

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Brighton |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 19 – 20 November 2015 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 17 |

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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 January 2016 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 15 January 2016. 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 11 January 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2016.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme management and resources and practice placements. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

Visit details

| | |
|---|---|
| Name and role of HCPC visitors | Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic) Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer | Amal Hussein |
| HCPC observer | Richéal Carroll |
| Proposed student numbers | 50 per cohort per year |
| First approved intake | September 2016 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2016 |
| Chair | The education provider did not provide an independent chair |
| Secretary | Alice Collier (University of Brighton) |

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 ongoing 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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 27 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 31 SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 visitors reviewed the documentation provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's equality and diversity of policies. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors were unable access the information that clearly articulated 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. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students, but were not clear from the discussions how this policy works, or 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 demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In scrutinising evidence, the visitors noted the statement that the Health Education England, Kent Surrey and Sussex (HEEKSS) have commissioned 50 places for 2015, however the business plan statement made no reference to the education provider's commitment to support this programme or the education provider commitment to providing enough resources to deliver the programme. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme and model of study through its secure place in the business plan of the institution.

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, the visitors were unable to determine the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective

programme. The visitors noted inconsistent references of staff-to-student ratio throughout the documentation, although HCPC does not prescribe staff-to-student ratio the visitors were unable to determine from the evidence the overall staffing within the programme. In discussions with the senior management team at the visit, the visitors noted that plans to recruit an additional lecture-practitioner member of staff has been agreed. However, 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: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine if subject areas are been taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CVs and descriptions of the modules. However, from a review of the documentation the visitors could not see which member of staff was responsible for each module. As a result, the visitors were therefore unable to determine what subject areas are being taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors therefore require further information that demonstrates who the module leaders are for each module.

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

Condition: The programme team must review the programme documentation to support student learning, to ensure it reflects the programme accurately and uses clear and up-to-date terminology.

Reason: The visitors noted that there were a number of instances of out-of-date terminology in use in the documentation submitted. For example, the 'Paramedic Practice Handbook' refers to the HCPC's former name "HPC". The visitors also noted in the same documentation (page 37) "The number of hours of attendance on courses leading to registration is laid down by the Health and Care Professions Council". This is incorrect as we do not stipulate attendance for education and training programmes, it is the education provider's responsibility to identify where attendance is mandatory and to have the necessary associated monitoring mechanisms in place. Furthermore, the visitors noted on page 41 "Health Care Professions Council (HCPC) for the protection of the public in The Standards of Conduct and Ethics (2012)". This should read as "the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics". It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the HCPC and HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscaper of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Paramedics.

Reason: The visitors noted that while the programme lead is not currently HCPC registered, they are NMC registered. The visitors were therefore satisfied with this arrangement. However, the visitors noted that the documentation and information given to students made several references to NMC requirements throughout the programme documentation. For example, the Paramedic Practice Handbook page 41, “the University of Brighton confers eligibility to apply for registration as a practitioner with the NMC or HCPC” and “The University also has to confirm to the NMC that graduates are fit to practise and are of good health and good character as defined by the NMC”. In addition, the visitors noted that the online audit form that students are required to complete made reference to the NMC student code of conduct as opposed to the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Paramedics. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for Paramedics.

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 programme team must provide further evidence that the attendance policies are communicated clearly and accurately to students.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted the attendance policy on page 37 of the student handbook. In scrutinising the evidence, the visitors noted that 80% is the minimum requirement of attendance for this programme “if 80 per cent of timetabled sessions is not achieved, in order to complete the module students need to demonstrate to the module leader...that they have worked towards the learning achievement”. The visitors were therefore satisfied with the processes in place to monitor student attendance. However, the attendance policy states “The number of hours of attendance on course leading to registration is laid down by the Health and Care Professions Council”. This is incorrect, as the HCPC does not stipulate attendance requirements on education and training programmes. Furthermore, in discussions with the students there was some confusion of the process that would be followed should their attendance fall below expectation. As such, the visitors require further evidence that the process regarding attendance is clearly and accurately communicated to students.

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 procedures in place to deal with any concerns about students’ profession related conduct and how it may be implemented throughout the programme.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation provided, 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 student misconduct in the education setting. The visitors were unclear, however, how concerns about students' profession-related conduct whilst 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 HCPC registration. Furthermore, the visitors noted that the documentation makes reference to primarily the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) fitness to practise procedures. As such, the visitors require evidence of the formal mechanisms by which the education provider manage any concerns with students' profession-related conduct on placement to ensure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service users and carer involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme, such as admissions and programme delivery. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. At the visit, the programme team indicated that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but provided limited details about how the involvement will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussions or from 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.

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

Condition: Further evidence to demonstrate how students completing the programme are able to practise safely and effectively.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that the programme reflected the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge articulated in the College of Paramedic (CoP) 2008 (version 2) curriculum guidance. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme team were not aware that they did not map to the latest curriculum guidance produced by CoP 2014 (version 3). From the discussions the visitors were unable to determine how, without the reflection of the most current curriculum guidance, student completing this programme are able to practise safely and effectively. The visitors therefore, require further information determine how the programme team ensure students completing the programme are safe and effective in the absence of the programme not being mapped to the most latest curriculum guidance.

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: From a review of the initial documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the programme team ensures that the curriculum remain relevant to current practice. The visitors noted in the SETs mapping document, the evidence outlined were “student will evaluating each module and the course board meetings will receive feedback from practice placement facilitator”. However, the visitors noted that the curriculum makes reference to out of date guidance such as College of Paramedic (CoP) 2008 (version 2) curriculum guidance. In addition to this, the programme leader is not a HCPC registered Paramedic. In the discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme leader despite not being a paramedic is heavily involved in the Paramedic profession as well as being a part of a number of steering groups for the profession. However, the visitors were not presented with any evidence to support this and therefore were unable to determine how the programme team will ensure that the curriculum will remain relevant to current practice. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the mechanisms that the programme team will have in place, such as ongoing research or professional practice activity, to keep the curriculum up-to-date with the current practice for the profession. This way, the visitors will be able to determine the mechanisms that will be in place to ensure that the curriculum will remain current.

