hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	MSc in mental health and approved mental health professional practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	7 – 8 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional)
	Nicholas Drey (Lay visitor)
	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, one cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2015
Chair	Ian Felstead (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 30 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 criterion.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: From the information provided in the documentation, the visitors noted the that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy on their university website, the policy outlined is a generic institution wide policy approach to AP(E)L. From a review of the information provided, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicant through this process. However, there is little information about it in the admissions information in relation to this programme. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors were also unable determine how the programme team actively monitor the AP(E)L process against the AMHP competencies set out in Section 2 of Approval criteria for approved mental health professionals. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider did not include a business plan or any evidence to suggest that this programme is secure with the education provider. During the visit, the visitors heard that the faculty which the programme sits in, has recently had a restructure as well as the appointment of a new School Head. As a result, the education provider is currently developing a 3 year business plan. However, the visitors also heard that this programme is scheduled for a major review next year which could determine whether this programme continues to run. It was also revealed to the visitors, that last year academic this programme did not actually run, according to the education provider this is a result of the University choosing not to recruit students onto the programme as well as other variables cited by the Senior Management Team. The visitors heard that this will be looked into during the major review assessment and a decision will be made regarding this programme. From all the discussions held at the visit, the visitors were unable to see if the programme was secure within the education provider's business plan. The visitors were also unable to see if the programme was viable or had enough support. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme fits into the education providers' business plan to ensure that this criterion continues to be met.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with staff curriculum vitae (CVs) for members of the team responsible for the delivery and management of the programme. However, from the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be responsible for which aspects of the programme management and who would be delivering specific areas of the programme. Also, it was not clear to the visitors whether some staff were full time or part time members of the programme team and how they contributed to the management of the programme. In addition, it was clear from the discussions at the visit, that the programme is predominately managed by the programme director. The visitors noted, however, that the programme director, is seconded for one day a week from Kent County Council to run this programme. It was evident from the discussions with the placement providers and students that the programme director is the main contact for everyone. However, the visitors were unsure how this programme is managed when the programme director is in post at another job for the remainder of the 4 working days of the week It was clear from the discussions, beside the programme director, that the placement providers would not know who they could contact within the programme team for any issues relating to this programme. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the structure for the day to day management of the programme, particularly when the programme director is away, the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team will deliver each area of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how students will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team when the programme director is away.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The visitors require further evidence of the memorandum of agreement between the education provider and employer and further evidence of when it will be finalised.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated this programme will be delivered in accordance with a partnership arrangement that will be detailed within a memorandum of agreement between the education provider and the employer. This memorandum of agreement will then provide the template for the effective management of the programme, including the distinct responsibilities for the different aspects of the programme and how these will be managed by the partner organisations. However, the visitors were not provided with a copy of the memorandum for Medway Council prior to the visit and were made aware at the visit that the memorandum is still in the process of being agreed and finalised. In order to determine if this programme is effectively managed between the parties, the visitors require details of the indicative content of the memorandum of agreement which may include details of placement capacity or the process for either of the partner

organisations to withdraw from the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this criterion.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to clearly articulate the feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine if there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme. During the visit, the visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme with the programme team. However, these systems were not always clearly reflected in the programme documentation. From the documentation the visitors were unclear about several aspects of the feedback systems in place. In particular, how student feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to students. The visitors heard that students are the only group to be given feedback forms. From this, the visitors were unclear how practice placement feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by the practice placement providers are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated back to practice placement providers and students. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this criterion is met. The visitors require information which clearly articulates student feedback mechanisms and practice placement feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme

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

Reason: From a review of the CV's submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that some that were included belong to staff members who taught on the social work programme. In reviewing the CV's, the visitors were unable to determine who the teaching staff would be for this programme as the visitors were not provided with any information on how these staff members would be involved in delivering this programme. Furthermore, due to the lack of clarity in who would be delivering the different aspects of the programme, the visitors were unable to determine if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be.

