

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Cumbria |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 05 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-14991-S6J0N0 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Andrew Jones | Paramedic |
| John Donaghy | Paramedic |
| Deirdre Keane | Lay |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| Stephanie Evans | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Cumbria |
| Helen Harling | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Cumbria |
| Liz Mallabon | Internal panel member | University of Cumbria |
| Raye Ng | Internal panel member | University of Cumbria |
| Nina Richardson | Learner panel member | University of Cumbria |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Davy Bradshaw | External panel member | Sheffield Hallam University |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 25 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02154 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes |
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Yes |

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met |
|---|-----|
| Learners | Yes |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes |
| Facilities and resources | Yes |

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Senior staff | Yes |
| Practice educators | Yes |
| Programme team | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 01 May 2020.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners understand that if they do not pass the practical components in the third year, they will not be eligible to apply for registration even if they have accumulated 360 credits.

Reason: From the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were aware that the placements in year three were non credit-bearing, but that they still needed to be passed for the learners to receive the award. There was an exit award available for those who accumulated 360 credits without passing the final year practice components, but this award would not be HCPC-approved. They considered that this arrangement was reasonable, but they were not clear from the materials provided for learners that it would be adequately communicated to the learners that they must pass the practice modules to be eligible to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether this standard was met, and require further evidence of how learners will be enabled to understand the consequences of the different awards.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process for appointing an external examiner for the programme, and the timescales for this process.

Reason: The education provider submitted a generic document related to external examiner appointments. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence what specific arrangements were in place to appoint an external examiner for this particular programme, how the education provider would ensure that the external examiner would be appropriately qualified and experienced, and how they would ensure that the position was filled in good time. They therefore require further evidence relating to how and when an external examiner would be appointed.

Recommendations

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

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing programme documentation for clarity and accuracy.

Reason: The visitors considered that this standard was met, as the programme had clear and appropriate management structures and experienced staff in place in key positions. However, they did notice during their review of the documentation that there were a certain number of minor errors and out-of-date references. For example, there were references to learners having a normal NHS working week, including evenings and weekends, and a mention of “radiographic skills” rather than paramedic skills. In the programme handbook, on page 4, it is stated that completing the programme will “enable” learners to register, rather than giving them eligibility to apply for registration. None of these errors prevent the programme meeting the standards at present, but the visitors considered that if they were not amended they might create a risk in future that standards around accurate information for learners were not met.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Recommendation: The education provider should keep under review its measures for ensuring the effectiveness of their relationship with the providers of spoke placements.

Reason: The visitors were aware from the documentation and from discussions at the visit that the education provider intended to run practice-based learning on a “hub and spoke” model. They were satisfied that this was appropriate and that the standard was met because of ongoing and effective relationships between the education provider and the placements. However, the visitors did also note that the ongoing effective delivery of the programme would depend on these relationships being maintained, and so they suggest that the education provider continue to ensure that they co-operate effectively.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to keep the service user and carer involvement under review in order to ensure that the involvement continues to reflect the breadth of paramedic practice.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the standard was met at threshold as there was an experienced and sizeable service user and carer group in place at the education provider. There was close involvement with both the existing paramedic provision (the DipHE), and with the planning for this programme. They were also aware from discussions at the visit that the education provider had a commitment to ongoing development of the service user and carer involvement. The visitors therefore suggest that one particular goal for this development should be to ensure that the service user group should continue to reflect as wide a range as possible of the work of paramedics. This will mitigate any future risk of the service user and carer group not preparing learners for paramedic practice.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Education provider | Edge Hill University |
| Name of programme(s) | MSci Nurse Paramedic, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 11 – 12 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15120-X4T4Z4 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Tristan Henderson | Paramedic |
| Vincent Clarke | Paramedic |
| Niall Gooch | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Anthony Turjansky | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | Edge Hill University |
| Katherine Griffiths-Smith | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | Edge Hill University |
| Maureen Harrison | Reviewer | Nursing and Midwifery Council |
| Rajeev Shrivastava | Internal panel member | Edge Hill University |
| Lorraine Partington | Internal panel member | Edge Hill University |

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| Jenny Pinfield | External panel member | University of Worcester |
| Allen Bewley | Internal panel member | Service user and carer group, Edge Hill University |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Programme name | MSci Nurse Paramedic |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| Proposed first intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 50 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02169 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted |
|---|--------------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes |
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Not Required |

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met |
|---|-----|
| Learners | Yes |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Facilities and resources | Yes |
| Senior staff | Yes |
| Practice educators | No – some key stakeholders were not present at this meeting, for example representatives of non-ambulance placements and paramedic Practice Educators |
| Programme team | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 14 May 2020.

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants have sufficient information about the costs of the programme.

Reason: The visitors were aware from programme documentation and from discussions at the visit that learners were likely to incur significant extra costs from studying on the programme, notably in relation to the fact that the programme was situated between two campuses, at Manchester and Ormskirk. They considered from their initial review that this was not made sufficiently clear in programme documentation. At the visit they were able to discuss this with the programme team, who stated that a new document would be produced giving applicants full information. However, the visitors were not able to view this document, and so were unable to determine whether the standard was met. They therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence relating to how they will ensure that applicants have clear information about the programme costs, especially those related to the dual location of the programme.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programme is fit for purpose with specific regard to how they ensure that all graduates will have a clear understanding of the paramedic profession and its particular demands, characteristics and requirements.

Reason: From the programme documentation and from discussions during the visit, the visitors were aware that the programme was aimed at developing a new profession, that of 'Nurse Paramedic'. This position was re-iterated throughout the visit and was presented as filling a gap in the health care system. The documentation presented this as being an 'integrated practitioner'. The briefing document for the visit identifies that: "the Team explained that the fourth year of study allows for a greater level of autonomy which in turn better equips graduates to join the workforce at an advanced stage".