4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the curriculum ensures that students understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to find evidence to outline where HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics were referred to in the programme curriculum and how the education provider ensures that students understand these standards, including how and where they apply. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the programme team ensure that students on the programme understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

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 evidence of the range of placement settings that students will experience to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department

of a hospital. However, the visitors could not identify how placements would be sourced and allocated to the large number of students for this programme. The visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the different placement settings, such as the non-ambulance setting, that were on offer to students, and which of these settings students would be required to attend. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures a range of placements to support the delivery of the programme, and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure a safe and supportive environment at alternative (non-ambulance) placement settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process which demonstrated that placements provided by SECAMB provide a safe and supportive environment for students. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show there is a process to ensure a safe and supportive environment at placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place for placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the ones in place for placements at SECAMB, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures a safe and supportive environment at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a thorough and effective system of approving and monitoring placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process intended to demonstrate that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements at SECamb. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place for placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the ones in place for placements at SECamb, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring placements at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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 to demonstrate how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place at alternative (non-ambulance) placement settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process which demonstrated that equality and diversity policies are in place for practice placements at SECamb. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that there is a process to ensure there are equality and diversity policies at alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the ones in place for placements at SECamb,

but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are in place at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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 “Database maintained by SECAMB Practice Placement Facilitator” 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 SECAMB hold a database of staff. From the documentation and discussions 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 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.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. In discussions with the placement providers, the visitors learnt the audit process conducted by SECAMB to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place in practice placements. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show there is a process in place to ensure an adequate number of staff in alternative (non-ambulance) settings placements, who are appropriately qualified and experienced. The programme team informed visitors that that there are similar processes in place for placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the ones in place for placements at SECAMB, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the

placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff are in place within placements at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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 “All clinical learning is supervised by HCPC registered paramedics or by Nursing and Midwifery Council [NMC] registered practitioners” in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. 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 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.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators in alternative (non-ambulance) settings have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. In discussions with the placement providers, the visitors learnt the audit process conducted by SECamb to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience in practice placements. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show there is a process to ensure staff at alternative (non-ambulance) settings have relevant skills, knowledge and experience. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the one in place for placements at SECamb, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings 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 evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in alternative (non-ambulance) settings have undertaken appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. In discussions with the placement providers, the visitors learnt the audit process conducted by SECamb to ensure that practice placement educators at SECamb undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show a process to ensure that practice placement educators will undertake appropriate practice placement educator training in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the one in place for placements at SECamb but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in alternative (non-ambulance) settings are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. In discussions with the placement providers, the visitors learnt the audit process conducted by SECamb to ensure practice placement educators at SECamb are appropriately registered. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that the education provider has a process in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the one in place for placements at SECamb, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education

provider ensures all practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings are appropriately registered, or to agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

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 SECAMB 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.

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 that any aegrotat award conferred on a graduate of this programme will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation provided prior to the visit and noted a web link to the education provider's regulation and procedures. Upon reviewing the web link, the visitors were unable to locate the information that clearly articulates an aegrotat award will not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards conferred by the education provider would not enable those students 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.

Recommendations

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the programme team continue to monitor and develop the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Reason: From the tour of resources at the visit, the visitors were made aware of the variety and volume of resources available to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. They were therefore satisfied that this standard is met at a threshold. However, in discussion at the visit a number of students highlighted that the resources available to them is limited particularly in relation to profession specific resources, however the programme team are very always on hand to ensure that resource is available to them. In discussion with the senior team, the visitors were made aware that further resources will be purchased ahead of the increase in student numbers which should ease demand on resources. The visitors would therefore like to recommend that the education provider continue to monitor and develop the learning resources available to students on the programme, to ensure that they continue to effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Mark Nevins
Mark Woolcock
Sid Jeewa

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Programme name | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (SWAST) |
| Mode of delivery | Flexible |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 29 – 30 October 2015 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 16 |

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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 December 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 15 January 2016. 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 19 January 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2016.

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 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 | John Donaghy (Paramedic) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Susan Boardman (Paramedic) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 30 per cohort, one cohort per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | April 2016 |
| First approved intake | 1 January 2016 |
| Chair | Alison Hampson (University of Cumbria) |
| Secretary | Suzanne Parkes (University of Cumbria) |

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 as the programme is new and as such there is currently no external examiner.

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 FdSc Paramedic Practice, 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 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 18 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 provide evidence, such as revisions to the advertising materials, which ensure that students' are aware that their academic study can be suspended at any time.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that the mode of study for this programme is full time or part time. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that if there are national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time. The visitors noted that this information was not reflected in the documentation and in particular advertising materials. As such, the visitors were unsure how students and applicants to the programme are aware that their studies may be suspended at any time. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence, such as revising the advertising materials, to demonstrate how students and applicants to the programme are made aware that students' academic study can be suspended at any time. In this way, the applicant can have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a 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 provide further evidence of the pre admissions information that will be available to ensure that potential applicants are able to make an informed choice about applying to this programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors saw references to admissions requirements in the programme specification and in discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware that admissions materials will be sent to all applicants via a closed web link. This closed web link will contain all the key information about the programme and key admissions information. However, the visitors noted that this web based resource has not yet been developed. Without being able to scrutinise the content presented on the web link and the visitors were unable to determine if and how key information will be provided to potential applicants such as the requirement for a criminal convictions and health checks, English language requirements and information regarding the structure of the programme. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore, require further evidence of the admissions information that will be made available to potential applicants, to ensure that they have all the information they require to be able to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In scrutinising evidence, the visitors noted that the majority of the programme will be delivered offsite, however the business plan statement made no reference to the education provider's commitment to support this model of training. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme and model of study through its secure place in the business plan of the institution.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how they intend to managed student's progression through the programme on a full time, part time and intercalation route.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that students are employed by ambulance trusts and that they can study this programme on a full time or part time basis to suit their working situation. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that if there is national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time to ease any potential staffing shortfalls. The visitors were not aware that intercalation could occur on this programme as they could not find any information regarding this in the documentation that was provided to them pre-visit. During their meeting with the visitors the programme team discussed how they intend to support students if their programme were to be suspended for a period of time and highlighted their experience of managing intercalation on their other HCPC approved programme. However, the visitors could not determine from this information how the education provider will effectively manage periods on this programme when students are suspended from studies to ensure that students can effectively stop and start their academic studies with little notice. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify from the evidence provided what mechanisms the programme team will use to effectively manage the experience for all students, regardless of their method of study or periods of suspension. As such, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider and programme team will effectively manage this programme. In particular this evidence will need to detail how any period of intercalation will be managed and what mechanisms are in place to ensure that all students will get parity of experience despite the different ways they may study the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate areas of responsibility across all areas of the programme to demonstrate that the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the lines of responsibility for the education provider and the staff at the training sites based in the partnership ambulance services. In discussions at the visit it was articulated that the education provider would have overall responsibility for the