Reason: From the review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to identify who the module leaders were for this programme. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme director would be the module leader for majority of the subjects delivered. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be, in order to determine how this criterion can be met by the programme.

B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place

Condition: The education provider must identify where students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify the attendance requirements for students or how students were informed about the mandatory elements of the programme. From the practice learning handbook, page 7 the visitors noted that "A record of attendance must be kept by the PE". In discussion with the students there was some confusion regarding understanding of the attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms for this programme. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team. It was highlighted that students are required to complete a minimum of 35 days of placements, however, it was clear students were not aware of this requirement or what would happen if they did not meet this minimum requirement. The visitors therefore were unable to determine how the programme team monitor attendance and are able to intervene if attendance became an issue. The visitors could not see where attendance requirements are communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this criterion is met.

D.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

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

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with Section 2 approval criteria for approving mental health professionals mapping document for the programme which linked the learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of competencies. However, from the evidence provided at the visit it was clear that the local authorities as the placement providers, are responsible for providing suitable placements for students, rather than the staff team at the education provider. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcomes of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement provider at the first placement meeting. From the information provided the

visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the local authorities will provide placements to students that will be of sufficient quality, length and variety for them to meet the competencies required. From the documentation provided, the visitors could also not determine how the education provider will ensure that the allocation of placements will be equitable and provide all students with sufficient placement experience to meet the required competencies in Section 2: Approved mental health professionals. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the allocation of placements work in practice and how the education provider will ensure that the number, duration and range of these placements ensures that all students will be provided with the opportunity to meet the required learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this criterion.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information clarifying how students are supported in working out of hours whilst on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted through meetings with students and placement educators that students may be required to work out of hours whilst on placement. This would most often be the case where mental health assessments are started during or after normal working hours and extend through to and past midnight. The visitors heard that both the local authorities that offer placements are moving to a 24/7 service or have already done so. In such circumstances, the visitors were unclear what support a student should expect to receive from the education provider and placement provider.

The visitors therefore require further information regarding the support mechanisms available to students on placement, specifically in relation to out of hours work. Any evidence should clearly address what support mechanisms are available from the education provider and placement provider and how this information is communicated to the student.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure a safe and supportive environment at all placement settings.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this criterion. The visitors also noted the student complaints procedure document, page 1, "Complaints relating to a placement may be better resolved within the workplace". From the documentation, the visitors were unsure how the education provider ensures all practice placements provide students with a safe and supportive environment, particularly if students may be expected to seek resolution at their placement without the support of the education provider. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors heard in great detail the efforts taken by the practice placement provider to ensure that all their placements are safe and supportive for students. However, the visitors were unable to determine the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that all placements are safe and supportive. Therefore, the visitors could not determine what the education provider's system for approving and monitoring placements are and

how, through using this system, they ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students to learn in. To ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence to show what steps the education provider takes to ensure that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

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

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

D.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

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

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers, as well as the education provider's equality and diversity policies. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. In scrutinising evidence, such as the 'Practice Placement Arrangement' documentation provided and in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the local authorities hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators. Due to the evidence provided and discussions, the visitors were unclear how much responsibility the education provider has and would continue to have for ensuring that the placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further evidence as to how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this standard, the education provider referenced the submission document in their SETs mapping document. The visitors had the opportunity to meet with the practice placement providers who spoke in detail about the steps they take to ensure their practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that there is a record kept by the programme team which records the qualification and experience of practice placement educators. However, the visitors were not presented with the record discussed. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme. The