The visitors were unclear what was meant by "advanced" in this context. The programme team suggested that this referred to the 'paramedic' skills being present in addition to nursing skills. The visitors were not clear how the concept of an 'integrated practitioner' was different to a dual registered nurse/paramedic. This meant that they were unable to make a determination about whether the education provider had a clear understanding of the unique and specific role of the paramedic, and hence whether the programme would create learners who could practise safely and effectively as paramedics. The HCPC as a regulator has a responsibility towards the paramedic profession, and the aim of HCPC visitors during an approval process is to ensure that learners who emerge from an approved programme will be able to practise safely and effectively within the paramedic profession as it currently exists.

The visitors, therefore, require further evidence of how the programme will ensure that learners are fully prepared to practise as paramedics

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the programme will be able to manage fifty learners per cohort.

Reason: Based on their review of programme documentation, the visitors had been working on the understanding that the education provider was seeking approval for thirty learners. However, in discussions with the senior team, the visitors were informed that the plan was for up to fifty learners per cohort to be admitted. Due to this information coming to light at the approval visit, the visitors considered that they had not had an opportunity to consider how the fifty learners would be appropriately managed, with regard to the following areas:

- Staffing and resources, including teaching space;
- Availability and capacity of practice-based learning.

In particular, the visitors noted that they had not been able to view formal or finalised agreements with partner ambulance services. In addition, the representatives from ambulance services who attended meetings with the HCPC panel did not appear to have a clear understanding of how the programme would work or of the organisation of

placements, notably that the majority of placements would be in non-ambulance settings.

In light of all of the above, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met and require further evidence on how the fifty learners will be managed with respect to the above.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that they have an appropriate process in place to appoint a suitable new programme lead if it becomes necessary for them to do so.

Reason: The education provider supplied evidence relating to staffing strategy, as well as curriculum vitae for some of the programme team, and a description of the responsibilities for the person with overall professional responsibility for the programme. However, this evidence did not include a clear description of what specific process was in place to recruit a new programme lead if it became necessary to do so. For example, it was not clear how the education provider would ensure that a person appointed to that role would have appropriate experience in running a health professional programme. The visitors considered that this was particularly important in light of the nature of the programme, which would enable learners to be dual registered as both paramedics, with the HCPC, and nurses, with the Nursing and Midwifery Council. Taking all of this into account, the visitors were unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence relating to how the education provider would appoint a new programme lead if it becomes necessary to do so, and how they would ensure that this person was suitably qualified and experienced.

3.5 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and practice education providers.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure ongoing regular and effective collaboration with practice education providers once the programme has started.

Reason: From the programme documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were aware that there had been collaboration with practice education providers during the development of the programme, for example regular meetings with local health authorities about their future staffing requirements and their amount of placement capacity. However, the visitors did not see evidence of a plan for ensuring that these relationships would continue to be regular and effective once the programme had started. They did not see, for example, dates for future meetings or ongoing terms of reference. They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met, and require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider will ensure that collaboration continues once the programme is running.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will continue to use their relationships with practice partners to ensure availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: As noted in the condition for SET 3.5 above, the visitors were aware that there had been meetings and ongoing relationships with likely providers of practice-based learning. In their evidence the education provider described how the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Medicine practice learning centre had responsibility for securing sufficient and appropriate practice-based learning for healthcare programmes at the education provider. However, it was not clear to the visitors how exactly this would be achieved for this specific programme. They asked the senior team, the programme team and practice education partners about this at the visit and received verbal reassurance about their ability to secure sufficient availability and capacity. However, they did not receive clear information about what detailed steps would be taken to ensure appropriate placements for all learners. They considered that such detail was particularly important in light of the new information communicated at the visit about learner numbers (see the condition for SET 3.2).

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

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

The following condition applies to the above standards. For simplicity, as the issue spans two standards, the education provider should respond to this condition as one issue.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that there are appropriate staff from paramedic backgrounds, to appropriately contextualise learning for the paramedic profession, and support the delivery and achievement of the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Reason: The education provider had supplied curriculum vitae for four members of staff, but the visitors were made aware at the visit that the education provider planned to draw on a large reservoir of staff. The visitors did not have information about these staff so were unable to determine whether they were appropriately qualified and experienced, although they were given verbal assurances about their suitability. The visitors had a particular interest in seeking this further information as they considered that there was a potential lack of specialist paramedic input into the programme, which is intended to provide dual registration. The programme team stated that they had undertaken a mapping exercise which determined a 95 per cent similarity in curriculum for paramedics and nurses, implying that only the remaining 5 per cent would need to be professionally differentiated. No evidence was provided to support the claimed 95% similarity. The visitors considered that this possibly indicated an inadequate understanding of the importance of paramedics' specific skills, knowledge and competencies, and so wished to be sure that staffing arrangements would strongly support the achievement and development of learners as future paramedics. They

therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider will ensure that such staff are available and involved in the appropriate parts of the programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme will enable learners to meet the specific standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: As part of their evidence, the education provider submitted a SOPs mapping exercise. The visitors reviewed and this and were able to discuss learning outcomes with the programme team. From this review and from the discussions, the visitors considered that some of the learning outcomes were insufficiently specific to enable all learners to meet all SOPs for paramedics. It was not clear, for example, that the learning outcomes as written would require all learners to have had practice-based learning in ambulance settings. The visitors were particularly concerned that the attempt to craft learning outcomes relating to practical competencies that were generic enough to cover both paramedic and nursing specialisms would not capture the quite specific requirements laid out for paramedics in sections 13 and 14 of the HCPC standards of proficiency for paramedics. The visitors particularly highlighted the following SOPs:

- 13.6 understand the theoretical basis of, and the variety of approaches to, assessment and intervention;
- 13.7 understand human anatomy and physiology, sufficient to recognise the nature and effects of injury or illness, and to conduct assessment and observation in order to form a differential diagnosis and establish patient management strategies;
- 14.1 know the theories and science that underpin the theory and principles of paramedic practice;
- 14.3 be able to conduct appropriate diagnostic or monitoring procedures, treatment, therapy or other actions safely and effectively;
- 14.5 know the indications and contra-indications of using specific paramedic techniques in pre-hospital and out-of-hospital care, including their limitations and modifications;
- 14.6 be able to modify and adapt practice to meet the clinical needs of patients within the emergency and urgent care environment;
- 14.7 know how to select or modify approaches to meet the needs of patients, their relatives and carers, when presented in the emergency and urgent care environment;

In discussions with the programme team this difficulty was acknowledged but it was not clear to the visitors what would be done to mitigate the risk of learners not being able to meet the paramedic SOPs. The visitors note that all graduates of this programme would be eligible to apply for registration as a paramedic on receiving the named award. Taking all of this into account, they were unable to determine whether the standard was met and require further evidence about how the education provider will ensure that all learners will be enabled to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme will reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base of the paramedic profession.