programme. When the visitors asked for clarification about the roles and responsibilities of the different people delivering the programme they were provided with a generic honorary contract agreement on day two of the visit. However, the contract did not provide detail about the roles and responsibilities of staff contracted by the education provider to deliver the programme at the partner ambulance trusts. As such, and without evidence of who is accountable for the delivery of each aspect of the programme, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme will be effectively managed. The visitors were also unable to tell how the delegation of responsibility to ambulance service staff would ensure that the education provider has the information it needs to maintain overall responsibility for every aspect of the programme. The visitors therefore need further evidence to determine what aspects of programme delivery are delegated to staff at partner organisations and how this is delegation will work to provide the education provider the information they require to effectively manage 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 of the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff that will be in place at the training sites to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided and the information provided regarding staff profile, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff will be in place at the training sites to deliver an effective programme. In scrutinising evidence, such as the programme handbook and staff CV's the visitors were aware of the number of academic staff at the university. However, the visitors learned that significant proportion of the programme will be delivered offsite by contracted staff members who will be on "honorary contract agreements" and will be practice educators currently employed by the partnership ambulance trusts. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence about the number of staff that will be available to deliver this programme at the training centres hosted by the trusts. As such, the visitors were unable to identify the number of staff who would be contracted by the education provider to ensure an adequate number of staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

Furthermore, the visitors are aware that the education provider intends to approve three different training sites. However, the visitors were not provided with information around the recruitment of staff at these training sites and associated timelines and in particular what criteria the education provider will use to ensure that the staff at the sites are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver the required aspect of the programme. In addition, the visitors were unable to determine what contingency plans were in place if staff are unable to deliver aspect of the programme due service pressures. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at the training sites will be sufficient to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the mechanisms in place for staff recruitment at training sites.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure that subject areas being delivered offsite will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In scrutinising evidence, such as the honorary contract agreement and staff CV's the visitors were unable to identify the recruitment process in place for offsite staff and in particular how the education provider will ensure that staff contracted by the education provider will be appropriately qualified to deliver aspects of the programmes. Furthermore, the visitors were not provided with an outlined person specification and what aspect of the programme will be delivered by staff at training sites. As such, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether subject areas being delivered offsite will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge and further evidence will be needed to demonstrate that the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process undertaken to ensure training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware upon confirmation of approval from the HCPC the programme team intend to approve three training sites at partnership ambulance trusts. The visitors were provided with a document titled "approval management of offsite delivery" on the day of the visit. In scrutinising this evidence, the visitors noted that the document was a generic university wide policy on approving offsite delivery. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the programme team would approve training sites to ensure that that they have appropriate resources in place to support student learning before sending students to the sites. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to identify if students at certain training sites lacked access to any resources, such as equipment to support clinical study. The visitors were also unclear how these processes would ensure parity of access to resources for students across all placement areas, and what the team would do to address any issues about resource access should they arise. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all students have access to the resources they require in order to successfully complete the programme. They also require further detail of the approval process in place that will enable the programme team to ensure that students across training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how they ensure that the resources including IT facilities across training sites are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff.

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors were aware of the learning resources including IT facilities that are being offered by the education provider such as an online library and an academic skills community. However, the majority of this programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at training site

centres. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the programme team would approve training site centres to ensure that they have appropriate resources including IT facilities. However, the visitors could not determine how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to ensure that resources across all training site centres are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to student and staff. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to how the approval process conducted by the programme team ensures that there are sufficient resources including IT facilities across all training site centres. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will ensure that the resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff across all training site centres. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used and how the programme may meet this standard.

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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students who successfully complete all of the modules to meet SOPs for paramedics. However, considering applicants are able to gain entry to the programme at Level 5, the visitors could not determine the criteria and / or the process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route should be exempted from undertaking particular modules and meeting certain learning outcomes. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be satisfied these students will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempted from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided and the information provided regarding the curriculum of the programme, the visitors could not determine how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum. In scrutinising evidence, such as the programme handbook, the visitors noted the "Year two draft practice structure timetable". From the timetable the visitors were unable to determine how theory and practice will be combined particularly as the programme team envision that students will work through the online content whenever they have free time at work. Furthermore, in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that that students will have protected time allocated to them. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how this allocation of time will be managed as they were unclear how the partner ambulance trusts could commit to this and it wasn't

reflected in the timetable provided. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the integration of theory and practice was central to the curriculum. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme team intends to redraft the current timetable to reflect better integration of theory and practice. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate and effectively delivers the curriculum.

Reason: In scrutinising the evidence provided, in particular section six of the programme handbook “programme teaching and learning methods” the visitors noted that the teaching methodology included “online and class based workshop activities and use of virtual electronic learning environment”. In discussions with the programme team, it was clarified to the visitors that this meant that a large proportion of the programme will be delivered online. From the evidence provided however, the visitors could not determine how this method of delivery would be effective in delivering the curriculum. In particular the visitors could not determine how and when the online lectures would be released, the types of tasks that student would be required to complete and how the programmes delivery would be structured. As such, the visitor require the programme team to provide further evidence of this learning approach. The visitors require this detail to be clearly articulated in the programme documentation to demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used will ensure effective delivery of the curriculum.

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 and experienced staff at practice placement settings.

Reason: From the initial documentation and the information provided at the visit regarding the approval and monitoring of placements In scrutinising evidence, such as the multi professional audit template document, and discussions at the visit the visitors learnt that the partner ambulance trusts, South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAST), hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators. The visitors were told that the partner trusts would feedback to the education providers regarding how many number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff were at each practice placement setting. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of how this will be done or how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of qualified and experience staff at practice placement settings across the partnership trusts. The visitors could therefore not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. As such the visitors will require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme can meet this standard.

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 to deliver the required aspects of the programme.

Reason: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the process for ensuring that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience depends on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NAST the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training ensures that placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts any practice placement educator has the knowledge skills and experience to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

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: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the training for practice placement educators to prepare them for supervising and mentoring students on this programme depend on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NAST the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training is appropriate and ensures that placement educators are fully prepared for placement. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts

any practice placement educator is has undertaken appropriate training and are fully prepared to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate training to prepare them to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all practice placement providers.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors considered documentation which detailed South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWSTR) as the two trusts the education provider will be working with. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the practice placement coordinator liaised with practice placement providers and that contact was tailored to individual partner trusts needs. The practice placement providers and educators whom the visitors met all felt they had sufficient contact with the programme team and were able to contribute to the programme's development. The programme team also indicated practice placement providers were able to provide informal feedback on the programme and many did so. However, from a review of the evidence it was clear that there was no formalised system in place to ensure regular, effective collaboration between the partner ambulance trusts and the education provider. This meant that, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider and the practice placement providers will regularly work in a joint manner and that communication will happen in both directions regardless of any possible changes to the partnerships. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence about the measures that are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice placement providers.