visitors had the opportunity to meet with the practice placement educators, who revealed that they have not attended practice placement educator training in a number of years. Without training the visitors were unable to determine how practice placement educators are prepared to deliver both formative and summative assessment as well as how this is consistent across placements. The visitors heard that practice placement providers ensure that their own practice educators had undergone their own in house training. But they were unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. From the discussions at the visit, it was clear that no formal training was available to practice placement educators. As such the visitors had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further evidence of that practice placement educators are undergoing appropriate training and have access to regular follow up training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of their processes to ensure placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that registration of practice educators are held with the local authorities. From this evidence the visitors could not determine what process the education provider had in place to ensure that all placement educators will be appropriately registered and what other arrangements would be agreed if this was not possible. During discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that a register of all practice placement educators will be held by local authorities and that this register will record the practice placement educators' registration status. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered if the registration of practice educators are held by the local authorities. They were also unclear as to the role of the education provider in agreeing other arrangements should appropriately registered practice placement educators not be available at certain placement sites. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place which ensures that placement educators are appropriately registered and what arrangements will be put in place should registered placement educators not be available.

D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors noted the collaborative arrangements described in the documentation. However, from the description the visitors were unsure if the collaborative arrangements involved, included regular meetings or other methods of communication between the education

provider and the placement provider. In discussions at the visit with the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors heard that there is no formal communication channel operating between the placement providers and the education provider. The placement provider and practice educators expressed concerns around their relationship with the education provider, in particular that there is no system in place where they can comment on their experience of supervising students on placement, influence the structure of practice placement or provide feedback on the programme's planning and design. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that this programme has no formal mechanism in managing the collaborative relationship between the practice placement providers, educators and the education provider. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find evidence from the documentation and discussions to determine how the education provider will ensure regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers and consequently how this criterion is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met.

D.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

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

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular they could not identify how they were made aware of the students' ability and expected scope of practice while on placement and what the expectations of both the students and practice placement educators should be at each individual placement to ensure that students gain the experience they require. During the discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the practice provider and educators often felt unprepared to take on students. This was confirmed to the visitors by the students, who described their experience of placement where often it seemed that practice educator or the placement provider were not aware that they were coming for placement. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place, which demonstrate how the education provider ensures students are fully prepared for placement. In particular this should demonstrate how practice educators are made aware of students' experience and expected scope of practice for each placement and how the expectation of both the students and practice placement educators at placement are managed to ensure that students get the experience they require to meet the relevant learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how placement providers, practice placement educators and students will be prepared for placements by the education provider.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how they have effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment strategy as outlined in the programme documentation, but were unable to determine from the evidence provided, the process in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. In discussion at the visit the programme team gave a brief outline of the marking strategy specific to this programme which indicated that assessment would be doubled marked generally by academics but there may be some aspects of the assessment undertaken by individuals outside of the academic programme team, such as local authority partners. In addition, the visitors heard that there is a practice moderation panel that ensures consistency in marking. The visitors could not find detail in the documentation as to these arrangements, or how people outside the programme team would be trained for involvement in assessment. They were also not clear on the details of moderation for the assignments within the academic team, and therefore were unable to determine a clear internal moderation strategy in relation to this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this

criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Recommendations

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff

Recommendation: The programme team should keep under review the length of time it takes for students gain a library card, and to gain access to learning resources for the programme including IT facilities, to continue to be appropriate to the curriculum, and readily available to students.

Reason: From discussion with the students it was apparent that they were satisfied with the resources associated with this programme. However, some students spoke of difficulties in registering with the library, in particular delays in receiving a library card. The visitors noted that without a library card, students are unable to access the resources including IT facilities. The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to keep under review the length of time it takes for students to gain a library card, and in turn access to the learning resources they need for the programme and to ensure that resources continue to be readily available to all students going forward.

Graham Noyce
Nicholas Drey
David Abrahart

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Canterbury Christ Church University
Programme name	Post Graduate Diploma in Mental Health and Approved Mental Health Professional Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	7 – 8 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

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

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 13 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Graham Noyce (Approved mental health professional)
	Nicholas Drey (Lay visitor)
	David Abrahart (Approved mental health professional)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, one cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2015
Chair	Ian Felstead (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)

Sources of evidence

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

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 30 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 20 criterion.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information to clarify the accreditation for prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme.