Reason: Based on their review of programme documentation and on discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that a lot of the programme material was generic, with the intention that this would be applied across learning required to register as a nurse and a paramedic. This was acknowledged by the education provider, as noted in the condition under SET 3.10 above. This was not necessarily a problem, as there is considerable shared underlying knowledge between the two professions. However, there are many areas where the application of that knowledge, and the way it is incorporated into professional practice, is very different between the two professions. The visitors considered that at present they did not see how the education provider was planning to ensure that all learners gained a clear understanding of the knowledge base and expectations of the paramedic profession. They were given verbal assurances about this at the visit but did see relevant evidence. This was important because all graduates of this programme would be eligible to apply for registration as a paramedic on receiving the named award. They therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider can ensure this.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that the curriculum will remain relevant to current practice.

Reason: Based on their review of programme documentation and on discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that a lot of the programme material was generic, with the intention that this would be applied across learning required to register as a nurse and a paramedic. This was acknowledged by the education provider, as noted in the condition under SET 3.10 above. This was not necessarily a problem, as there is considerable shared underlying knowledge between the two professions. However, there are many areas where the application of that knowledge, and the way it is incorporated into professional practice, is very different between the two professions. The visitors considered that at present they did not see how the education provider was planning to ensure that the curriculum remained relevant to current paramedic practice. They were given verbal assurances about this at the visit but did see relevant evidence about how, for example, specialist paramedic staff would be used to maintain the clinical currency of the programme. This was important because all graduates of this programme would be eligible to apply for registration as a paramedic on receiving the named award. They therefore require further evidence relating to how the education provider can ensure this.

4.5 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme will teach, present and integrate paramedic-specific content in a way that ensures that all learners are prepared to integrate theory and practice as paramedics.

Reason: Based on their review of programme documentation and on discussions at the visit, the visitors considered that some aspects of the programme were not sufficiently

tailored towards the specific requirements of paramedic learners, and would not enable them to develop and maintain their understanding of the demands and expectations of the profession. They noted that a lot of the programme material was generic, with the intention that this would be applied across learning required to register as a nurse and a paramedic. This was acknowledged by the education provider, as noted in the condition under SET 3.10 above. This was not necessarily a problem, as there is considerable shared underlying knowledge between the two professions. However, there are many areas where the application of that knowledge, and the way it is incorporated into professional practice, is very different between the two professions. The visitors considered that the programme did not currently appear to take sufficient account of this. The visitors note that all graduates of this programme would be eligible to apply for registration as a paramedic on receiving the named award. They require further evidence relating to how the education provider will ensure that all learners will be enabled to understand how general medical knowledge is integrated into their particular practice.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they enable service users and learners to give appropriate consent in those parts of the programme where it may be necessary to do so.

Reason: The education provider submitted evidence for this standard that included information about how learners were prepared for practice-based learning. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this information what process the education provider had in place for specifically ensuring that appropriate consent was obtained from service users and learners, where necessary. The visitors were not able to seek clarification on this at the visit due to time pressures.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they communicate to learners their policy on attendance, and in particular how they expect learners to proceed if they have missed learning and teaching activities.

Reason: The education provider submitted as evidence a paragraph from a document given to learners, which mentioned attendance requirements, stating that 100% attendance was expected. The visitors asked about this at the visit and the programme team informed them that the 100% requirement was there to set high expectations. The visitors considered that this was reasonable, but they noted that the education provider did not appear to have communicated to learners what they should do if they missed learning and teaching activities for legitimate reasons such as illness. There was no indication of what steps learners ought to take or what would be done to support them. The visitors were therefore unable to determine that the standard was met and require further evidence regarding how the education provider would support learners.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners are enabled to access an appropriate range of practice-based learning, specifically including ambulance-based placements, to support their achieving the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The evidence submitted by the education provider included information about the kinds of placement that would be available to learners. It specifically mentioned, for example, ambulance trusts. However, from their review of this documentation the visitors were not clear that learners would be obliged to complete a placement with an ambulance trust or in other settings where paramedics would normally be expected to work, e.g. in a community care setting. These were presented as options that would be available, or as examples of the kind of practice-based learning that was available, and which learners would be able to choose in co-ordination with the education provider. The visitors considered that there was a lack of clarity about whether learners would be guaranteed an appropriate breadth of experience, because it appeared that they would be able to complete the practice-based learning components of the programme and achieve the award without having been on an ambulance placement or under supervision from a paramedic in an urgent / primary care setting. The visitors asked the programme team to clarify this but did not receive a definitive answer. This was partly related to the dual registration nature of the programme, which necessitated a wide range of practice-based learning being available but also limited the opportunities for professional specialisation. The visitors considered that from the HCPC perspective it would not be appropriate for a learner to receive an award that leads to eligibility to apply for registration as paramedic without having undertaken practice-based learning in an ambulance setting supervised by a paramedic.

They were therefore unable to determine whether the standard was met and require further evidence relating to how the education provider will ensure that learners have access to an appropriate range of practice-based learning to enable them to meet the SOPs. They noted that there was a potential link to the condition under SET 4.1 above.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

The following condition applies to the above standards. For simplicity, as the issue spans two standards, the education provider should respond to this condition as one issue.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard the education provider submitted documents explaining their understanding of practice-based learning and descriptions of relevant roles. Reference was made to the general role of the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Medicine practice learning centre. The visitors considered that this was useful information, but that it did not provide them with a clear understanding of how the education provider intended to audit practice-based learning on an ongoing basis for

this specific programme. In discussions at the visit, the programme team gave verbal assurances that they had a process for finding practice-based learning placements, that they would be in close touch with placement providers, and that problems that arose could be raised through various channels, both formal and informal. However, the visitors were not clear from this what kind of formal ongoing process would be in place for ensuring that placement settings continued to provide high quality practice-based learning which would support learners' achievement on the programme, and would be safe and supportive. They therefore were unable to determine that the standard was met and require further evidence about how the education provider's placement quality monitoring will work.