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 to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement.

Reason: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the training for practice placement

educators to prepare them for supervising and mentoring students on this programme depend on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NWAAT the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training ensures that placement educators are fully prepared for placement. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts any practice placement educator is fully prepared to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant training to prepare them to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students who successfully complete all of the modules to meet SOPs for paramedics. However, the visitors noted that applicants are able to gain entry to the programme at Level 5 through the utilisation of the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy. But from the evidence provided they could not determine the criteria and / or the process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route have already met certain learning outcomes and as such can be exempted from undertaking particular modules. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how many attempts applicants will be able to submit their practice portfolio for assessment through the AP(E)L policy. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be that students accessing the programme through the AP(E)L policy will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempted from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are assessed as able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information on the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that the mode of study for this programme is full time or part time. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that although students can progress through the programme either on a full time or part time basis, if there is national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time. From the documentation, the visitors were not aware that intercalation was an option for this programme as this information was not addressed. At the visit, the programme team discussed how they intend to support students if their academic study were to be suspended for a period of time, in addition they commented on their experience of managing intercalation on their other HCPC approved programme. However, because the visitors were not provided with enough information, they were unable to determine how the education provider will assess students to make sure that they continue to progress within the programme despite any interruptions. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify how progression routes through the programme will be made clear to students and what impact any suspension of studies would have each time their study is suspended. As such, the visitors require further information on the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme to determine that this standard can be met.

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 provide further evidence to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which awards do not.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that there was an exit award available to students studying this programme. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, the visitors could not determine how the evidence provided in the discussions were reflected in the programme documentation to ensure that students are aware of which awards provide eligibility to apply to the Register. For example in the Approval visit document (page three) it states "Successful completion of all Level 4 modules and the qualificatory practice unit allows an exit point, if desired, with a Certificate HE in Pre-Hospital and Emergency Care". The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence which ensures that students are aware that exiting with a "Certificate HE in Pre-Hospital and Emergency Care" will not confer eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way they can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

Recommendations

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that there is clarity for students about who the programme leader is.

Reason: From a reviewing of the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document and the staff curriculum vitae, the visitors noted who the programme leader is and were satisfied that they have overall professional responsibility for this programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where students were informed about who the programme leader was. In particular they could not find in the programme handbook any information to this effect. As such, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that there is clear and consistent information for students about who the programme leader is.

John Donaghy
Susan Boardman
Simon Mudie

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Programme name | Dip HE Paramedic Practice (NAST) |
| Mode of delivery | Flexible |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 29 – 30 October 2015 |

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 2 |
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Visit details | 3 |
| Sources of evidence | 4 |
| Recommended outcome | 5 |
| Conditions..... | 6 |
| Recommendations..... | 16 |

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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 December 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 15 January 2016. 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 19 January 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 12 February 2016.

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 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 | John Donaghy (Paramedic) Simon Mudie (Lay visitor) Susan Boardman (Paramedic) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 15 per cohort, one cohort per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | April 2016 |
| First approved intake | 1 January 2016 |
| Chair | Alison Hampson (University of Cumbria) |
| Secretary | Suzanne Parkes (University of Cumbria) |

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 as the programme is new and as such there is currently no external examiner.

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 FdSc Paramedic Practice, 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 40 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 18 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 provide evidence, such as revisions to the advertising materials, which ensure that students' are aware that their academic study can be suspended at any time.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that the mode of study for this programme is full time or part time. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that if there are national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time. The visitors noted that this information was not reflected in the documentation and in particular advertising materials. As such, the visitors were unsure how students and applicants to the programme are aware that their studies may be suspended at any time. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide further evidence, such as revising the advertising materials, to demonstrate how students and applicants to the programme are made aware that students' academic study can be suspended at any time. In this way, the applicant can have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a 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 provide further evidence of the pre admissions information that will be available to ensure that potential applicants are able to make an informed choice about applying to this programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors saw references to admissions requirements in the programme specification and in discussion with the programme team the visitors were made aware that admissions materials will be sent to all applicants via a closed web link. This closed web link will contain all the key information about the programme and key admissions information. However, the visitors noted that this web based resource has not yet been developed. Without being able to scrutinise the content presented on the web link and the visitors were unable to determine if and how key information will be provided to potential applicants such as the requirement for a criminal convictions and health checks, English language requirements and information regarding the structure of the programme. Without this information the visitors were unable to determine how the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore, require further evidence of the admissions information that will be made available to potential applicants, to ensure that they have all the information they require to be able to make an informed choice regarding whether to apply.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors could not discern how the education provider will ensure that the programme has, and will continue to have, a secure place in the education provider's business plan. In scrutinising evidence, the visitors noted that the majority of the programme will be delivered offsite, however the business plan statement made no reference to the education provider's commitment to support this model of training. At the visit, the visitors met with the senior team and learnt that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. Discussions covered financial security of the programme and security for students if the programme was deemed no longer viable. However, because this was not documented, the visitors require further evidence to be satisfied that the programme can meet this standard. The visitors therefore require further evidence which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme and model of study through its secure place in the business plan of the institution.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how they intend to managed student's progression through the programme on a full time, part time and intercalation route.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that students are employed by ambulance trusts and that they can study this programme on a full time or part time basis to suit their working situation. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that if there is national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time to ease any potential staffing shortfalls. The visitors were not aware that intercalation could occur on this programme as they could not find any information regarding this in the documentation that was provided to them pre-visit. During their meeting with the visitors the programme team discussed how they intend to support students if their programme were to be suspended for a period of time and highlighted their experience of managing intercalation on their other HCPC approved programme. However, the visitors could not determine from this information how the education provider will effectively manage periods on this programme when students are suspended from studies to ensure that students can effectively stop and start their academic studies with little notice. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify from the evidence provided what mechanisms the programme team will use to effectively manage the experience for all students, regardless of their method of study or periods of suspension. As such, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how the education provider and programme team will effectively manage this programme. In particular this evidence will need to detail how any period of intercalation will be managed and what mechanisms are in place to ensure that all students will get parity of experience despite the different ways they may study the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate areas of responsibility across all areas of the programme to demonstrate that the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the lines of responsibility for the education provider and the staff at the training sites based in the partnership ambulance services. In discussions at the visit it was articulated that the education provider would have overall responsibility for the

