not clearly identify where in the programme documentation the qualifications, knowledge, skills and experience that the education provider requires in appointing individuals to be placement educators for the programme is reflected. In addition, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures employers are clearly informed of the requirements regarding the recruitment of placement educators who are appropriately qualified and experienced. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the education provider’s requirements regarding the qualifications and experience of placement educators involved in the supervision of AMHP students. The information provided should clearly demonstrate how these requirements are communicated to employers involved in recruiting and appointing suitable placement educators.

#### **D.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to show how they confirm that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the documents submitted by the education provider in relation to how the programme meets this criterion, specifically the Quality Assurance of AMHP Placements. Discussions at the visit indicated that the placement provider will be responsible for identifying placement educators, checking registration details and ensuring they are currently practicing as an AMHP. From the evidence provided, the visitors could not see a system that would be used by the education provider to confirm that practice placement educators are appropriately registered and therefore meet the criteria they set out for practice placement educators. As a result, the visitors require further evidence of the process that will be in place to ensure that this criterion can be met.

**E.8 Assessment regulations must clearly specify that any requirements for an aegrotat award which may be made will not lead to eligibility to be approved as an AMHP**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence that assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility to apply to a local authority to be approved as an AMHP.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to a local authority to be approved as an AMHP or that an aegrotat award is not given for this programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate where in the programme documentation it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to a local authority to be approved as an AMHP.

**E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence which makes clear in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation

## Recommendations

### **B.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider keeping staff knowledge under review to ensure that those delivering the programme subject area have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that all modules are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, and therefore that this criterion is met. However, the visitors noted that many of the programme team were child care expert and very few of the programme team have had experience of being an Approved mental health professional. The visitors recommend that the education provider continues to review the amount of specialist expertise the core teaching staff team have. In this way the programme team may be able to identify how best to maintain and increase the level of specialist expertise and knowledge of the teaching staff going forward.

### **D.3 The practice placement settings must provide safe and supportive environment.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to review how practice placement providers ensure students are made aware of personal risks and safety issues relating to placement.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors were satisfied that practice placement providers are expected to carry out relevant assessment of risks within the area of practice. However, discussions with students revealed a varied induction experience on placement in relation to personal risks and safety. From this information, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to review the placement induction process employed by the practice placement provider, in particular, how practice placement provider inform students about risks and safety issues.

Lynn Heath  
Robert Goemans  
Christine Morgan

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lincoln
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Social Work (Lincoln Campus)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	13 – 14 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 February 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work (in England) profession came onto the register in August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – MSc Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional). Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Richard Barker (Social worker) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort once a year (inclusive of part time route)
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Paul Walsh (University of Lincoln)
Secretary	Carolyn Smith (University of Lincoln)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not physically see the learning resources and specialist teaching accommodation however, there was a briefing about learning resources and teaching rooms.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials and the website, to ensure that potential applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors noted on page 13 of D1 Practice Learning Handbook “All students are expected to hold a full UK driving license and own a car by the time they enter first placement. No compensation will be made for students who do not own a car and full driving license”. However during the meeting with the programme team, visitors learnt that students are encouraged to own a car and have full UK driving licence. In exceptional circumstances, such as students with special needs, the education provider will make compensation to requirements of owning a car and full UK driving licence. The visitors were unable to determine how this exception to the admission requirement will be communicated to potential applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants are informed of the exceptions to admissions procedures. This way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. For example, page 13 of the A2 Programme Specification states that “At enrolment, all candidates must have an enhanced Criminal Record Bureau check”. This method has now change to Disclosure Barring Service (DBS). The visitors noted references to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) within document E11 Undergraduate Regulations2013 – 14 (page 21). The GSCC no longer exists, the documentation needs to be reviewed to ensure the current regulator is reflected appropriately and accurately. During the meeting with the programme, the visitors learnt that the education provider only uses the DBS method for checking previous convictions and the programme team would take account of these examples in particular when updating programme documents. The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and that students are asked verbally before each activity. However, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### **6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which exit awards do not.

**Reason:** From the documentation the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. The visitors noted in the programmes handbook on page 13 that “Only by passing all modules within either the BSc or MSc Social Work programme will you be eligible to register as a social worker with the HCPC”. However, the visitors were unable to see where in the documentation students were explicitly informed that anyone who received an exit award of Bachelor of Science in Social Studies would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which do not.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiners and were satisfied with the current arrangement. However, in the documentation submitted by the

education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Dee Keane  
Vicki Lawson-Brown  
Richard Barker

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Lincoln
<b>Programme name</b>	MSc Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	13 – 14 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	8

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 9 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 February 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the Social Work (in England) profession came onto the register in August 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate or review the programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered the following programmes – BSc (Hons) Social Work and Post Graduate Diploma Interprofessional Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional). Separate reports exist for these programmes.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Richard Barker (Social worker) Vicki Lawson-Brown (Social worker)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Paul Walsh (University of Lincoln)
Secretary	Carolyn Smith (University of Lincoln)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not physically see the learning resources and specialist teaching accommodation however, there was a briefing about learning resources and teaching rooms.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 54 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining four SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 revisit all programme documentation, including advertising materials and the website, to ensure that potential applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From the information provided, the visitors noted on page 13 of D1 Practice Learning Handbook “All students are expected to hold a full UK driving license and own a car by the time they enter first placement. No compensation will be made for students who do not own a car and full driving license”. However during the meeting with the programme team, visitors learnt that students are encouraged to own a car and have full UK driving licence. In exceptional circumstances, such as students with special needs, the education provider will make compensation to requirements of owning a car and full UK driving licence. The visitors were unable to determine how this exception to the admission requirement will be communicated to potential applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme advertising materials, to ensure potential applicants are informed of the exceptions to admissions procedures. This way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology used is current and up to date.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. For example, page 13 of the A3 Programme Specification states that “At enrolment, all candidates must have an enhanced Criminal Record Bureau check”. This method has now change to Disclosure Barring Service (DBS). The visitors also noted in the frequently asked questions (FAQs) for applicants that “The programme contains an 80-day first placement and final 100-day placement, which take place in Terms 2-3 of the first and second year respectively”. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider only uses the DBS method for checking previous convictions and that the first placement for the MSc Social Work programme is 70 days. In discussion with the programme team it was also indicated the programme team would take account of these examples in particular when updating programme documents. The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and that students are asked verbally before each activity. However, the visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors saw curriculum vitae for the current external examiners and were satisfied with the current arrangement. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### **2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider consider providing further information to potential applicants about the academic entry requirements.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme and provide initial information about requirements. The visitors noted that the education provider requires a “good undergraduate degree (normally 2:1 or above), achieved or predicted”. The visitors suggest the education provider may wish to consider rephrasing this statement by adding that students with lower academic grades when there is sufficient evidence of experience in the field of social care or other relevant qualifications may be considered for a place on this programme. The visitors feel this way the education provider would further enhance the potential pool of applicants for this programme.

Dee Keane  
Vicki Lawson-Brown  
Richard Barker

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wolverhampton
<b>Programme name</b>	Dip HE in Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	7 – 8 October 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	13

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 December 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 January 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Vincent Clarke (Paramedic) Penny Gripper (Lay visitor) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	April 2015
Chair	Megan Thomas (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Rachel Ford
Members of the joint panel	Alison Felce (Internal Panel Member) Rachel Ford (Internal Panel Member) Ruth Shiner (Internal Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore no reports exist.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BNurs (Hons) Adult Nursing programme and other programmes, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures.