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

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

The following condition applies to the above standards. For simplicity, as the issue spans several standards, the education provider should respond to this condition as one issue.

Condition: With regard to the practice educators used as part of the programme, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that:

- There are adequate numbers with appropriate qualifications and experience;
- They have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning; and
- The practice educators received regular suitable training.

Reason: The education provider submitted evidence for this standard describing their understanding of the role of the practice educator, their expectations of the role, and the way in which they intend practice educators to work. The visitors considered that this evidence was useful and appropriate insofar as it went, but it was not clear to them how the education provider would ensure that the practice educators would be suitable for their roles, and how they would ensure that they remain suitable. There was not sufficient evidence relating to processes for determining ongoing suitability, so they could not determine whether the standard was met. In discussions at the visit the education provider gave verbal reassurances that this would be done through co-operation with practice partners, but the visitors require further evidence outlining how this will work. The fact that the visitors were not able to meet with practice educators at the visit made it harder for them to make a clear and appropriate judgment.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that learners and practice educators have the information they need, in order to be prepared for practice-based learning.

Reason: The evidence submitted for this standard included general information about the organisation of practice-based learning, which was organised at the institutional level by the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Medicine practice learning centre. However, the visitors did not see specific reference in this documentation to how learners and practice educators for this programme would be appropriately prepared for practice-based learning. Verbal assurances were given at the visit that relevant information would be sent to learners and practice educators well in advance. The learners from existing programmes within the Faculty did not raise specific concerns about this aspect of their experience. However, the visitors did consider that they required further evidence about what process would be used to ensure that information was always supplied in a timely manner, particularly in light of their outstanding concern about audit of practice-based learning as noted in the condition under SET 5.3 above.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors were aware from the documentation provided that learners in practice-based learning would be assessed using a PAD. In discussion with the programme team, it became apparent that the NMC had very clear requirements related to who could sign a student's PAD in a summative capacity, i.e. that the 'sign-off' must be completed by a Registered Nurse. The visitors considered that this was not appropriate for the sign-off of competencies considered to be 'paramedic specific' or for 'shared' competencies to be 'signed off' solely in a nursing setting by a nurse practice educator. The visitors require evidence of students' PADs needing to be 'signed off' by a paramedic in the context of undertaking the traditional paramedic role, i.e. in ambulance-based practice or primary care under the supervision of a paramedic. The visitors require this evidence to be reassured that the protected title of 'paramedic', which could be used by graduate registrants, remains recognisable in the current context of entry-level paramedics working in the UK health industry.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that practice educators have been appropriately prepared to use the practice assessment document (PAD).

Reason: The visitors were aware from the documentation provided that learners in practice-based learning would be assessed using a PAD. However, they were not clear from the evidence submitted how the education provider intended to ensure that any staff member on placement who might have input into PAD assessment, whether formative or summative, had been appropriately prepared to do so. They considered that this was important because if there was not consistency and accuracy in such assessment across all learners, then the PAD would not be providing an objective, fair and reliable measure of individuals' progression and achievement. The visitors raised the issue with the programme team and were given verbal assurances that it would be part of the general training received by practice educators. However, as they did not

see specific evidence about how this would be incorporated into such training, they were unable to determine that the standard was met, and require further evidence relating to how practice educators will be enabled to use the PAD appropriately.

6.5 The assessment methods used must be appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that all assessment methods used are appropriate to measuring the learning outcomes.

Reason: The visitors were aware from the documentation that several of the modules were assessed solely by a twenty-minute oral examination. The visitors considered that, while this could be an appropriate way for the education provider to organise assessment, they would need to see further information about how the education provider ensured that assessors using this method would be able to assess all the learning outcomes appropriately and fairly. In the absence of such guidance, they could not determine whether assessing modules in this way would ensure that learning outcomes were appropriately measured. Therefore, they require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that all assessments are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes, whether or not they decide to continue with using the oral examination for the modules in question.

6.7 The education provider must ensure that at least one external examiner for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the process for appointing an external examiner for the programme, and the timescales for this process.

Reason: The education provider submitted a generic document related to external examiner appointments. However, it was not clear to the visitors from this evidence what specific arrangements were in place to appoint an external examiner for this particular programme, how the education provider would ensure that the external examiner would be appropriately qualified and experienced, and how they would ensure that the position was filled in good time. They therefore require further evidence relating to how and when an external examiner would be appointed.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Hertfordshire |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship), Work based learning |
| Approval visit date | 25 - 26 February 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15022-J9P1M7 |

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Laura Akers | Occupational therapist |
| Rebecca Khanna | Occupational therapist |
| Mohammed Jeewa | Lay |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |
| Tracey Samuel-Smith | HCPC executive (observer) |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Joel Carlton | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Hertfordshire |
| Liz Mellor | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Hertfordshire |
| Liz Gormley-Fleming | Internal validation panel | University of Hertfordshire |
| Sarah Flynn | Internal validation panel | University of Hertfordshire |

| | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Alison Hampson | External subject specialist | University of Cumbria |
| Anna Clampin | Professional body representative | Royal College of Occupational therapy (RCOT) |
| Lyn Westcott | Professional body representative | Royal College of Occupational therapy (RCOT) |
| Clair Parkin | Professional body representative | RCOT Officer |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship) |
| Mode of study | WBL (Work based learning) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| Proposed First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02160 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted | Comments |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes | |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes | |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes | |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes | |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes | |

| | | |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes | |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes | |
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Not Required | The programme has never run. |

