

Education and Training Panel

Minutes of the meeting of the Education and Training Panel held as follows:

Date: Friday 30 January 2026
Time: 10am
Venue: Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)
Members: Helen Gough (Chair)
Helen White

In attendance:

Francesca Bramley, Governance Manager
Jamie Hunt, Head of Education
Noah Linley-Adams, Governance Officer
Kabir Kareem, Education Manager
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh, Education Quality Officer

1 Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting of the ETP. No apologies were received from ETP members.

2 Declaration of conflicts of interest

- 2.1 No conflicts of interests were declared by ETP members.

3a Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions, with provider observations

- 3.1 The ETP considered the information relating to the approval of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Apprenticeship programme at the University of Greenwich, subject to conditions being met.
- 3.2 The ETP noted that the partner visitors had identified the conditions required for the programme to meet the relevant standards of education and training (SETs). These conditions related to SET 3.1 - the programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose - and SET 3.6 - there must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.
- 3.3 The ETP noted that the education provider had submitted additional observations and requested that these remain confidential. In these, the provider raised concerns about their ability to meet the conditions, explaining that they were caught between programme approval and a competitive tender. They accepted the requirement to have an employer in place for HCPC approval but suggested that the tender process prevented them from evidencing this. They indicated that this put them in a position where they could neither finalise approval without an employer nor secure an employer without approval.
- 3.4 The ETP considered the points raised in the confidential observations and noted that the circumstances were not as described by the provider. It was confirmed that, at the outset of the assessment, the London Ambulance Service (LAS) had been identified as the intended employer, and the HCPC had therefore already engaged with the LAS regarding the tender and was familiar with the associated requirements. The ETP agreed that, in this context, the lack of HCPC approval at this stage would not prevent the education provider from submitting a tender, nor would it place them at a disadvantage in the tender process.
- 3.5 The ETP noted that the approval case for the programme commenced just over a year ago, alongside two other degree apprenticeship programmes. This process was subsequently separated as partner visitors had identified that, unlike the other programmes, the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Apprenticeship did not yet have an employer in place. The ETP noted that securing an employer was essential for the delivery of practice-based learning

and for ensuring learners could be appropriately supported to meet the HCPC requirements for registration (the standards of proficiency for paramedics, and the standards of conduct, performance, and ethics).

- 3.6 The ETP noted that the education provider intended to secure the LAS as the employer for the programme, however that this had not yet been formally confirmed. The tender process to appoint an employer was expected to take place in March 2026, with a decision anticipated in mid to late April 2026. The ETP also noted that the education provider would face competition from other providers, and that the LAS would award the contract to only one organisation, or a group of organisations operating as a consortium.
- 3.7 The ETP queried the strength of the relationship between the education provider and LAS. The Executive advised that existing HCPC-approved programmes operated by the education provider with the LAS as the employer provided reassurance regarding the quality of that relationship.
- 3.8 The ETP noted that the LAS potentially had the capacity to accommodate up to 160 learners per year. This would be either for a single education provider or a consortium/partnership of education providers acting together for a degree apprenticeship programme. Should the University of Greenwich secure the LAS as the employer, it was expected that all these learners would be allocated to their proposed degree apprenticeship programme.
- 3.9 The ETP noted that the HCPC requires education providers to have an employer confirmed by the end of an assessment. The Executive clarified that they have a pre-existing working relationship with the LAS and therefore would not accept speculative applications for approval with them as the employer, until the point that the tender had been awarded.
- 3.10 The ETP considered whether the programme could be approved if the education provider secured an employer other than the LAS. The Executive advised that this would be possible, provided that the employer enabled the education provider to meet the SETs and deliver a sustainable programme with appropriate practice-based learning. However, this would likely necessitate a new approval process due to material differences between employers. The ETP noted that South East Coast Ambulance Service may be a secondary option should the LAS tender award not be secured by the education provider.
- 3.11 The ETP approved the programme subject to the condition that the education provider secured an employer, with the expectation that this would be the LAS. Should the education provider secure an alternative employer, an additional review would likely be required to again sufficient assurance that the standards of education and training would be met.

3b Programmes recommended for approval at new education providers

- 3.10 There were no items for consideration.

3c Programmes recommended for approval with provider observations

3.11 There were no items for consideration.

4 Performance review

4.1 There were no items for consideration.

5 Focused review

5.1 There were no items for consideration.

6 Record changes – no provider consent

6.1 There were no items for consideration.

7 Any other business

7.1 No other business was declared.

8 Close

8.1 The meeting concluded at 10.23am.