**Reason:** The mapping document for the Standards of Education and Training (SETs) made reference to documents in relation to this standard. However, the visitors noted the equality and diversity policy appeared not to be up to date. During the visit and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an updated equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students, but were not clear how it is implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored in order to determine whether this standard is met.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show the status of the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisation including the draft of these arrangements finalised and signed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted, in the documentation provided, the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisation West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS) which articulated the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were able to identify how the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and WMAS could ensure that the programme has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. However, in the senior team meeting it was discussed that because of the timing of this approval visit, the programme may not start in January 2015. It was agreed during the meeting, that the partnership arrangements need to reflect the new start date of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show the draft of these partnerships finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided and during discussion with the senior management team at the visit, the visitors noted that plans to recruit an additional staff member has been agreed. However, from discussions at the visit, it was not clear when this recruitment would take place. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how, following the recruitment to this post, there will be an adequate

number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

### **3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that staff with specialist expertise and knowledge are in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** The education provider included staff Curriculum vitae(s) with the documentation, and the visitors were content that some of the staff have specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver this programme, however, they noted that only one staff member was a registered paramedic. During discussion with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider is planning to recruit another member of staff who will be a paramedic and will also consider employing visiting paramedic tutors for the delivery of this programme. The visitors were concerned about whether subject areas were being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require information on any additional staffing resources that are in place to support the delivery of an effective programme, to include details of the visiting staff members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. This condition is in line with SET 3.5. The education provider should detail how they ensure that staff have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme effectively.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure the terminology in use is reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

**Reason:** The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, there was reference to the HCPC regulating 13 professions in a number of places in the documentation for example, module 5HW053, p141. The visitors also noted on page 98 of the programme specification “HCPC Standards of Proficiency for paramedics in England”. With reference to these two examples respectively; the HCPC is a regulatory body regulating 16 professions and the Standard of Proficiency for paramedics are for all paramedics in the United Kingdom. The visitors require the documentation to be reviewed to remove any instances of incorrect or out-of-date terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users, in practical sessions.

**Reason:** From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users. Visitors were given a “student consent form” during the visit however due to time constraints, the visitors could not review the document. The visitors could not determine how students were informed about participation requirements within the programme, how records were maintained to indicate consent had been obtained, or how situations where students declined from participation were managed with alternative learning arrangements so there would be no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

**3.15 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 education provider must identify where on the programme students’ attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did mention attendance for this programme. However, the visitors noted that each module has different mandatory attendance requirements and monitoring mechanisms. During discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that these individual module requirements are not clearly articulated in the programme documents. Therefore the programme team will need to clearly identify where students’ attendance is mandatory and the procedures and mechanisms in place to monitor it effectively. The visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly identify where on the programme students’ attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles and learning outcomes. The education provider changed and updated some of the learning outcomes for modules 5HW053 and 5HW054 as part of the post panel process for the internal validation. The education provider did provide further detailed mapping to show how the changes made to the modules’ learning outcomes mapped onto specific teaching and learning opportunities and demonstrated how all the SOPs were met. However, the visitors did not have time to assess these changes and determine all the SOPs are met. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme’s learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme

meet the SOPs for paramedics to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes including SOPs covered in modules 5HW053 and 5HW054.

#### **4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.**

**Condition:** Further evidence must be provided to show how the programme reflects the relevant curriculum guidance and external reference frameworks.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that page 98 of the programme specification mentions the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (2008), QAA The Quality Code (2013), QAA Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality & Standards in Higher Education & SEEC Level Descriptors (2006) and The College of Paramedics (COP) Curriculum (2014) as a point of reference as a relevant external reference point. The visitors were content that the different requirements of QAA have been reflected in the curriculum. However, the visitors noted in COP mapping document on page 321 that some of the curriculum standards have been left blank. The visitors were given further mapping document during the visit to show how the programme reflect the COP curriculum guidance but the visitors did not have enough time to assess these documents. Therefore the visitors could not determine from the documentation how the COP curriculum (2014) is reflected in the programme curriculum. The visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the curriculum reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge of the paramedic profession and qualification.

#### **4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of the mechanisms that will be in place to ensure that the curriculum will remain current.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with evidence of the currency of the programme within the SETs mapping for this programme, outlining the guidance and frameworks which have formed the foundations of the curriculum in its current form. The visitors were satisfied that the currency of the curriculum was fulfilled however; they were unclear as to how the programme team will ensure currency of the curriculum going forward. This standard requires evidence of how the activities of the programme team and any external stakeholders will make sure the curriculum stays relevant over time. As referred to in the condition against 3.5, the programme is in the process of recruiting staff to the programme and intend to invite visiting tutors. The visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms that the programme team will have in place, such as ongoing professional input, to keep the curriculum up-to-date with the current practice for the profession.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there will be placements in non-ambulance service settings, as highlighted in on campus course guide, page 8: “You will be expected to complete 750 hours per year (1500 in total) of clinical practice in a range of pre hospital and other healthcare placements”. The visitors also noted in Practice Learning Handbook on page one, that students will attend placements as part of their programme. The placements providers are WMAS, other NHS trusts and non NHS placement providers. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators and students in the placement settings are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** At the visit, the programme team and practice placement providers indicated that they are in the process of developing a “skills passport” to ensure all practice educators are aware of the students’ progress and their scope of practice. The programme team talked through how they envisage this will be used alongside the

Practice Assessment Document (PAD) in assessing and preparing students and preparing practice placement educators in the practice placement setting. The visitors were unclear as to how the placement educators and students will be prepared in using it. This standard is also link to the other condition placed on SET 5.11 above. Therefore, the visitors require further documents including the “skills passport” to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

**Reason:** In line with the visitors’ concerns relating to SET 4.1, they noted that the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit has been amended to make it clear. The education provider provided the amended mapping document during the visit, however, the visitors did not have time to review the amended mapping document and determine how all students who successfully completed the programme demonstrated that they had met all the standards of proficiency. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme’s assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

**6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit any revised module descriptors for the programme.

**Reason:** As detailed in the reasons for SET 4.1, discussion at the visit indicated the programme team have amended the learning outcomes for modules 5HW053 and 5HW054, including assessment, as part of the post panel process for the internal validation. The visitors will need to review them to ensure changes will not adversely affect the assessment of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to resubmit the programme module descriptors for 5HW053 and 5HW054 so that the visitors can determine this standard is met.

**6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence of how they ensure that the assessments are applied consistently and objectively.

**Reason:** From the documentation received, the visitors noted that the education provider ensured students’ performance will be assessed in both academic and placement settings. The visitors noted in the module descriptors that assessment criteria including Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) were used to assess students’ performance. However, the visitors noted inconsistency in the assessment of students’ performance in both settings. For example the OSCEs used to assess students in academic settings carried inconsistent weighting and pass marks. This condition is linked to the condition set against SET 5.11. During the programme

team meeting, the visitors learnt the assessment criteria for assessing students' performance will be revised to ensure requirements are clearly explained including weighting and pass marks. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit revised assessment criteria in both settings to demonstrate how students' performance will be assessed consistently, objectively and ensure fitness to practice.

**6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award.

## Recommendations

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider consider providing further information to potential applicants about the profession of paramedic including the professional values.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme. The visitors noted the programme does provide initial information about paramedic as a profession. The visitors suggest the education provider may wish to consider strengthening the initial information about the philosophy and core values of paramedic profession. The visitors feel this way the education provider would further enhance the calibre of potential students for this programme. Also, this would enhance decision making for potential applicants if they are fully aware of the career this programme can lead to and the regulatory and professional requirements of the profession. The visitors suggest some initial information around professional values online may provide a valuable resource for these potential applicants.