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met |
|---|-----|
| Learners | Yes |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes |
| Facilities and resources | Yes |
| Senior staff | Yes |
| Practice educators | Yes |
| Programme team | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 12 May 2020.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarity around learner numbers to demonstrate that the programme is sustainable.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed the resource statement as evidence for this standard. The visitors noted that the document sets out the education provider's intentions for developing the programme. However, they could not see any evidence of the programme's place in the school's business plan, which could include possible risks to its delivery and how these are to be effectively managed

At the visit, the employers (partner organisations) stated that they are looking to recruit 22 learners from their existing workforce and would look to undertake this level of recruitment over the next three years but they also stated that the numbers might change. The programme team informed the visitors that there would be a minimum of 16 learners on the programme. However, when asked, the practice educators were uncertain about the number of learners to expect on the programme. Given the different information from the different groups, the visitors were unclear about the actual number of learners expected on the programme. As such, they could not be sure that the programme would continue to recruit sufficient numbers of learners in the future to ensure ongoing sustainability. In addition, the visitors were unclear about the contingency plans in place should learner numbers fall below expectations. The visitors therefore considered that they require further clarity around the learner numbers at each year of the programme before they can determine the programme's sustainability.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of their recruitment plans, including timelines and contingency plans to demonstrate the programme's sustainability.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the resource document as evidence for this standard. The document stated that the programme is predicted to recruit 1.6-1.8 WTE staff for a maximum cohort of 22 learners. The visitors noted that from the 1.6-1.8 WTE, a programme lead has been appointed to a 0.8 WTE post and the education provider would be advertising for senior lecturers equivalent to 1.0 WTE to start in May/June 2020. The senior team reiterated this at the visit and added that the new staff members would likely be practitioners (practice educators) who will be recruited to the academic team through secondments. When asked about any contingency plans in place to manage any possible risks and threats to the programme should be unsuccessful in recruiting sufficient staff with the required level of qualification and experience, the education provider could not provide clarity around how they would manage such risks. The visitors considered that the education provider had not provided the level of detail required to demonstrate how they will effectively manage any possible risks around staffing challenges, in terms of numbers and experience, should they be unsuccessful in their recruitment plans. As such, the visitors considered that the education provider would need to provide timelines for their recruitment plans and information around their contingency plans should their staff recruitment plans be unsuccessful. This way they can determine whether the programme is sustainable.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, which describes the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day-to-day management of the programme and how they are made aware of their responsibilities.

Reason: The visitors were directed to pages 82-83 of the submission document as evidence for this standard. In their review, the visitors could see an overview of how the programme will be managed overall. However, it was unclear to them the partnership arrangements that were in place to deliver those parts of the programme within practice placement sites. This included the roles and responsibilities and conjoint decision-

making arrangements at the programme level. In their pre-visit response to the visitors' feedback on the documentary review, the education provider referred the visitors to Appendix DA17 B. However, the visitors were unable to locate this document.

In the senior team presentation on resourcing the programme, the visitors were made aware that the programme had been co-designed and co-produced between the education provider, employers, clinicians and practice educators. However, the senior team was unable to provide the visitors with clarity about how the different organisations and individuals will be involved at a programme level going forward.

The visitors considered that the education provider had not provided clear evidence of the roles and responsibilities of all parties who will be involved in the management of the programme, including governance. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence that clearly articulates the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in the programme's management including, how all those involved in the programme management have a clear understanding of their responsibilities

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how apprentices will be involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors identified the university and school's arrangements for the involvement of learners in the ongoing delivery of a typical non-degree apprenticeship programme. At the visit, the visitors met with learners on 'traditional' routes for paramedic, radiography and physiotherapy programmes who spoke widely about their involvement in their programmes. They explained to the visitors how feedback works between learners and educators and outlined their existing student liaison committee. They also explained to the visitors how, through their feedback, they have been able to contribute to improvements in their own programmes.

The visitors recognised the extent of the involvement of learners within programmes with more traditional models of education. However, the visitors also recognised that there are differences between degree apprenticeship programmes and traditional route programmes, particularly as the apprentices would only be in the university one day a week and would not have the same level of access to the programme resources or time to possibly attend meetings. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how this model of learner involvement would translate to a degree apprenticeship programme and therefore how apprentices will be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence that clearly articulates how apprentices will be involved in and continuously contribute to the programme.

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified staff with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise to deliver the programme effectively.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme and senior teams, the visitors were informed about the education provider's proposal to recruit clinical practitioners in the delivery of the curriculum. The senior team also informed the visitors that they have advertised for 1.6 – 1.8 WTE academic staff to start in May/June 2020. From this information, the visitors were clear about the education provider's plans to recruit a number of staff onto the programme. However, they could not be sure of the appropriateness of the staff that will be recruited, as they have not seen the role specification. In addition, the visitors were unclear about the contingency plans in place should the recruitment be unsuccessful.

The visitors noted the CVs of the clinical practitioners, who may be involved in the programme delivery through secondment, demonstrated a broad range of experience. However, they considered that the amount of commitment expected from these individuals in terms of time, and details of how the modules will be apportioned, remained unclear. In addition, the programme team informed the visitors that a member of staff will be allocated the role of practice lead to manage the relationship with practice-based learning, including preparing practice educator training. The visitors noted however that the staffing plan did not highlight who will be responsible for undertaking this role and how this would be incorporated into their other academic activities.

As such, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates the education provider's plan to ensure the programme is adequately staffed with appropriately qualified and experienced staff and that subject areas will be delivered by educators with relevant specialist knowledge and expertise. As part of this, the visitors require:

- evidence of the roles being recruited to, to ensure the individuals can support the delivery of, and breadth of, knowledge taught on the programme – for example role specifications;
- further information that shows the timeframes for staff recruitment as well as contingency plans if recruitment is unsuccessful; and
- evidence of the role responsible for managing the relationship with practice-based learning – for example role specification.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that occupational therapy profession-specific resources are available and accessible to all learners and educators.

