

Health Professionals Council
Department of Education and Policy

Visitors report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth & Hampshire Ambulance Service NHS Trust & Isle of Wight Healthcare Trust
Name and titles of programme(s)	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science (Part time delivery)
Date of event	28 th & 29 th June 2005
Proposed date of approval to commence	September 2005
Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area)	David Whitmore – Paramedic Bob Fellows - Paramedic
HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance)	Sharon Woolf – Education Manager Edward Crowe – Education and Policy Department
Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation):	

Scope of visit *(please tick)*

New programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major change to existing programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part 1.

1.1 Confirmation of meetings held

	yes	no	n/a
Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme planning team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.2 Confirmation of facilities inspected

	yes	No
Library learning centre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.3 Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

Requirement (please insert detail)	yes	No	n/a
1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Proposed student cohort intake number please state	
Foundation Degree	20 - 28

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS – These are all referenced to the HPC Standards of Education and Training (SET)

SET 2.1

- Ensure that the application and selection process for HAST & IOW are the same.
- Review information given to applicants with regard to the entry process and assessments to be undertaken.

Reason: It was not clear from the paperwork submitted that HAST and IOW were using the same selection criteria. The information on the exact nature of the various elements of the selection process was not clear, and was open to different interpretations. All students should be made aware of the single entry process involved for all candidates

Reason: The student should have full access within the student handbook to the assessment processes.

SET 3.2

- That the full three years of the programme are mapped out. (I.E Expand the colour document across the three years).

Reason: Only a small part of the whole course had been mapped out. The three years of the programme need to be clearly mapped out. This will highlight all the “pinch points” and once identified can be avoided.

SET3.5

- The module descriptors need to show who is to actually lead and / or teach the module. (Maria-Eleni currently appears on every modular descriptor)

Reason: From the submitted paperwork it appears that Maria-Eleni is delivering all the various taught modules. This is obviously not so. It needs to be clear as to who is teaching what.

SET 3.9

- The panel needs sight of the student consent to act as clients or patients in simulation training or assessments.

Reason: This was not evident in the submitted paperwork

SET 4.1

- The learner outcomes need to be altered to ensure appropriate language is used express the LO's.

Reason: In places the language used did not reflect the desired learning outcome for the

relevant academic / practice level.

SET 4.3

- That the Unit Abstracts remove references to achieving IHCD award standards and use references to the HPC Paramedic Standards of Proficiency (SOP).

Reason: The HPC Standards of Proficiency are the required standard to ensure eligibility to apply for registration. Portsmouth University along with its partners have chosen not to imbed the IHCD award or use their exams or other standards.

SET 6.5

- The panel needs to have the Assessment Policy to be made available for scrutiny.

Reason: It was not with the submitted paperwork, though an e copy was handed to the panel on the second day.

SET 6.7.5

- There is a need to appoint a suitably qualified external examiner from the HPC paramedic register.

Reason: Doctor Ray is not a registered paramedic. The BPA Visitor (Steve Hatton) offered help in this area.

RECOMENDATIONS

SET 2.2.5

- That the AP(e)L credit level is monitored over time to see if the initial AP(e)L exercise was accurate and appropriate.

Reason: It was felt by the panel that the AP(e)L awarded was too generous especially the 60 points granted for academic level 5.

SET 3.4

- That there is a strategy to develop ambulance tutorial staff to become lecturer / practitioners based both within the University and practice, as is common in other programmes of this nature.

Reason: There are currently no formal arrangements to have either HAST or IOW tutors appointed as lecturer / practitioners at Portsmouth Uni. In other schemes of this nature it has proven of immense benefit to have such tutors appointed to a joint academic / practice role.

SET 5.8.2

- EMT's cannot be mentors as they are currently not registered with a regulatory body. However it is acknowledged that this may occur during the first year, only, of the programme. It is also expected that this will only be for the first cohort of students.

Reason: This is accepted good practice, though the difficulties of achieving this for the first year were accepted by the panel, who do not wish to delay this initiative by making this a condition.

Decision of the HPC Visitors

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

David Whitmore:

Bob Fellows:

Date: 25/7/2005