Mark Nevins  
Penny Gripper  
Vince Clarke

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	25 – 26 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 March 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body (College of Paramedics) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic) Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort per year (inclusive of BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Howard Brown (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Krisztina Jaksa (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Long (Internal Panel Member) Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Hardwick (External Panel Member) Vincent Clarke (College of Paramedics) Paul Townsend (College of Paramedics)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore no reports exist. However, the visitors did review the external examiner's reports for the FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level

## Conditions

### **2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further information about the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme and evidence to demonstrate students will achieve all the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** The documentation provided for this visit included information about the education provider wide accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) processes. The education provider's website indicates that applicants can apply to use the AP(E)L process, "Where applicants' prior un-certificated learning, including experience and industrial training, can be assessed with sufficient accuracy it may be used to give entry to an Oxford Brookes programme with specific credit" (A2-5 Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL)). It was highlighted through discussion that students from the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care will transfer onto this programme through the AP(E)L route once they have completed year one or year two of the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care. As these are two different programmes, the visitors were unclear how students will achieve the SOPs for paramedics when they enrol through the AP(E)L route from Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care to this programme. The visitors therefore require further information about the AP(E)L policy for the programme and evidence to demonstrate students who enrol to this programme from Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care will achieve all the SOPs for paramedics.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the EP and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided, that the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulate the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were unable to identify how these proposed partnership arrangements reflect the new arrangements to ensure that this new programme provision has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there are updated partnership agreements between the education provider and its partner organisations. However, the visitors were unable to see those agreements at the visit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show the draft of these partnership agreements finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of what commitment is being made to ensure the programme has a secure place in the education providers' business plan.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that the programme has appropriate resources in place for the proposed intake of 50 students once a year. However, during the meetings and discussions with the senior and programme team, the visitors learnt that the student numbers will increase to 70 students along with the programme running the first and the second year of the programme in September 2016. The visitors also learnt that this programme and the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care programme will run in parallel in 2016 – 17 and 2017 – 18 academic years. The visitors could not determine how the current resources including academic staff, practice educators and practice placements detailed in the documentation are appropriate for the above changes to student intake. This condition is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 3.1 regarding placement arrangements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show the commitment made and how the education provider is planning to put appropriate resources in place to ensure the programme is secure.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised to meet the conditions set as a result of this validation event.

**Reason:** Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel it was clear revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors consider programme documentation that students routinely refer to as important resources to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set referred to amendments to module descriptors, the programme specification document and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review the revised documents to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

### **3.15 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 education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did mention attendance requirements for this programme. The visitors learnt during the programme team meeting that each module guide has mandatory attendance requirements and monitoring mechanisms. The visitors were only given module descriptors and therefore could not review module guides. The visitors highlighted that these individual module

requirements are not clearly articulated in the programme documents provided. Therefore the programme team will need to clearly identify where students' attendance is mandatory and the procedures and mechanisms in place to communicate and monitor it effectively.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the plans for continued service user and carer involvement within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine whether service users and carers are involved in the programme because in the SETs mapping document SET 3.17 was left blank. Discussion at the visit indicated there was service users and carers' involvement in this programme in a number of ways. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users in the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited detail about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles and learning outcomes. During discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel it was clear revisions will be made to some of the learning outcomes for modules to meet conditions set by the joint panel as part of the post panel process for the internal validation. Therefore the visitors will require further evidence of how the programme's revised learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for paramedics, to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes, including SOPs covered in the revised modules.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there will be placements in front-line ambulance service settings, as highlighted in Practice Learning Handbook, page 16 “Full Time 2015 students undertaking the first year of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Degree are expected to achieve a total of 750 practice hours. Practice hours will comprise 750 hours placement experience on front-line ambulances”. However, during the meeting with the programme team, the visitors learnt that students will attend non ambulance placements in the NHS as part of their programme. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators and students in the placement settings are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** At the visit, the programme team and practice placement providers indicated that a “check list” of objectives that need to be achieved at non ambulance placement will be provided (Practice Learning Handbook page 22). During discussions, the programme team highlighted that they will work on strengthening the existing document to include students’ scope of practice. The programme team talked through how they envisage this document will be used alongside the Practice Assessment Document

(PAD) in assessing and preparing students and preparing practice placement educators in the practice placement setting. However, the visitors were unable to determine how this document will ensure all practice educators are aware of the students' progress and their scope of practice. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the placement educators and students will be prepared adequately for practice placement. This standard is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 5.11 above. Therefore, the visitors require further documents including the any documents about students' scope of practice to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit detailing the learning outcomes in programme modules and the assessment methods to assess these learning outcomes. However, in line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel, it was clear revisions will be made to the assessment methods for some of the modules to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

**6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award.

**6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors saw the curriculum vitae for the current external examiners and were satisfied with the current arrangement. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider ensure staffing levels for the programme are reviewed appropriately to reflect the projected student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, the visitors were content that this standard was met. However, during the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme will increase student numbers up to 220 in 2019 – 20 academic year as the programme becomes established. The visitors would like to recommend that if this happens the education provider considers reviewing the staff numbers on an annual basis to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. If the number of students on the programme increases significantly the visitors remind the programme team that they must inform the HCPC through the major change process.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider considers engaging with current and other placement providers to ensure the number and range of placement settings and practice educators is appropriate for the projected student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, the visitors were content that this standard was met. However, during the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme will have an increase student numbers of up to 220 in 2019 – 20 academic year as the programme becomes established. The visitors would like to recommend that if this happens the education provider considers working closely with current and other placement providers to ensure the number and range of placement settings and practice educators is appropriate for the projected student numbers. If the number of students on the programme increases significantly the visitors remind the programme team that they must inform the HCPC through the major change process.

Clare Bates  
Paul Bates  
Bob Fellows

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Flexible
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	25 – 26 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 30 March 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 14 May 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body (College of Paramedics) considered their endorsement of the programme. The visit also considered BSc Paramedic Practice. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of all the programmes and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on this programme only. A separate report exists for the other programme. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body, outline their decisions on the programmes' status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Robert Fellows (Paramedic) Clare Bates (Lay visitor) Paul Bates (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort per year (inclusive of BSc Paramedic Practice)
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Howard Brown (Oxford Brookes University)
Secretary	Krisztina Jaksa (Oxford Brookes University)
Members of the joint panel	Rachel Long (Internal Panel Member) Julia Winter (Internal Panel Member) Sharon Hardwick (External Panel Member) Vincent Clarke (College of Paramedics) Paul Townsend (College of Paramedics)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit, the programme is a new programme and therefore no reports exist. However, the visitors did review the external examiner's reports for the FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the FdSc Paramedic Emergency Care as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval, the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level

## Conditions

### **2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further information about the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme and evidence to demonstrate students will achieve all the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** The documentation provided for this visit included information about the education provider wide accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) processes. The education provider's website indicates that applicants can apply to use the AP(E)L process, "Where applicants' prior un-certificated learning, including experience and industrial training, can be assessed with sufficient accuracy it may be used to give entry to an Oxford Brookes programme with specific credit" (A2-5 Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL)). It was highlighted through discussion that students from the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care will transfer onto this programme through the AP(E)L route once they have completed year one or year two of the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care. As these are two different programmes, the visitors were unclear how students will achieve the SOPs for paramedics when they enrol through the AP(E)L route from Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care to this programme. The visitors therefore require further information about the AP(E)L policy for the programme and evidence to demonstrate students who enrol to this programme from Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care will achieve all the SOPs for paramedics.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the EP and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided, that the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulate the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were unable to identify how these proposed partnership arrangements reflect the new arrangements to ensure that this new programme provision has a secure position in the education provider's business plan. In the senior team meeting it was discussed that there are updated partnership agreements between the education provider and its partner organisations. However, the visitors were unable to see those agreements at the visit. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show the draft of these partnership agreements finalised and signed, to determine how the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

### **3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of what commitment is being made to ensure the programme has a secure place in the education providers' business plan.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that the programme has appropriate resources in place for the proposed intake of 50 students once a year. However, during the meetings and discussions with the senior and programme team, the visitors learnt that the student numbers will increase to 70 students along with the programme running the first and the second year of the programme in September 2016. The visitors also learnt that this programme and the Dip HE Paramedic Emergency Care programme will run in parallel in 2016 – 17 and 2017 – 18 academic years. The visitors could not determine how the current resources including academic staff, practice educators and practice placements detailed in the documentation are appropriate for the above changes to student intake. This condition is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 3.1 regarding placement arrangements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show the commitment made and how the education provider is planning to put appropriate resources in place to ensure the programme is secure.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised to meet the conditions set as a result of this validation event.