Reason: Through a virtual facilities tour, the visitors were able to view teaching and learning areas and resources, and discuss resourcing for the programme with the senior and the programme teams. The visitors were made aware, both through the documentation and during discussions at the visit, that learners on the programme would share resources with other programmes. During the virtual facilities tour, the visitors were informed that occupational therapy learners would be able to use the physiotherapy laboratories. The programme team said dietetic laboratories can also be used for teaching skills in home settings. The visitors were not made aware of any occupational therapy profession-specific resources or equipment, for instance, commonly used standardised assessments and orthotic equipment, which will be used to support the delivery of the programme. Both the practice educators and the programme team informed the visitors that learners will be able to utilise resources

within practice placement sites in situations where there is not the required resources within the university. However, they stated that these arrangements are not yet finalised and are therefore not certain. Therefore, the visitors were unable to determine what occupational therapy specific resources were available, and the arrangements within the university and / or within partner organisations to ensure the availability and accessibility of these, to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates the occupational therapy specific resources available to learners and educators on this programme, including, any resources available at practice placement sites when these resources are not available in the university. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the effective processes in place to obtain consent from service users when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document submitted by the education provider stated that the process for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners was contained in the practice placement assessment forms. From reviewing this documentation, the visitors saw information relating to how consent was sought from learners but they were unable to locate information relating to how consent was sought from service users. The visitors did not see any form of written consent or evidence of the effective processes in place to obtain consent from service users. The programme team informed the visitors that service users are expected to have a pre-session discussion before participating in role-plays, however, they confirmed that there were no formal processes for obtaining their consent. The service users also informed the visitors that consent is taken formally and informally. They explained that their understanding was that when they sign up as service user, it was implied that they had given their consent to participate in activities such as role plays. From this information, the visitors were unclear about how the programme respected individual's rights and reduced the risk of harm. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the effective processes in place for obtaining consent from service users and carers before they participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching.

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

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure adequacy in the number and appropriateness of the qualifications, skills and experience of practice educators.

Reason: The education provider referred in their mapping to the CVs of practice educators. The visitors were also referred to other documents (Appendix 17-A, 17-B) which they were unable to locate. From their review of the CVs, the visitors could see the qualifications and experience of the practice educators who will be involved in the delivery of the programme. However, the visitors did not receive information about the minimum number of practice educators required or the knowledge, skills and experience they will need in order to ensure safe and effective learning. Therefore, it was not clear to the visitors from looking at this information how the education provider will ensure adequate numbers of practice educators across all practice-based learning settings. The visitors were also unclear about the education provider's requirements for practice educators in terms of their qualifications, skills and experience. The programme team informed the visitors that local practice education providers currently provide practice-based learning to learners from other education providers. However, they stated that they are now looking to grow their own practice educators. The visitors received verbal assurance that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced practice educators for this programme. However, the visitors were not clear how the education provider will determine whether the practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective practice-based learning in relation to the learning outcomes to this programme. They therefore require further evidence demonstrating how the education provider ensures there will continuously be an adequate number of practice educators with the knowledge, skills and experience to ensure safe and effective practice.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate practice educator training.

Reason: The education provider referred the visitors to page 55 of the submission document as their evidence for this standard. From their review, the visitors noted that the programme team will provide training sessions for both new and experienced practice educators. At the visit, the programme team informed the visitors that a member of staff will be allocated the role of practice lead to prepare and assist in practice educator training. The programme team also stated that some training will be occupational therapy specific, while some will be delivered with the physiotherapy team. They added that the training had not yet been developed but would be delivered over the summer. The senior team told the visitors that the majority of the practice educators were experienced working with learners from other education providers. They also confirmed that the practice educators will have access to library facilities within the university.

The visitors noted that apprenticeship programmes are a different model of education and may attract more mature learners who have different needs than someone on a traditional programme. Given this, the visitors considered it was important that practice educators undertake specific training appropriate to this type of learner needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme. The visitors therefore considered that the education provider had not evidenced how they will ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate practice educator-training specific to this programme or how often this training will occur. To ensure practice educators are appropriately prepared so they support learning and assess apprentices effectively, the

visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate how often specific training for practice educators will happen and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time MOccTH (Hons) Occupational Therapy, Full time Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Approval visit date | 10-11 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15048-M5W6C9 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contents | |
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 4 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 5 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Jennifer Caldwell | Occupational therapist |
| Joanne Stead | Occupational therapist |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|-----------------|--|------------------------|
| Paul Brunt | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Plymouth |
| Phil Gee | Independent deputy chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Plymouth |
| Joanne Melhuish | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Plymouth |

| | | |
|----------------|--|------------------------|
| Joan Healey | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCoT) | Professional body |
| Dawn Mitchell | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCoT) | Professional body |
| Clair Parkin | Royal College of Occupational Therapy (RCoT) | Professional body |
| Fiona Maclean | External Advisor | |
| Eleanor Tunick | Student representative | University of Plymouth |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2008 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 40 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02163 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider proposed changes to this programme, which involved reviewing the curriculum alongside the introduction of a new Integrated Masters.

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Programme name | MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 30 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02165 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider proposed changes to this programme, which involved reviewing the curriculum alongside the introduction of a new Integrated Masters.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Programme name | Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration) |
|----------------|---|

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2013 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 5 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02231 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider proposed changes to this programme, which involved reviewing the curriculum alongside the introduction of a new Integrated Masters.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Programme name | MOccTh (Hons) Occupational Therapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Occupational therapist |
| Proposed First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 20 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02168 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted |
|---|-----------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Yes |
|---|-----|

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met |
|---|-----|
| Learners | Yes |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes |
| Facilities and resources | Yes |
| Senior staff | Yes |
| Practice educators | Yes |
| Programme team | Yes |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 05 May 2020.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a system in place for capturing learners' feedback and reviewing this feedback with all practice educators to ensure quality of practice-based learning.

Reason: In their evidence for this standard, the education provider submitted documents stating that practice educators are supported in their role through training, consultation, and avenues where they share 'best practice' and facilitate practical links between student support services, learners and their practice educators. Through their documentary review, the visitors noted that feedback from learners on their practice experience was not gathered consistently across all areas. They noted that feedback appeared to be gathered in statutory practice-based learning but was not shared routinely with the practice educators. They also noted that the private, voluntary and independent practice-based learning did not have access to the feedback system.