programme. When the visitors asked for clarification about the roles and responsibilities of the different people delivering the programme they were provided with a generic honorary contract agreement on day two of the visit. However, the contract did not provide detail about the roles and responsibilities of staff contracted by the education provider to deliver the programme at the partner ambulance trusts. As such, and without evidence of who is accountable for the delivery of each aspect of the programme, the visitors were unable to identify how the programme will be effectively managed. The visitors were also unable to tell how the delegation of responsibility to ambulance service staff would ensure that the education provider has the information it needs to maintain overall responsibility for every aspect of the programme. The visitors therefore need further evidence to determine what aspects of programme delivery are delegated to staff at partner organisations and how this is delegation will work to provide the education provider the information they require to effectively manage 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 of the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff that will be in place at the training sites to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided and the information provided regarding staff profile, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will ensure that an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff will be in place at the training sites to deliver an effective programme. In scrutinising evidence, such as the programme handbook and staff CV's the visitors were aware of the number of academic staff at the university. However, the visitors learned that significant proportion of the programme will be delivered offsite by contracted staff members who will be on "honorary contract agreements" and will be practice educators currently employed by the partnership ambulance trusts. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence about the number of staff that will be available to deliver this programme at the training centres hosted by the trusts. As such, the visitors were unable to identify the number of staff who would be contracted by the education provider to ensure an adequate number of staff are in place to deliver an effective programme.

Furthermore, the visitors are aware that the education provider intends to approve three different training sites. However, the visitors were not provided with information around the recruitment of staff at these training sites and associated timelines and in particular what criteria the education provider will use to ensure that the staff at the sites are appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver the required aspect of the programme. In addition, the visitors were unable to determine what contingency plans were in place if staff are unable to deliver aspect of the programme due service pressures. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at the training sites will be sufficient to deliver the programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the mechanisms in place for staff recruitment at training sites.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure that subject areas being delivered offsite will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In scrutinising evidence, such as the honorary contract agreement and staff CV's the visitors were unable to identify the recruitment process in place for offsite staff and in particular how the education provider will ensure that staff contracted by the education provider will be appropriately qualified to deliver aspects of the programmes. Furthermore, the visitors were not provided with an outlined person specification and what aspect of the programme will be delivered by staff at training sites. As such, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether subject areas being delivered offsite will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge and further evidence will be needed to demonstrate that the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the process undertaken to ensure training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware upon confirmation of approval from the HCPC the programme team intend to approve three training sites at partnership ambulance trusts. The visitors were provided with a document titled "approval management of offsite delivery" on the day of the visit. In scrutinising this evidence, the visitors noted that the document was a generic university wide policy on approving offsite delivery. In discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the programme team would approve training sites to ensure that that they have appropriate resources in place to support student learning before sending students to the sites. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to identify if students at certain training sites lacked access to any resources, such as equipment to support clinical study. The visitors were also unclear how these processes would ensure parity of access to resources for students across all placement areas, and what the team would do to address any issues about resource access should they arise. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme team ensures that all students have access to the resources they require in order to successfully complete the programme. They also require further detail of the approval process in place that will enable the programme team to ensure that students across training sites have resources in place to support student learning in all settings.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about how they ensure that the resources including IT facilities across training sites are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff.

Reason: From the evidence provided the visitors were aware of the learning resources including IT facilities that are being offered by the education provider such as an online library and an academic skills community. However, the majority of this programme will be delivered either remotely via an online learning environment (OLE) or at training site

centres. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that the programme team would approve training site centres to ensure that they have appropriate resources including IT facilities. However, the visitors could not determine how approval of training sites would be conducted and how the education provider would ensure that processes were in place to ensure that resources across all training site centres are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to student and staff. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence as to how the approval process conducted by the programme team ensures that there are sufficient resources including IT facilities across all training site centres. The visitors also require evidence to demonstrate how the programme team will ensure that the resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students and staff across all training site centres. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used and how the programme may meet this standard.

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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students who successfully complete all of the modules to meet SOPs for paramedics. However, considering applicants are able to gain entry to the programme at Level 5, the visitors could not determine the criteria and / or the process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route should be exempted from undertaking particular modules and meeting certain learning outcomes. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be satisfied these students will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempted from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided and the information provided regarding the curriculum of the programme, the visitors could not determine how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum. In scrutinising evidence, such as the programme handbook, the visitors noted the "Year two draft practice structure timetable". From the timetable the visitors were unable to determine how theory and practice will be combined particularly as the programme team envision that students will work through the online content whenever they have free time at work. Furthermore, in discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that that students will have protected time allocated to them. However, the visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how this allocation of time will be managed as they were unclear how the partner ambulance trusts could commit to this and it wasn't

reflected in the timetable provided. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the integration of theory and practice was central to the curriculum. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme team intends to redraft the current timetable to reflect better integration of theory and practice. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the integration of theory and practice is central to the curriculum.

4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the range of learning and teaching approaches used is appropriate and effectively delivers the curriculum.

Reason: In scrutinising the evidence provided, in particular section six of the programme handbook “programme teaching and learning methods” the visitors noted that the teaching methodology included “online and class based workshop activities and use of virtual electronic learning environment”. In discussions with the programme team, it was clarified to the visitors that this meant that a large proportion of the programme will be delivered online. From the evidence provided however, the visitors could not determine how this method of delivery would be effective in delivering the curriculum. In particular the visitors could not determine how and when the online lectures would be released, the types of tasks that student would be required to complete and how the programmes delivery would be structured. As such, the visitor require the programme team to provide further evidence of this learning approach. The visitors require this detail to be clearly articulated in the programme documentation to demonstrate that the range of learning and teaching approaches used will ensure effective delivery of the curriculum.

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 and experienced staff at practice placement settings.

Reason: From the initial documentation and the information provided at the visit regarding the approval and monitoring of placements In scrutinising evidence, such as the multi professional audit template document, and discussions at the visit the visitors learnt that the partner ambulance trusts, South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAST), hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators. The visitors were told that the partner trusts would feedback to the education providers regarding how many number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff were at each practice placement setting. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence of how this will be done or how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of qualified and experience staff at practice placement settings across the partnership trusts. The visitors could therefore not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. As such the visitors will require further evidence to demonstrate how the programme can meet this standard.

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 to deliver the required aspects of the programme.

Reason: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the process for ensuring that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience depends on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NAST the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training ensures that placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts any practice placement educator has the knowledge skills and experience to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

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: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the training for practice placement educators to prepare them for supervising and mentoring students on this programme depend on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NAST the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training is appropriate and ensures that placement educators are fully prepared for placement. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts

any practice placement educator is has undertaken appropriate training and are fully prepared to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate training to prepare them to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all practice placement providers.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors considered documentation which detailed South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust (SWAST) and North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAAS) as the two trusts the education provider will be working with. Discussions with the programme team revealed that the practice placement coordinator liaised with practice placement providers and that contact was tailored to individual partner trusts needs. The practice placement providers and educators whom the visitors met all felt they had sufficient contact with the programme team and were able to contribute to the programme's development. The programme team also indicated practice placement providers were able to provide informal feedback on the programme and many did so. However, from a review of the evidence it was clear that there was no formalised system in place to ensure regular, effective collaboration between the partner ambulance trusts and the education provider. This meant that, from the evidence provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider and the practice placement providers will regularly work in a joint manner and that communication will happen in both directions regardless of any possible changes to the partnerships. The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide further evidence about the measures that are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration with practice placement providers.