**Reason:** Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel it was clear revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors consider programme documentation that students routinely refer to as important resources to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set referred to amendments to module descriptors, the programme specification document and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review the revised documents to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

### **3.15 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 education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit did mention attendance requirements for this programme. The visitors learnt during the programme team meeting that each module guide has mandatory attendance requirements and monitoring mechanisms. The visitors were only given module descriptors and therefore could not review module guides. The visitors highlighted that these individual module

requirements are not clearly articulated in the programme documents provided. Therefore the programme team will need to clearly identify where students' attendance is mandatory and the procedures and mechanisms in place to communicate and monitor it effectively.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the plans for continued service user and carer involvement within the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine whether service users and carers are involved in the programme because in the SETs mapping document SET 3.17 was left blank. Discussion at the visit indicated there was service users and carers' involvement in this programme in a number of ways. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users in the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited detail about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

### **4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that the documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, each with several of the SOPs listed as being covered in each module. There was also a mapping document which showed the SOPs mapped against module titles and learning outcomes. During discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel it was clear revisions will be made to some of the learning outcomes for modules to meet conditions set by the joint panel as part of the post panel process for the internal validation. Therefore the visitors will require further evidence of how the programme's revised learning outcomes ensure that students who complete the programme meet the SOPs for paramedics, to ensure that this standard is met. The visitors require a detailed breakdown of how each SOP is delivered in relation to the learning outcomes, including SOPs covered in the revised modules.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there will be placements in front-line ambulance service settings, as highlighted in Practice Learning Handbook, page 16 “Full Time 2015 students undertaking the first year of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Degree are expected to achieve a total of 750 practice hours. Practice hours will comprise 750 hours placement experience on front-line ambulances”. However, during the meeting with the programme team, the visitors learnt that students will attend non ambulance placements in the NHS as part of their programme. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators and students in the placement settings are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** At the visit, the programme team and practice placement providers indicated that a “check list” of objectives that need to be achieved at non ambulance placement will be provided (Practice Learning Handbook page 22). During discussions, the programme team highlighted that they will work on strengthening the existing document to include students’ scope of practice. The programme team talked through how they envisage this document will be used alongside the Practice Assessment Document

(PAD) in assessing and preparing students and preparing practice placement educators in the practice placement setting. However, the visitors were unable to determine how this document will ensure all practice educators are aware of the students' progress and their scope of practice. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the placement educators and students will be prepared adequately for practice placement. This standard is also linked to the other condition placed on SET 5.11 above. Therefore, the visitors require further documents including the any documents about students' scope of practice to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

**6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping documentation provided prior to the visit detailing the learning outcomes in programme modules and the assessment methods to assess these learning outcomes. However, in line with the visitors' concerns relating to SET 4.1, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and professional body visiting panel, it was clear revisions will be made to the assessment methods for some of the modules to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme's assessment strategy and design ensures that all students who complete the programme meet all the standards of proficiency to ensure that this standard is met.

**6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly state that aegrotat awards do not confer eligibility to apply to the Register.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. Discussion indicated aegrotat awards would only be awarded in exceptional circumstances on a case by case basis. The visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding the aegrotat award.

**6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors saw the curriculum vitae for the current external examiners and were satisfied with the current arrangement. However, in the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard when updating programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

## Recommendations

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider ensure staffing levels for the programme are reviewed appropriately to reflect the projected student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, the visitors were content that this standard was met. However, during the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme will increase student numbers up to 220 in 2019 – 20 academic year as the programme becomes established. The visitors would like to recommend that if this happens the education provider considers reviewing the staff numbers on an annual basis to ensure there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. If the number of students on the programme increases significantly the visitors remind the programme team that they must inform the HCPC through the major change process.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider considers engaging with current and other placement providers to ensure the number and range of placement settings and practice educators is appropriate for the projected student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, the visitors were content that this standard was met. However, during the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme will have an increase student numbers of up to 220 in 2019 – 20 academic year as the programme becomes established. The visitors would like to recommend that if this happens the education provider considers working closely with current and other placement providers to ensure the number and range of placement settings and practice educators is appropriate for the projected student numbers. If the number of students on the programme increases significantly the visitors remind the programme team that they must inform the HCPC through the major change process.

Clare Bates  
Paul Bates  
Bob Fellows

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	The University of Northampton
<b>Programme name</b>	BA (Hons) in Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Work based learning
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	22 – 23 October 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	5
Recommended outcome .....	6
Conditions.....	7
Recommendations.....	12

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'social worker' in England must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 15 December 2014 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 9 January 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as the social work profession came onto the register in 2012 and a decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing programmes from this profession. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider reviewed the programme and the professional body considered their accreditation of the programme. The education provider, the professional body and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider and the professional body outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Paula Sobiechowska (Social worker in England) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	50 per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	John Sinclair (The University of Northampton)
Secretary	Vivien Houghton (The University of Northampton)
Members of the joint panel	Caroline Hickman (The College of Social Work) Helen Keville (The College of Social Work) Ivna Reic (The University of Northampton) Rachel Dubsky (The University of Northampton) Alison Ewing (The University of Northampton) Shelley Briggs (University of central Lancashire) Lee Quinney (University of Wolverhampton)

	Sue Beacock (University of Hull) Jo Webb (MIND) Sam Dunkerley (Northamptonshire County Council) Natalie Campoin (The University of Northampton) Hannah Brighton (The University of Northampton)
--	---

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 submit further evidence to show how applicants to the programme are accurately advised on current bursary circumstances and allocations.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit the visitors were guided to the course fact sheet. The visitors noted that the fact sheet states “A NHS Social Work bursary is available to support successful applicants during the course of their study” (page 1). However in a meeting with the programme team it was stated that 27 out of 29 students in the most recent cohort received bursaries and those who were not eligible received a grant from the university. The university grant is £1500 per year and therefore not equivalent to the bursaries received from the department of health which currently stand at £4862.50 (subject to variable tuition fees). The visitors noted that this information could be misleading to potential applicants leading to the assumption that all students would receive a comparative bursary. The visitors also consider this to be important information to allow potential applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to revisit and update admissions materials to accurately reflect the current circumstances and allocation of social work bursaries and grants.

### **2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to show how their equality and diversity policies are consistently implemented throughout the admissions process.