During discussions with the practice educators, the visitors heard that learners occasionally provide feedback on their practice-based learning to practice educators, as they are not currently required to do so. The practice educators explained that it would help to ensure quality if there was a system that required learners to provide feedback on their practice experience with their practice educators and ensures the feedback is shared with all practice educators.

The visitors considered that the education provider had not demonstrated that there is a robust system in place that allows learners to provide feedback in practice-based learning. They also considered that feedback is not gathered across all practice education providers, and not shared systematically. As such, they could not determine that the education provider had a thorough and effective system for ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have a thorough and effective system that captures all of learners' feedback in practice-based learning and ensures the feedback is used for quality assurance across all practice-based learning sites.

Recommendations

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

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider introducing workshops that are appropriate to practice educators' role and learners' needs.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met at threshold, as all the appropriate information to evidence practice educators were being offered a wide range of training according to their needs, was identified within the documentation.

The visitors noted however through discussions at the visit that practice educators sometimes struggle to support certain types of learner needs, for instance international learners who may be finding it difficult to acclimatise to the culture and system of learning in the United Kingdom. The practice educators indicated they could benefit from workshops that focused around internalisation to enhance their ability to support the learning needs of all learners. The visitors therefore suggest that, to ensure all practice educators are confident and appropriately prepared for their role, the education provider could consider introducing workshops that will enable practice educators in supporting learners' needs effectively and ensure all practice educators have access to such workshops.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MPhysio (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration), Full time accelerated PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration), Full time |
| Approval visit date | 10-11 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-15497-R2Q0C3 |

Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment | 4 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review | 5 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Fleur Kitsell | Physiotherapist |
| Pamela Bagley | Physiotherapist |
| Frances Ashworth | Lay |
| Patrick Armsby | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Paul Brunt | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of Plymouth |
| Jackie Hunt | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of Plymouth |
| Shan Aguilar-Stone | Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) Panel member | CSP – Professional Body |

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| Vicky Pearsall | CSP Panel member | CSP – Professional Body |
| Julie Wilkins | External panel member | Glyndwr University – External reviewer on behalf of Plymouth University. |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2004 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 70 learners shared across all Physiotherapy programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02164 |

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The education provider had made changes to this programme alongside the introduction of the programmes below.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | MPhysio (Hons) Physiotherapy |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 70 learners shared across all Physiotherapy programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02166 |

We undertook this assessment of these new programmes proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time. This programme is an integrated Masters and allows for learners to exit with a BSc (Hons) award.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Programme name | MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2021 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 70 learners shared across all Physiotherapy programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02167 |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Programme name | PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration) |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Profession | Physiotherapist |
| First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | 70 learners shared across all Physiotherapy programmes |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02246 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted | Comments |
|---|-----------|--|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes | |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes | |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes | |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes | |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes | |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes | |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes | |
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Yes | Only requested if the programme (or a previous version) is currently running |

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met | Comments |
|-------|-----|----------|
|-------|-----|----------|

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| Learners | Yes | The panel met with current BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy learners as the programme is running. |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | Yes | |
| Facilities and resources | Yes | |
| Senior staff | Yes | |
| Practice educators | Yes | |
| Programme team | Yes | |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 18 May 2020.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The programmes must reflect the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications to ensure it is fit for purpose.

Reason: In the programme specifications for the three programmes the visitors were able to see a section titled 'Programme Intended Learning Outcomes'. These learning outcomes were related to the programme overall rather than the assessed learning outcomes that were stated in the module descriptors. The visitors were satisfied that the assessed learning outcomes were appropriately mapped to the standards of proficiency for physiotherapists. However, they considered that the programme intended learning outcomes did not accurately reflect the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) which is set out by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) and underpins all higher education qualifications in the UK.

To illustrate the visitors' issue, they have provided an example as follows. From the FHEQ the visitors noted that holders of a level 6 qualification must be able to 'critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem'. For the BSc (hons) level 6 programme, an outcome for learners is 'The skills of problem solving, evaluation,

clinical reasoning and reflective practice' under 'cognitive and intellectual skills' (section 8.2). For the level 7 programmes under the same heading an outcome for learners is 'The skills of complex problem solving, critical evaluation, clinical reasoning and reflective practice'.

The visitors considered that the level 6 programme intended learning outcome did not reflect the FHEQ level 6 requirements appropriately. The programme learning outcomes for level 7 were considered more reflective of FHEQ level 6 requirements. The HCPC normally expects the threshold entry route onto the Register for Physiotherapists to be a Bachelor degree with honours (level 6). The FHEQ sets out the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base for qualifications at this level and so the programme must reflect this accurately to ensure that learners are appropriately prepared for entering the Register. As the current programme intended learning outcomes do not appropriately show that learners will be effectively prepared to enter the profession, the visitors considered that this impacted the programmes ability to be fit for purpose. Therefore, the education provider must show that the programme intended learning outcomes appropriately reflect the FHEQ to ensure the programme is fit for purpose.

Recommendations

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

2.1 The admissions process must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend making detailed information around additional costs for learners available to applicants earlier in the application process, to enhance applicant's ability able to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

Reason: The visitors determined from the documentation provided and discussions at the visitors that learners were suitably informed about the programme and that there would be additional costs associated. They could also see information around available on the education providers website. However, at the visit the visitors were told that more detailed information about the nature of the additional costs would be provided at open days and interviews. The visitors understood the education providers approached but considered it would be more useful for applicants if this information was available at an earlier date. Therefore, the visitors recommend that the education provider provides more detailed information around additional costs for learners earlier in the application process.