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 to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators are fully prepared for placement.

Reason: In scrutinising evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to access the link to the student handbook and the practice placement educator or 'mentor' handbook. In discussions with the programme team and the practice placement providers, the visitors learnt that the training for practice placement

educators to prepare them for supervising and mentoring students on this programme depend on the trust in which the placement educators are employed. For NWAAT the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been created which will be delivered by the education provider and will have to be undertaken before staff can act as practice placement educators. For SWAST, practice educators do not engage with any training provided by the education provider and instead have to complete an online 'webfolio' before they can act as placement educators. However, the visitors were not provided with the content of either course and as such were unsure how the training ensures that placement educators are fully prepared for placement. As such the visitors could not determine what policies or processes the education provider uses to ensure that despite any differences in delivery the training offered by the trusts any practice placement educator is fully prepared to supervise and mentor students while they are on placement. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant training to prepare them to supervise and mentor students from this programme.

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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students who successfully complete all of the modules to meet SOPs for paramedics. However, the visitors noted that applicants are able to gain entry to the programme at Level 5 through the utilisation of the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy. But from the evidence provided they could not determine the criteria and / or the process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route have already met certain learning outcomes and as such can be exempted from undertaking particular modules. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how many attempts applicants will be able to submit their practice portfolio for assessment through the AP(E)L policy. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be that students accessing the programme through the AP(E)L policy will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempted from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are assessed as able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further information on the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that the mode of study for this programme is full time or part time. However, discussions with the programme team revealed that although students can progress through the programme either on a full time or part time basis, if there is national service pressures students' academic study can be suspended at any time. From the documentation, the visitors were not aware that intercalation was an option for this programme as this information was not addressed. At the visit, the programme team discussed how they intend to support students if their academic study were to be suspended for a period of time, in addition they commented on their experience of managing intercalation on their other HCPC approved programme. However, because the visitors were not provided with enough information, they were unable to determine how the education provider will assess students to make sure that they continue to progress within the programme despite any interruptions. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to identify how progression routes through the programme will be made clear to students and what impact any suspension of studies would have each time their study is suspended. As such, the visitors require further information on the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme to determine that this standard can be met.

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 provide further evidence to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and which awards do not.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided the visitors noted that there was an exit award available to students studying this programme. From discussions with the programme team the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing the programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. It was also clear that anyone who received an exit award would not be eligible to apply to the HCPC Register. However, the visitors could not determine how the evidence provided in the discussions were reflected in the programme documentation to ensure that students are aware of which awards provide eligibility to apply to the Register. For example in the Approval visit document (page three) it states "Successful completion of all Level 4 modules and the qualificatory practice unit allows an exit point, if desired, with a Certificate HE in Pre-Hospital and Emergency Care". The visitors therefore require the education provider to provide evidence which ensures that students are aware that exiting with a "Certificate HE in Pre-Hospital and Emergency Care" will not confer eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC. In this way they can determine how the programme may meet this standard.

Recommendations

3.4 There must be a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme who must be appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be on the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that there is clarity for students about who the programme leader is.

Reason: From a reviewing of the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document and the staff curriculum vitae, the visitors noted who the programme leader is and were satisfied that they have overall professional responsibility for this programme. Therefore the visitors are content that this standard is met. However, in reviewing the programme documentation the visitors were unable to determine where students were informed about who the programme leader was. In particular they could not find in the programme handbook any information to this effect. As such, the visitors recommend that the programme team consider reviewing the programme documentation to ensure that there is clear and consistent information for students about who the programme leader is.

John Donaghy
Susan Boardman
Simon Mudie

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Programme name | Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 11 – 12 November 2015 |

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 '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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 December 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 15 January 2016. 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 10 February 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 March 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that 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 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 | Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Ian Prince (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| HCPC observer | Aveen Croash |
| Proposed student numbers | 35 year one entry per cohort, one cohort per year 35 year two entry per cohort, two cohorts per year |
| First approved intake | September 2009 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | September 2015 |
| Chair | Mairi Byrne (Edge Hill University) |
| Secretary | Elaine McIntosh (Edge Hill University) |

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 ongoing 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 49 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining nine SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 provide further information to demonstrate how it continues to ensure the quality of the assessment and learning outcomes for the programme delivered by North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) through the AP(E)L process.

Reason: From the documentation provided, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were clear that there are two entry routes to the programme, direct entry and entry via the AP(E)L process in year two, with applicants being employed by NWAS. Applicants via the AP(E)L route will be exempt from completing year one of the programme due to their prior learning and experience with NWAS. The documentation submitted prior to the visit detailed the AP(E)L policy for the programme and for the institution. The visitors also noted that the programme has ten modules, delivered over a two year period.

The visitors were provided with a document which benchmarked the first year modules against the IHCD ambulance technician award programme delivered at NWAS. The visitors considered the benchmark exercise however, from this document, they were unable to determine how the learning outcomes of the IHCD ambulance technician award programme delivers all the learning outcomes of year one of this programme. During the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that potential applicants employed by NWAS will be assessed on an individual basis for entry onto the programme via the AP(E)L policy. The visitors were unable to see how applicants' prior learning would be mapped against the necessary learning outcomes to exempt them from completing year one of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how they continue to ensure the quality of decisions made through its AP(E)L process.

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. The visitors noted the equality and diversity policy is in place at the education provider. During the visit and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an 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 continues to be met.

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 correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: There were discrepancies in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider. For example, the programme specification on page 2 states “Approved by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) for the purpose of eligibility for entry to the HCPC register as a paramedic”. Similarly, the placement handbook on page 11 states “Your programme has been designed in order that you accrue at least the minimum number of hours stipulated by the HCPC to enable you to register as a qualified paramedic at the end of your programme”. With reference to these examples respectively; completing an approved programme does not give automatic eligibility for entry to the Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice Register however those who successfully complete an HCPC approved programme will be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC. Also, the HCPC does not prescribe minimum hours for placements, we require education providers to have appropriate range, number and duration of practice placements. The visitors noted several other instances of inaccurate information and instances which are not reflective of the current terminology used in relation statutory regulation and the HCPC. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect 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 continues to 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 noted a consent form as evidence to determine how this standard continues to be met. However, the visitors could not find Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practiced information about the option for students to opt out of participation. 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. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team will update the existing protocols including their consent form to ensure students have the option not to participate, this includes confidentiality and managing situations when students decline from participating as service users. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide updated evidence of the protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service users and carer involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme, such as admissions and programme delivery. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. At the visit, the service users and carers indicated that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how the involvement will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussions or from 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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the combined learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students to meet SOPs for paramedics. However, considering the condition set for SET 2.6, the visitors could not determine the criteria or process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route should be exempt from undertaking particular modules and / or learning outcomes. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be satisfied that these students will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore meet the SOPs, on successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempt from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme.