**Reason:** Documentation provided to support this standard referred to the education providers’ equality and diversity policy. The visitors were satisfied that the content of the policy was adequate to ensure equality and diversity in the admissions procedures, however, the visitors were unable to see how the policy was consistently applied in the interview process for applicants to the programme. In particular, the visitors noted that section 8.3 of the equality and diversity policy states “Ensuring that specific training and guidance is provided to those responsible for carrying out specific functions e.g. staff recruitment and selection or student admissions” (page 14). However, in a meeting with the programme team it was stated not all those involved in the admissions interviews had received equality and diversity training, in particular members of the service user and carer group. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to revisit the current equality and diversity training provided to all those involved in applicant interviews and provide further evidence on how the policy is implemented and monitored.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must submit further evidence to show how they act on information gathered through their monitoring and evaluation systems.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to a number of documents showing ways in which the education provider monitored the programme and gathered feedback from students, stakeholders and service users and carers. The visitors noted the systems in place to gather feedback, however, could not see how the information gathered through feedback was acted on and fed back into the programme. In a meeting with students it was highlighted that feedback was often given to the programme team, however, students were unable to see how their feedback had been acted on and how it had informed the content of the programme. For example, it was noted that students voiced the benefits of having a lecture hosted by a service user in year two of the programme and consequently requested more contact with service users and carers. However, the students had not received any further contact with service users and were not aware of any plans to involve them further in the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence on the mechanisms in place to ensure the education provider acts on feedback provided through monitoring and evaluation processes.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain students' consent when they are acting as service users in role play situations.

**Reason:** From the SETs mapping document provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that students would be informed about their right to confidentiality in the classroom and group work settings. However, in discussions with the programme team and students the visitors noted that there was not a formal process by which students would be able to give their consent when acting as service users in role plays, and other practical teachings. Also, the visitors could not see how students understood the risk of emotional distress through participating in role plays, and any impact on their academic progression if they chose to opt out of participating. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students on the programme will be able to give informed consent to participate in role play activities, when they are acting as service users.

### **3.15 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 education provider must provide further evidence on how attendance policies and monitoring mechanisms are clearly communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation provided that students are expected to attend a minimum 80 per cent of academic lectures. In discussion with the students it was highlighted that there is an attendance policy and that students are aware of when attendance is mandatory. However the students were not clear on the process used to record their attendance, or what repercussions there may be should their attendance

fall below the required threshold. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that registers were taken in every lecture and that students who missed two consecutive lectures would be contacted to discuss their circumstances and reasons for missing lectures. The visitors were satisfied with the processes stated by the programme team, however, could not be satisfied that the process was being consistently applied and clearly communicated to students. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how attendance policies are consistently applied, and, how students are made aware of how attendance is recorded and the repercussions should their attendance fall below the required threshold.

**5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information on how the programme will continue to provide an appropriate number of placements for the number of students on the programme at any one time.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team and practice educators, the visitors heard that one of the education providers' main placement providers, Northamptonshire County Council (NCC), was currently in special measures following recent Ofsted inspections. This has led to NCC currently not offering children and family practice placements to students. It was highlighted that this had an impact on the number of placements available to the programme and subsequently, to students. The visitors heard that the programme team had reduced student numbers in recent cohorts in order to ensure enough placements were available. The most recent cohort currently has 29 students in comparison to the proposed 50. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the current cohort were supported adequately by the number of placements available, they could not be sure that this would be maintained for future cohorts of 50 students per year. The visitors therefore require further clarity from the education provider on further placements that will be secured to support a 150 student cohort (across three years), or amendments to the proposed student numbers going forward.

**5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further information on how the programme will continue to provide an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placements setting for the number of students on the programme at any one time.

**Reason:** In discussions with the programme team and practice educators, the visitors heard that one of the education providers' main placement providers, Northamptonshire County Council (NCC), was currently in special measures following recent Ofsted inspections. This has led to NCC currently not offering children and family practice placements to students. It was highlighted that many placements would provide their own placements educators, meaning that a reduction in placements also meant a reduction in placement educators available to support students. The visitors heard that the programme team had reduced student numbers in recent cohorts in order to ensure enough placements were available. The most recent cohort currently has 29 students in comparison to the proposed 50. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the current cohort were supported adequately by the number of placements and placement educators

available, they could not be sure that this would be maintained for future cohorts of 50 students per year. The visitors therefore require further clarity from the education provider on further placements and placement educators that will be secured to support a 150 student cohort (across three years), or amendments to the proposed student numbers going forward.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the current policy around refresher training for practice educators and the monitoring systems in place.

**Reason:** The documentation provided prior to the visit directed visitors to the placement calendar within the placement guidance document which highlights a recall day for practice educators. The visitors noted that this is one way for the programme to ensure its placement educators are undertaking appropriate training. The calendar states that "...is it advisable for Practice Teachers and/or On-site Supervisors to attend the recall day" (page 41). Further to this, in discussions with the programme team and practice educators, it was stated that recall days were not compulsory and there was currently no mechanism in place for recording attendance. The visitors could not identify any other opportunities for practice placement educators to take part in some form of refresher training as appropriate to their role. Therefore, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme team would ensure that all practice educators were up to date and ensured parity in training and assessment of students in the placement setting. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence that all practice placement educators will partake in some form of refresher training as appropriate to their role. The visitors also need to see what mechanisms will be in place to monitor placement educators' engagement with the training, including clear policies about non-engagement.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of how students are fully prepared for practice placements.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to specific modules within the curriculum that prepared students for the placement setting. However, in a meeting with students the visitors heard that there was inconsistency in the information provided to students in preparation for placements. In particular it was stated that students did not feel well supported on placement and felt that they were often put into situations which they were not prepared for. For example, students expressed concern in the level of responsibility they were given in the early stages of their placements. They felt that they had not been prepared for such a steep learning curve and had not expected to be

in such a position of power. In a meeting with the programme team the visitors heard that students are advised of what to expect in placement through the curriculum content and in specific placement preparation lectures. The visitors were satisfied that the material to prepare students for practice placements contained relevant information, but, could not be certain that information around practice placement preparation was being adequately communicated to, and understood by students. Therefore the visitors require further information on the mechanisms in place to ensure that students are well informed about what is expected of them, their responsibilities during a placement, and, how the programme team ensure that this information has been understood.

**6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Condition:** The education provider must revisit the step off award titles to ensure that approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to the protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

**Reason:** From documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the programme contains three exit routes as follows: PGCert Social Work, PGDip Social Work and BA Social Work. In meeting the programme team it was highlighted that a request has been made to the Deputy Director of Student and Academic Services to implement a supplementary regulation that ensures the protected title of social work is not in any exit award titles that do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration. However this has not yet been implemented or confirmed. The visitors note that the use of “social work” in exit award titles could be misleading to applicants and students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the titles of exit awards to ensure that approved programmes are the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title.

## Recommendations

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the application process, specifically the e-mail application, to enable the programme team to make an appropriate decision about whether to offer the applicant a place on the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that as part of the recruitment process, applicants are required to submit a written exercise via e-mail. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the content of the written exercise was appropriate, it was noted that there was no way of identifying if the applicant was the author of the application. The visitors were satisfied that, following the e-mail application, there were other mechanisms in the selection process to appropriately inform the education providers decision to ensure suitable applicants were offered a place on the programme. However, they recommend the programme team reconsiders the use of an e-mail application to further enable them to make an appropriate decision about whether to offer the applicant a place on the programme.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest that the education provider considers reviewing the programme specification to ensure consistency throughout the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided and number of documents to support this standard which showed that the programme resources to support student learning are effectively used. They also spoke with students on the programme who stated that they felt well supported by the available resources on the programme. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the programme specification had an inconsistency in the way in which it displayed key skills for the programme. In particular, key skill C1 states “Make decisions, set goals and construct specific plans to achieve these, taking into account relevant factors including legislation and ethical guidelines” (page 5). However, in the same document, key skill C1 states “Key Skill 1 e.g. Communication Skills” (page 17). The visitors consider that whilst current students felt well informed on the curriculum, an inconsistency in the ways in which key skills are stated presents a risk to the accurate teaching of key skills for future cohorts. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider revisits the programme specification to ensure that the resources to support student learning in all settings continue to be effectively used.