HCPC approval process report

| | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Education provider | University of the West of Scotland |
| Name of programme(s) | BSc Paramedic Science, Full time |
| Approval visit date | 03-04 March 2020 |
| Case reference | CAS-14979-C2G9C8 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contents | |
| Section 1: Our regulatory approach..... | 2 |
| Section 2: Programme details..... | 3 |
| Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment..... | 3 |
| Section 4: Outcome from first review..... | 4 |

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| David Comber | Paramedic |
| David Whitmore | Paramedic |
| Ian Hughes | Lay |
| Temilolu Odunaike | HCPC executive |

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

| | | |
|-----------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Chris O'Donnell | Independent chair (supplied by the education provider) | University of the West of Scotland |
| Hazel Shepherd | Secretary (supplied by the education provider) | University of the West of Scotland |
| Donna Taylor | Internal validation panel | University of the West of Scotland |

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Daune West | Internal validation panel | University of the West of Scotland |
| Mark Willis | External subject specialist | University of Sunderland |

Section 2: Programme details

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Programme name | BSc Paramedic Science |
| Mode of study | FT (Full time) |
| Profession | Paramedic |
| Proposed First intake | 01 September 2020 |
| Maximum learner cohort | Up to 60 |
| Intakes per year | 1 |
| Assessment reference | APP02151 |

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

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

| Type of evidence | Submitted | Comments |
|---|-----------|----------|
| Completed education standards mapping document | Yes | |
| Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements | Yes | |
| Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning | Yes | |
| Proficiency standards mapping | Yes | |
| Information provided to applicants and learners | Yes | |
| Information for those involved with practice-based learning | Yes | |
| Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme | Yes | |

| | | |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|
| Internal quality monitoring documentation | Not Required | The programme has never run. |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|

We also usually ask to meet the following groups at approval visits, although there may be some circumstances where meeting certain groups is not needed. In the table below, we have noted which groups we met, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

| Group | Met | Comments |
|---|-----|--|
| Learners | No | As the programme is new, we met with learners on BSc (Hons) Applied Bioscience programme |
| Service users and carers (and / or their representatives) | No | We did not meet with any service users or carers as there were none involved in the programme yet. |
| Facilities and resources | Yes | |
| Senior staff | Yes | |
| Practice educators | Yes | |
| Programme team | Yes | |

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

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

Conditions

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

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 20 May 2020.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will involve service users and carers in the programme.

Reason: The education provider referred the visitors to page 42 of the Practice Assessment Document, which identified a template of a service user/carer feedback form. The visitors did not meet with any service users or carers at the visit. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that they had contacted some

service user and carer groups and sent questionnaires to individuals who had used the ambulance service. The programme team also stated that, as a school, they were looking to set up a service user and carer group. Through these discussions, the visitors could see that the education provider had a strategy in place to involve service users and carers across different health programmes within the school. However, the visitors saw no formalised information that demonstrated how service users and carers are involved in the programme currently, or will be involved in the programme going forward. The visitors considered that they would require further information on how the strategy will be implemented within this particular programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information that identifies who the service users and carers will be and how they will be involved in the programme to ensure their involvement is appropriate.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that non-NHS Scotland practice educators involved in the programme will have access to resources that are effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the resources available for teaching on the programme, and discussed resourcing with the programme team and senior team. The visitors noted that the documentation submitted prior to the visit provided information on how learners will access resources but they could not find information on how practice educators (PEs) will access the resources they need to support learning and teaching on the programme. The visitors met with practice educators from various NHS Scotland placements and from non-ambulance service who are involved in the programme. They informed the visitors that they have access to the university's shared resources as well as both NHS Lanarkshire and national libraries. The NHS Scottish ambulance service PEs also said that they have access to the Scottish knowledgebase service – a software where information can be stored and shared. The programme team also informed the visitors that NHS Scottish ambulance and non-ambulance PEs have access to NHS journals and could access information through open access or Google Scotland. From this information, the visitors were satisfied that both NHS Scottish ambulance and non-ambulance PEs will have access to the resources they need to support learning and teaching on the programme. However, they were unclear how non-NHS such as hospices and care homes practice educators, who could also be involved in the programme, would have access to resources and how this was explained to them. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how non-NHS practice educators will have appropriate access to the resources they need to deliver the programme effectively.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The programme team must revise the practice assessment document to ensure it is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the Practice Assessment Document (PAD) submitted was still in the draft form. At the visit, the programme team told the visitors that they would be making

changes to the PAD following observations made by some members of the internal and external validation panel. The visitors considered that for them to be able to determine whether this document will be effective and appropriate in the delivery of the programme, they will need to see the amended, final version. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise and submit the finalised practice assessment document before they can determine that it is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must revise the module descriptors to demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, throughout the visit, both the internal and external validation panel members required the programme team to re-write some of the modules to meet their requirements.

The visitors therefore noted that re-writing the affected modules could result in changes to the learning outcomes. Without seeing the finalised learning outcomes, the visitors were unable to make a judgement on how they enable learners to meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the effective processes in place to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: The visitors reviewed page 6 of the practice assessment document as evidence for this standard. From their review, the visitors saw that learners would have had to complete mandatory training prior to undertaking practice-based learning. However, there was no mention of how consent will be sought during practical and clinical teaching. The visitors could not determine the process in place for obtaining learners' consent when they participate as service users in role plays. At the visit, the visitors asked learners about their awareness of how consent policies worked in situations where they were taking part as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The learners indicated that there were no formal processes for obtaining their consent. From this information, the visitors were unclear about how the programme respected individual's rights and reduced the risk of harm, whilst making sure that learners understood what will be expected of them as health and care professionals. In addition, the visitors were unclear how the education provider manages situations where learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the effective process the education provider has in place for obtaining consent from learners before they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors also require evidence to show what

alternative learning arrangements will be put in place where learners do not consent to participating as a service user.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessments provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed evidence for this standard and they were satisfied that the assessments were effective at deciding learners' fitness to practise by the end of the programme. However, during the visit, both the internal and external validation panel members required the programme team to re-write some of the modules to meet their requirements. The visitors considered that re-writing the affected modules could result in changes to the learning outcomes and subsequently, how those learning outcomes were assessed. If changes were made to the assessments, the visitors could not be certain that the new assessments would remain objective, fair and reliably measure learners' progression and achievement. The education provider is therefore required to provide evidence demonstrating that assessments throughout the programme provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.