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 evidence which demonstrates how students gain access to a wide range of learning experiences in the placement environment which support achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: At the visit practice educators stated that although students on the programme through the AP(E)L route will be employees of North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) and they will be treated as students for the duration of their time on this programme. The programme team and practice educators indicated that direct entry students will be supernumerary for the duration of their time whilst on ambulance placements however, students enrolled through the AP(E)L route would not be guaranteed any supernumerary hours whilst on ambulance placements. Whilst the

HCPC does stipulate that students must achieve supernumerary hours during their placement, the visitors were unable to see where AP(E)L route students' time would be protected on placement to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors were unsure how students on direct and AP(E)L route will have parity in their ambulance placements. Furthermore, the visitors could not see how an AP(E)L route student would be prioritised as a student rather than an employee of NWS in emergency situations where they might be required to drive an ambulance or perform other such duties. The visitors noted that whilst the priority is that AP(E)L route students will be expected to perform employer based duties in emergency situations they cannot be sure that these students will gain access to a wide range of learning experiences to support the achievement of learning outcomes and parity in ambulance placements. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how current placement arrangements appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes, or, that the current arrangements are adjusted to appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes and ambulance placements provide parity in placements for all students.

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 those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the combined learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students to meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, considering the condition set for SET 2.6, the visitors could not determine the criteria or process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route should be exempt from undertaking particular modules and / or learning outcomes. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be satisfied that these students will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempt from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are assessed as able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on successful completion the programme. This condition is linked to the condition for SET 2.6 and SET 4.1.

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 ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that any aegrotat award given will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

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 the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that, should

awards be given, they do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. This way the visitors can be satisfied that this information is available to students and that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Manchester campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move to new building in the near future. The visitors were presented with brief information on where the programme will be relocating to, but were not provided with any information on the resources that will be available at the new location. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change process once they move to the new location as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Glyn Harding
Mark Navins
Ian Prince

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Name of education provider | The University of Northampton |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of delivery | Full time Part time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 3 – 4 November 2015 |

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 '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 ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 December 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 15 January 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 24 December 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 15 January 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that 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 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 | Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Amal Hussein |
| Proposed student numbers | 70 per cohort, one cohort per year |
| First approved intake | September 2015 |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | January 2016 |
| Chair | Michelle Thompson (The University of Northampton) |
| Secretary | Karen Hares (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 ongoing 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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 programme documentation including advertising materials, to clearly articulate that international students with a different exit award at degree level will not be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Reason: In the documentation provided, the visitors noted in the Legacy Validation Handbook (page three), “the programme could potentially facilitate an additional number of students from outside the UK; for example, students from Saudi Arabia who may have completed a diploma at level 4 to attain a degree qualification but not wishing to register with the HCPC”. Furthermore, as part of the arrangements these students will not complete their placements in UK and therefore, they will not be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC. However, from a review of the admission documentation the visitors were unable to locate where potential international applicants would be informed that they will not be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC because they did not complete an approved programme. 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 international applicants and students are informed that they would not be able to register with the HCPC.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the selection and entry criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent.

Reason: From a review of the admissions information in the programme specification (page three), the visitors noted “Access course (must be health or science related) students would be expected to achieve 15 level 3 credits at distinction and 30 level 3 credits at Merit. In addition evidence of academic study completed within the last 5 years will be required”. In discussions with the programme team it was revealed that this statement was incorrect and that students will not be expected to demonstrate academic study within the last five years. As such, the visitors require the education provider to revise the selection and entry criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent.

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 that any exit awards of this programme for international student do not confer eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors were concerned that the programme and admission documents did not provide enough clarity for international students about registration with the HCPC. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that students from Saudi Arabia who meet the entry requirements could be enrolled on this programme to attain a degree qualification. However, these students will not attend approved practice placements as part of the programme in United Kingdom therefore, they will be awarded an exit award, a degree qualification, which does not provide eligibility to apply for registration with HCPC. In addition, the programme team clarified that there would be awards that international students would be able to exit the programme with, but these were not currently named in the programme documentation. This standard requires that the exit awards and the programme documentation must make it clear that only HCPC approved programmes lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration. In line with the condition set under 2.1, as the visitors could not see any named exit awards for international students on the programme, the visitors require further evidence of where it is stated in the programme documentation, that exit awards for international students on this programme do not lead to eligibility to apply for HCPC registration.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Park campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move the whole university to new grounds in the near future. The visitors were presented with brief information on where the university will be relocating to, but were not provided with any information on the resources that will be available at the new location. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change process once they move to the new location as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that resources continue to be effectively used to support students in all settings and that this standard continues to be met.

Anthony Hoswell
Manoj Mistry
Bob Fellows

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Portsmouth |
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Operating department practitioner |
| Date of visit | 15 – 16 December 2015 |

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 'operating department practitioner' 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 February 2016 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 15 January 2016. 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 20 January 2016. 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 2016.

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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 | Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Alex Urquhart |
| Proposed student numbers | 35 per cohort, one cohort per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | 1 September 2016 |
| Chair | Jane Portlock (University of Portsmouth) |
| Secretary | Rebecca Isaia (University of Portsmouth) |

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 as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new. However the visitors did review the external examiners' reports from the last two years of the Dip HE Operating Department Practice programme

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 Dip HE Operating Department Practitioner programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

The HCPC did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit.

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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining one SET.

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

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures this service user and carer involvement is consistent and sustainable for the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors reviewed the documentation which outlined the school of health sciences and social works' policy to involve service users and carers in the recruitment process. During the visit the visitors did not meet the service user and carer representative who was unable to attend the meeting. The visitors did meet with students from the Dip HE programme, who were asked about their experience of service user and carer involvement in their programme. They responded that they had not experienced any involvement with the service user and carer group. During the meeting with the programme team some time was allocated to discuss the involvement of service users and carers. The programme leader stated that the team have found it difficult to involve service users and carers due to the nature of the profession. The programme leader did however state that there were future plans to involve service users and carers in the programme. An example of this being a plan to run a Saturday club where students meet with children who have scheduled surgeries and explain what the ODP does and what to expect when they arrive for their surgery. This was supported by the service user and carer document which outlined the ideas that are being developed. The course documentation highlighted that there may be implications with insurance, safety and attendance requirements for this type of involvement. The programme team stated that these concerns would be addressed before implementation. From the above evidence the visitors were not sure how the programme team will ensure this service user and carer involvement is sustainable and consistent across the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures the service user and carer involvement is consistent and sustainable for the programme.