### **3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing how the whistleblowing policy is communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors could see that there was an appropriate whistleblowing policy in place that was accessible to students, and were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that, whilst the student handbook mentions

whistleblowing as a responsibility for students, there is no guidance on the process to take should a student need to raise a complaint. Further to this, in a meeting with students, it was highlighted that students were aware of the policy but not necessarily aware of how to implement it should the need arise. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team review the process used to communicate the policy to students and the steps they should take if needed.

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the current provision of service user and carer representatives for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there is a small number of service users and carers involved in the programme. In addition to this, it was highlighted that service users and carers were primarily involved in the recruitment process which required the involvement of four service users and carers at any one time. The visitors were satisfied that this involvement ensures the standard is met, however, considered there to be a risk to this form of involvement with such a small provision of service users and carers. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider considers expanding the current provision of service users and carers for the programme and consider alternative mechanisms for their involvement.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Recommendation:** The education provider should consider reviewing the current range placement provisions for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors met with students and placement educators who advised of the range of placements students were currently and had previously undertaken. Whilst concern was raised about the limited number of placements in children's services, it was stated that there were some placements available in this area and the visitors were therefore satisfied that the current range of placements was appropriate. However, in a meeting with the programme team, it was highlighted that one of the education providers' main placement providers, Northamptonshire County Council (NCC), was currently in special measures following recent Ofsted inspections. It was also highlighted that this placement provider was the main provision of placements in children's services leaving the programme with a limited range of placements to offer students. The visitors consider there to be a risk to the range of placements the education provider can offer students. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider expands the placement provision, particularly in children's services, to ensure there continues to be an appropriate range of placements to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

David Childs  
Paula Sobiechowska  
Kathleen Taylor

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University Campus Suffolk
<b>Validating body / Awarding body</b>	University of East Anglia and University of Essex
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	25 – 26 November 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 January 2014. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	April 2015
Chair	Neil Cooper (University Campus Suffolk)
Secretary	Alison McQuin (University Campus Suffolk)
Members of the joint panel	Anne Johnston (Internal Panel Member) Amanda Blaber (External Panel Member) Sue Innes (External Panel Member) Emma Parker (External Panel Member) Stephen Smith (External Panel Member) Gavin Tash (External Panel Member) Kay Thompson (External Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Operating department practitioner and nursing programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining five SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular that the selection process will not be held on two consecutive days.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with information at the visit regarding the admissions process, which requires applicants to attend an interview at a selection day before being offered a place on the programme. The information provided indicated that applicants would be invited to a two day selection process. During discussions with the programme team it was revealed that the two day selection process will not be held on two consecutive days, instead applicants will be informed after the first day whether they will be invited for the second stage of the interview which will be held on a different day. From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors could not see where this information was communicated to potential applicants to the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence as to how the programme team ensure that applicants to the programme are fully informed of the requirements of the selection process and in particular, that the selection process will not be held on two consecutive days. In this way the visitors can determine how applicants are fully informed about the admissions process before deciding to apply and take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided and during discussions with the senior management team at the visit, the visitors noted that plans to recruit an additional part time staff member have been agreed. However, from discussions with the senior team, it was clear that the additional part time staff member will not be in post until next year. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how, following the recruitment to this post, there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

### **3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that staff with specialist expertise and knowledge are in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** The education provider included staff curriculum vitae with the documentation. The visitors were content that some of the staff have specialist

expertise and knowledge to deliver this programme, however, they noted that only one staff member was a registered paramedic. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider is planning to recruit another member of staff who will be a paramedic and will also consider employing visiting paramedic tutors for the delivery of this programme. The visitors were concerned about whether subject areas were being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require information on any additional staffing resources that are in place to support the delivery of an effective programme, to include details of the visiting staff members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. Or any details on plans for further recruitment of subject specific staff members. This condition is in line with SET 3.5. The education provider should detail how they ensure that staff have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme effectively and how the professional aspects of practice will be delivered to students by those who don't have the professional knowledge and skills that they require to be a Registrant.

#### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the 'Educational Audit' tool used in approving and monitoring placements. However, the documentation did not provide information around how the process is used to ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place at practice placement setting. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors were told that local and regional work is currently on going in ensuring that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at practice placement setting via the 'East of England Paramedic Partnership Group meetings'. The visitors acknowledge that the Partnership group is still at early development stage. However, the visitors were unable to see from the use of the 'Educational Audit' and the 'East of England Paramedic Partnership Group meetings' how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting. To ensure this standard is met the visitors require further evidence to show that the education provider has systems in place and a monitoring mechanism to ensure that there are adequate numbers of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from discussions with the programme team that there will be placements in non-ambulance service settings. From the Paramedic course handbook it was clear that East Anglian Ambulance Trust will be providing the core placements for this programme but students will also 'experience working as a paramedic in an urban area'. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, specifically regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators and students in the placement settings are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** The documentation received included a practice placement handbook. However, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensured students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for each individual placement particularly regarding the students' scope of practice and expectation at each individual placement. Within the programme team meeting, the visitors were made aware that students will be fully prepared for placements by undergoing a placement induction. Discussions with the students revealed a varied experience of placement induction and also a varied impression regarding how well they felt prepared for

placement. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place which demonstrates how the education provider ensures students are fully prepared for placement and practice educators are made aware of students' scope of practice for each placement and expectation at placement. This standard is also link to the other condition placed on SET 5.11 above. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

## Recommendations

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the service users and carers are involved in the programmes and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, during discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that there are planned future developments with service user and carer involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as developing a forum for service users and carers. However, the programme team provided limited detail about how this would be done, or how the forum will directly impact this programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement. The visitors suggest that any developments, such as those mentioned, may lead to more robust service user and carer involvement in the programme and may provide a greater depth to students' learning and other aspects of the programme.

### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider considers engaging with current and other placement providers to ensure that the number of appropriately qualified practice educators is adequate for the student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, this recommendation is linked to the condition set on 5.6. Discussions with the programme team revealed, that in certain practice placement settings, the level of support provided to students by mentors will vary because the placement providers will provide students' placements for other programme. Which may result in mentors taking on more than one student at a time. Therefore, visitors would like to recommend that the education provider considers working closely with current and other placement providers to ensure the number of appropriately qualified practice educators is adequate for the student numbers.

### **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team revise the course handbook to clearly articulate the progression and development from level four to level six.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for students progression and achievement within the programme. Therefore, this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that the information presented to students could be stronger in guiding them through the progression and achievement expected from level four to level six. In particular it was noted that the course handbook could clearly articulate this information. The visitors suggest that by revising the course handbook students can gain a greater understanding of the skill level required at each stage of the programme.

Glyn Harding  
Mark Nevins

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Bedfordshire
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	9 – 10 December 2014

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	19

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title 'paramedic' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 January 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject, or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 16 January 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 26 March 2015.

## Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider validated the programme. The education provider and the HCPC formed a joint panel, with an independent chair and secretary, supplied by the education provider. Whilst the joint panel participated in collaborative scrutiny of the programme and dialogue throughout the visit; this report covers the HCPC's recommendations on the programme only. As an independent regulatory body, the HCPC's recommended outcome is independent and impartial and based solely on the HCPC's standards. A separate report, produced by the education provider, outlines their decisions on the programme's status.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, two cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	April 2015
Chair	Juliet Fern (University of Bedfordshire)
Secretary	Richard Hearing (University of Bedfordshire)
Members of the joint panel	Humphrey Shaw (Internal Panel Member) Tim Gregory (Internal Panel Member) Peter Hannell (External Panel Member) Anthony Kitchener (External Panel Member) Catherine Cracknell (External Panel Member)

## Sources of evidence

Prior to the visit the HCPC reviewed the documentation detailed below, sent by the education provider:

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Operating department practitioner programme as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

## Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be satisfied that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the relevant part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 24 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can be approved. Conditions are set when certain standards of education and training have not been met or there is insufficient evidence of the standard being met.

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can be approved. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Conditions

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 submit the finalised admission procedures and information that will be given to applicants

**Reason:** From the information provided regarding the admission procedures, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. During discussions with the senior team, it was revealed that the information given to applicants regarding the admission procedures has been updated since the time the documentation was submitted to the visitors. The visitors were provided with the updated admission information on the second day of the visit, but were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors require the programme team to submit the finalised admission procedures and information that will be given to applicants. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme meets this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **2.1 The admissions procedures 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 revisit programme advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are made aware of the costs of Disclosure and Barring Service checks associated with the programme on entry.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the 'Course and Unit Information Form' document which will be used to inform applicants about the programme. Discussions with the programme team revealed that students will be expected to pay for their own Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks. However, the visitors were unable to determine from the documentation submitted how costs of DBS will be communicated to potential applicants. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the programme documentation including advertising materials, to ensure that potential applicants are informed of any costs associated with DBS checks. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

### **2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the admissions procedures and how they ensure that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors were provided with a statement regarding DBS checks in the Course and Unit Information Forms document (page 3), which states applicants must “undergo Disclosure and Baring Service Clearance”. From this information the visitors were unable to determine how the DBS check is applied and how policies are structured to deal with any issues that would arise as a result of the check. The visitors were provided with information regarding DBS checks on the second day of the visit but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see evidence of the process in place for managing DBS checks. The visitors were also unable to determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto the programme if any issue does arise. Therefore, the visitors require further information about the DBS checks that are applied at the point of admission. In particular the visitors require further evidence of the education provider process and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if an issue arises.

#### **2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about the admissions procedures and how they ensure that successful applicants meet the education provider’s health requirements.

**Reason:** From the information provided in the documentation and in discussion at the visit, the visitors were clear that all students must complete a health declaration as part of the admissions process to the programme. The visitors were provided with a statement regarding health clearance in the Course and Unit Information Forms document (page 3), which states applicants must “undergo Occupational Health clearance, including appropriate vaccinations”. From this information the visitors were unable to determine the education provider process for determining what adjustments could or could not reasonably be made if health conditions were disclosed. The visitors were provided with information regarding health declarations on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see evidence of the process in place for managing health declarations. From the initial documentation, the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures apply the health declarations, how any issues that may arise would be dealt with. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student if adjustments would be required. Therefore the visitors require further information about the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission. In particular the visitors require further evidence about who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if adjustments are required.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation provided and during discussions with the senior management team at the visit, the visitors noted that plans to recruit an additional full time staff member have been agreed. However, from discussions with the senior team, it was clear that the additional full time staff member will not be in post until next year. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how, following the recruitment to this post, there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

### **3.6 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that staff with specialist expertise and knowledge are in place to deliver the programme.

**Reason:** The education provider included staff curriculum vitae with the documentation. The visitors were satisfied that some of the staff have specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver this programme, however, they noted that only one staff member was an HCPC registered paramedic. During discussions with the senior team and the programme team, the visitors learnt that the education provider is planning to recruit another member of staff who will be a paramedic and will also consider employing visiting paramedic tutors for the delivery of this programme. With the current profile of paramedic experience in the staff group, the visitors were concerned about whether subject areas were being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require information about any additional staff resources that are, or will be, in place to support the delivery of an effective programme, to include details of the visiting staff members of the programme team and their allocated areas of responsibility across the programme. This condition is in line with the condition for SET 3.5. The education provider should detail how they ensure that staff have relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the programme effectively.

### **3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised in line with any changes made to meet the conditions set as a result of this approval visit.

**Reason:** Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation and external visiting panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by internal panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that students routinely refer to as an important resource to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set by internal panel referred to amendments to module descriptors, the programme specification document and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review revised documentation to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

### **3.14 Where students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching and for managing situations when students decline from participating.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document (SET 3.14) submitted by the education provider stated that “the team are currently working on this protocol in preparation for the approval event”. The visitors were provided with a consent form on the second day of the visit but were unable to review this document due to time constraints. As such, the visitors did not see evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users and for managing situations when students decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of any formal protocols for obtaining informed consent from students before they participated as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. They also require evidence that demonstrates how students are informed about the requirement for them to participate, how records are maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. In particular, the visitors require evidence to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place so there would be no impact on their learning where students declined from participation.

### **3.15 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 education provider must identify where students’ attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify the attendance requirements for students or how students were informed about the mandatory elements of the programme. In discussion with the students from the Operating department practitioner programme there was some confusion regarding understanding of the attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms for this programme. The programme team highlighted that they expect full attendance at all times from students. However, the visitors were unable to see where in the documentation this requirement was communicated to students. Through discussion with the programme team, the visitors learnt that for in house lectures, attendance sheets are sometimes used to monitor attendance and that poor attendance would be followed up. The visitors were provided with information regarding the attendance policy on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. From the documentation sent prior to the visit and discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme

### **3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further detail of the formal procedure in place to deal with any concerns about students' profession related conduct and how the procedure would be implemented.

**Reason:** From reviewing the documentation provided prior to the visit, and from discussions with the programme team, practice placement team and the students, the visitors were clear that there are mechanisms in place to deal with any misconduct of students in the education setting. The visitors were unclear, however, how concerns about students' profession-related conduct while on placement are relayed to the programme team, or how any issues would be dealt with by the education provider. The visitors were also unclear how any non-academic conduct issues would be dealt with by the education provider, or whether the students are aware how any issues could impact on future registration. The visitors were provided with information on fitness to practice procedures on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. Therefore, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms by which the education provider manage any concerns with students' profession-related conduct on placement and how this information will be communicated to students to ensure this standard is met.

### **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information about how they ensure that a sufficient number, duration and range of placements are available for all students who undertake this programme.

**Reason:** In discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware that there is a close working arrangement with the East of England Ambulance Trust. The visitors also noted from discussions with the placement providers and the programme team that East of England Ambulance Trust are responsible for providing suitable placements for students, rather than the staff team at the education provider. From the information provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the number, duration and range of placements offered by the East of England Ambulance Trust will be sufficient for students to meet the learning outcomes for the programme. The visitors were provided with further information about placements on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. The visitors therefore require further information which articulates how the programme team ensure that there are a sufficient number, duration and range of placements to support the delivery of the programme and enable students to meet the relevant learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

## **5.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further clarification of the formal processes used to allocate placements and ensure that all students get the experience they require to achieve the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a SOPs mapping document for the programme which linked the learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of proficiency. However, from the evidence provided at the visit it was clear that East of England Ambulance Trust are responsible for providing suitable placements for students, rather than the staff team at the education provider. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcomes of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement provider at the first placement meeting. From the information provided the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the placements undertaken by students will be sufficient for them to meet the learning outcomes required for successful completion of the programme. The visitors were provided with further information about placements on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensures that the allocation of placements provide students with sufficient placement experience to meet the required learning outcomes and subsequently the SOPs. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the allocation of placements work in practice and how the programme team ensure that the number, duration and range of these placements ensure that students can meet the required learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

## **5.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However, in considering the initial documentation submitted and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. From discussions with the programme team, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and student questionnaires feed into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is

considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

### **5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place within practice placements.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's equality and diversity policy under SET 6.6. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider's "equality and diversity policy and strategy covering all staff, students and stakeholders" will ensure equality and diversity policies are in place within practice placements. From a review of the initial documentation and discussions with the placement provider, the visitors noted that the East of England Ambulance Trust secure practice placements for students. The visitors could not find evidence of any formal mechanisms in place to ensure the quality of practice placements before they are used. From discussions with the programme team and practice placement providers the visitors noted that a number of informal mechanisms are used to check and monitor the equality and diversity policies are in place. The visitors highlighted that formal arrangements should be in place so that the education provider is able to ensure that practice placements have equality and diversity policies in place. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence that demonstrates how the programme ensures equality and diversity policies are in place within practice placements.

### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff.

**Reason:** From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the East of England Ambulance Trust hold a database of staff. Also, the visitors were told that local and regional work is currently on going to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at practice placement setting via the East of England Paramedic Partnership Group meetings. The visitors acknowledge that the Partnership group is still at early development stage. However, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this

standard is met, and require information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

### **5.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this standard, the education provider referenced the “Mentor registers held by Trust” in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that East of England Ambulance Trust are currently working with the University of East Anglia to develop a mentorship programme. The visitors learnt that the education provider can feed into this development programme, and that all practice placement educators will be expected to undergo the mentorship programme. From the discussions and initial documentation, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

### **5.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

**Reason:** From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educators training options that are offered to practice educators including a 15 credits Mentorship & Support for Professional Practice course. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator’s training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement

educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

### **5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of their processes to ensure placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements.

**Reason:** From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements. For this standard, the education provider referenced “mental health placements – with NMC Registered Mental Health nurses, Maternity placements – with NMC Registered Midwives”. From this, the visitors were unclear of the process in place in ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the “Mentor register held by Trusts” will record practice educator registration. From the discussions and documentation, it was unclear how the education provider would be involved in maintaining responsibility for ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered if the registration of practice educators are held by the Trust. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place in ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for non-ambulance service placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from discussions with the programme team that there will be placements in non-ambulance service settings. From the course handbook it was clear that the East of England Ambulance Trust will be providing the core placements for this programme but students will also experience working as a paramedic in an urban area. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, specifically regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given

sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- the learning outcomes to be achieved;
- the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;
- expectations of professional conduct;
- the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and
- communication and lines of responsibility.

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further information as to how the education provider ensures placement educators and students are fully prepared for placements.

**Reason:** The visitors could not determine from the practice placement handbook how the education provider ensured students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for each individual placement particularly regarding the students' scope of practice and expectations of both the students and practice placement educators at each individual placement. At the programme team meeting, the visitors were made aware that students will be prepared for placements by undergoing a placement induction. Discussions with the students revealed a varied experience of placement induction and also a varied impression regarding how well they felt prepared for placement. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place which demonstrates how the education provider ensures students are fully prepared for placement and practice educators are made aware of students' scope of practice for each placement and expectation of both the students and practice placement educators at placement. This condition is linked to the other condition placed on SET 5.11 above. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to support the way the placement educators and students will be prepared.

**5.13 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place throughout practice placements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of how they ensure a range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues are in place throughout practice placements.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted under SET 5.13 that the education provider has stated "To be discussed at approval event". From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine whether there is a process in place throughout practice placement that ensures the learning and teaching methods respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues. Therefore, the visitors, require further evidence that there is a system in place that ensures, where possible, service users are aware that students are involved and appropriate consent has been sought. In this way the visitors can determine how the education programme can meet this standard.

## **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.6. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that demonstrates how the education provider ensure that there are effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment of students. The visitors were provided with information on the mechanisms in place on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see documentation that defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that the education provider has effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment of students. In this way the visitors can determine how the education programme can meet this standard.

## **6.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.**

**Condition:** The programme team must clarify the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, and how this information will be communicated to students.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.7. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that demonstrates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme. From the discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear how the programme team assess students to make sure that they continue to progress within the programme and how this information would be communicated to students. The visitors were unable to see how the assessment regulations regarding student progressions and achievements would be made clear to students so they can understand what is expected of them at each stage of the programme. The visitors were provided with information on student progression and assessment regulations on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see documentation that defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. The visitors therefore, require the programme team to specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme, in particular how this information will be communicated to students.

**6.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide evidence that they have regulations or policies in place that ensure that any interim award made available to students will not provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.8. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that demonstrates requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC protected title or part of the Register in their named award. Discussion with the programme team revealed that currently there is no interim award, however, the programme team are in discussion to introduce a non-titled exit award. The visitors require evidence that final arrangements for the provision of exit awards are made in line with HCPC requirements to be satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see documentation which defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. The visitors require evidence that demonstrates the education provider has regulations or policies in place that ensure that any interim award made available to students will not provide eligibility to apply for HCPC registration, and that the programme documentation clearly articulates this.

**6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must clearly articulate an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.9. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that clearly articulates an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors could not determine where there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard, on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see documentation which defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. The visitors could therefore not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the assessment regulation around this standard and that there is a clear statement included in the programme documentation regarding aegrotat awards and that this is accessible to students.

### **6.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for students.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate there are procedures in place for the right of appeal for students.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.10. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that demonstrates that there are procedures in place for the right of appeal for students and how this information would be communicated to students. Discussions with the programme team revealed a university wide process in place for dealing with rights of appeals for students. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors also did not see documentation which defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. The visitors therefore require further information that clarifies the appeals procedure for students and details how students are told about the right to appeal to ensure this standard is met.

### **6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must include a clear statement in the programme documentation that at least one external examiner for the programme will be from the relevant part of the Register, or agree other arrangements.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures under SET 6.11. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors found it hard to navigate through the site and locate the appropriate information that clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner being appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register. The visitors were provided with additional information around this standard on the second day of the visit, but did not have sufficient time to review the evidence. As such, the visitors did not see documentation which defined the programme's assessment regulations for this standard. This standard requires that the assessment regulations of the programme state that at least one of the external examiners appointed to the programme needs to be appropriately registered or that suitable alternative arrangements should be agreed. Therefore the visitors require evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the appointment of external examiners to the programme have been included in the relevant documentation to ensure that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

### **3.17 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the service users and carers are involved in the programmes and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, during discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that the service users and carers group that contribute to other health programmes at the education provider, will also be involved with this programme. The programme team indicated that there are planned future developments with this group and that they will be involved in different aspects of the programme. However, the programme team provided limited detail about how this would be done, or how the involvement of this group of service users and carers will directly impact this programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team consider further strengthening the current and future plans for service user and carer involvement. The visitors suggest that any developments, such as those mentioned, may lead to more robust service user and carer involvement in the programme, may provide a greater depth to students' learning, and other aspects of the programme.

### **5.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors suggest the education provider considers engaging with current and other placement providers to ensure that the number of appropriately qualified practice educators is adequate for the student numbers.

**Reason:** From the evidence provided in the programme documentation and the programme team meeting at the visit, this recommendation is linked to the condition set on 5.6. Discussions with the programme team revealed, that in certain practice placement settings, the level of support provided to students by mentors will vary because the placement providers will provide students' placements for other programme. This may result in mentors taking on more than one student at a time. Therefore, visitors recommend that the education provider considers working closely with current and other placement providers to ensure the number of appropriately qualified practice educators is adequate for the student numbers.

Mark Nevins  
Susan Boardman  
Diane Whitlock