Andrew Steel
Julie Weir
Diane Whitlock

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Sunderland |
| Programme name | Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 25 – 26 November 2015 |

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 '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 01 January 2016 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 15 January 2016. 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 25 February 2016. 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 23 March 2016.

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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider 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 | John Donaghy (Paramedic) Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor) David Whitmore (Paramedic) |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Abdur Razzaq |
| Proposed student numbers | 20 per cohort, three cohorts per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | June 2016 |
| Chair | Jane Tunmore (University of Sunderland) |
| Secretary | Margaret Young (University of Sunderland) |

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 as the programme is new and there is currently no external examiner.

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 BSc (Hons) Public Health and BSc (Hons) 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 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven 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 provide further evidence to show how admissions information will be clearly articulated and communicated to potential applicants to make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors were provided with information about admissions procedures prior to the visit. The visitors noted the generic education provider's admission policy, however, they did not see the programme specific admissions policies and procedures. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that this is a closed programme and students will only be enrolled on to this programme if they are employees of the North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NEAS). The programme team stated, employees will be directly recruited to NEAS to enrol on to this programme. The programme specific admission policies and procedures have been developed in partnership with NEAS, therefore the programme team will be involved in the NEAS recruitment process for this programme. The visitors were satisfied with the process in place however, the visitors were unable to determine how these programme specific policies and procedures will be communicated to potential applicants. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence to show how admissions information will be clearly articulated and communicated to potential applicants to make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. This way the visitors can be sure this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the entry requirements for this programme are appropriate, clear and consistent, and accurately reflected in the documentation.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted the education provider's organisational wide entry requirements for undergraduate programmes. However, the visitors did not see any programme specific entry requirements. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that this is a closed programme and students will only be enrolled on to this programme if they are employees of the North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NEAS). The programme team stated, employees will be directly recruited to NEAS to enrol on to this programme. The programme specific admissions policies and procedures including entry requirements have been developed in partnership with NEAS therefore, the programme team will be involved in the NEAS recruitment process for this programme. At the visit, the programme team stated that there are programme specific entry requirements such as five GCSCs and English language requirements. However, the visitors did not see any of these entry requirements and therefore were unable to determine if this programme has appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards. The visitors require the education provider to ensure the entry requirements to this programme are appropriate, clear and consistent, and accurately reflected in the documentation.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the systems in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the programme is subject to the education providers' internal annual monitoring processes. The visitors also noted in the documentation that this programme is developed in partnership with North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NEAS). Students will only be enrolled on this programme if they are employees of NEAS and approximately seven NEAS employee tutors will deliver 75 percent of the curriculum at the education provider. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the education provider will be part of the interview panel when students are recruited to NEAS to be enrolled on to this programme. The education provider and NEAS have quarterly meetings to ensure this programme is effectively monitored and evaluated, and discuss any lesson learnt. The visitors could not see this arrangement formally written anywhere in the documentation. Because of the nature of this partnership, the visitors considered these quarterly meetings important and require the education provider to provide further evidence to show how these quarterly meetings will be arranged and attended by NEAS and the education provider consistently and regularly. This way the visitors can be sure the programme meet this standard.

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 correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: There were discrepancies in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider. For example, the programme specification in section 34 states "the programme meets the vocational demands of the HCPC". Similarly, section 35 states "The Diploma of Higher Education in Paramedic Practice prepares students for entry to the HCPC paramedic register". With reference to these examples respectively; the HCPC does not have vocational demands, the HCPC requires the education providers to ensure their programmes meet the standards of education and training (SETs). Similarly, completing an approved programme does not give automatic eligibility for entry to the Register however those who successfully complete an HCPC approved programme will be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC. The visitors noted several other instances of inaccurate information and instances which are not reflective of the current terminology used in relation statutory regulation and the HCPC. The visitors therefore require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect 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 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 education provider must provide the details of the formative objectives students will have to achieve on placements in year two of the programme.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors noted formative placement objectives for placement areas in year one of the programme. The visitors were satisfied with these objectives and happy with what is expected of students to progress in terms of their practical skills during year one placements. However, the visitors did not see a similar document for placements in year two of the programme. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team is in the process of developing these objectives. The visitors will need to see the objectives for placements in year two to ensure students know what is expected of them on placements. In addition, how these objectives are different from the objectives for placements in year one to ensure progression in practical skills. Therefore, to be able to determine if this standard is met, the visitors require details of the formative objectives students will need to achieve on placements in year two of the programme.

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 students will keep a record of the skills they learn on their placements to help them prepare for practice placements.

Reason: From the documentation, the visitors could not determine how students on placement will keep a record of their learning. At the visit, during the programme team and practice placement providers meeting, the visitors learnt that students will have a “placement diary” to keep a record of the skills they learn at each placement. The programme team talked through how they envisage this document will be used in assessing and preparing students and preparing practice placement educators in the practice placement setting. However, the visitors did not see a copy of this document to determine if it is adequate and appropriate to ensure students and practice educators are prepared for placement. The visitors were therefore unclear as to how the placement educators and students will be prepared adequately for practice placements. Therefore, the visitors require further documents, including the placement diary, to demonstrate that placement educators and students will be appropriately prepared for placement.

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 evidence which demonstrates how students gain access to a wide range of learning experiences in the placement environment which support achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team stated that this is a closed programme and students will be employees of North East Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NEAS) and will be treated as students for the duration of their time on this programme. The programme team and practice educators indicated that direct entry students will get 225 supernumerary hours, 150 hours with clinical mentors and 375 hours with a registered paramedic during their ambulance placements. During the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme team is working on the breakdown and allocation these hours as stated above. Furthermore, the programme team is in the process of developing alternative placement arrangements with partners such as mental health / dementia units, emergency departments and coronary care cardiac units. The visitors did not see the breakdown and allocation of these hours or the details of the alternative placement arrangements. The visitors therefore require evidence to outline the breakdown and allocation of placement hours and to demonstrate how this is effective to support the delivery of the learning outcomes.

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 with the HCPC.

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 the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC. The visitors were given the appointment criteria for external examiners however, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

John Donaghy
Joanne Watchman
David Whitmore