Reason: From the information provided in the documentation, the visitors noted the that the education provider has information regarding their AP(E)L policy on their university website, the policy outlined is a generic institution wide policy approach to AP(E)L. From a review of the information provided, the visitors were unable to locate any clear detailed information regarding AP(E)L within the information provided to applicants to this programme. Discussion with the programme team clarified the policy was not regularly used. The programme team spoke of the support they provided applicant through this process. However, there is little information about it in the admissions information in relation to this programme. The visitors were unclear as to how the programme applied the generic AP(E)L policy and how potential applicants were made aware of what constitutes as criteria for AP(E)L. The visitors were also unable determine how the programme team actively monitor the AP(E)L process against the AMHP competencies set out in Section 2 of Approval criteria for approved mental health professionals. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the admissions and programme documentation to explain the process in place.

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

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

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors noted that the education provider did not include a business plan or any evidence to suggest that this programme is secure with the education provider. During the visit, the visitors heard that the faculty which the programme sits in, has recently had a restructure as well as the appointment of a new School Head. As a result, the education provider is currently developing a 3 year business plan. However, the visitors also heard that this programme is scheduled for a major review next year which could determine whether this programme continues to run. It was also revealed to the visitors, that last year academic this programme did not actually run, according to the education provider this is a result of the University choosing not to recruit students onto the programme as well as other variables cited by the Senior Management Team. The visitors heard that this will be looked into during the major review assessment and a decision will be made regarding this programme. From all the discussions held at the visit, the visitors were unable to see if the programme was secure within the education provider's business plan. The visitors were also unable to see if the programme was viable or had enough support. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of how the programme fits into the education providers' business plan to ensure that this criterion continues to be met.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with staff curriculum vitae (CVs) for members of the team responsible for the delivery and management of the programme. However, from the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be responsible for which aspects of the programme management and who would be delivering specific areas of the programme. Also, it was not clear to the visitors whether some staff were full time or part time members of the programme team and how they contributed to the management of the programme. In addition, it was clear from the discussions at the visit, that the programme is predominately managed by the programme director. The visitors noted, however, that the programme director, is seconded for one day a week from Kent County Council to run this programme. It was evident from the discussions with the placement providers and students that the programme director is the main contact for everyone. However, the visitors were unsure how this programme is managed when the programme director is in post at another job for the remainder of the 4 working days of the week. It was clear from the discussions, beside the programme director, that the placement providers would not know who they could contact within the programme team for any issues relating to this programme. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the structure for the day to day management of the programme, particularly when the programme director is away, the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team will deliver each area of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how students will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team when the programme director is away.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The visitors require further evidence of the memorandum of agreement between the education provider and employer and further evidence of when it will be finalised.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated this programme will be delivered in accordance with a partnership arrangement that will be detailed within a memorandum of agreement between the education provider and the employer. This memorandum of agreement will then provide the template for the effective management of the programme, including the distinct responsibilities for the different aspects of the programme and how these will be managed by the partner organisations. However, the visitors were not provided with a copy of the memorandum for Medway Council prior to the visit and were made aware at the visit that the memorandum is still in the process of being agreed and finalised. In order to determine if this programme is effectively managed between the parties, the visitors require details of the indicative content of the memorandum of agreement which may include details of placement capacity or the process for either of the partner organisations to withdraw from the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this criterion.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to clearly articulate the feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine if there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme. During the visit, the visitors discussed the monitoring and evaluation of several aspects of the programme with the programme team. However, these systems were not always clearly reflected in the programme documentation. From the documentation the visitors were unclear about several aspects of the feedback systems in place. In particular, how student feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by this feedback are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated to students. The visitors heard that students are the only group to be given feedback forms. From this, the visitors were unclear how practice placement feedback is considered by the programme team, how any changes initiated by the practice placement providers are implemented, and how any changes to the programme following feedback are communicated back to practice placement providers and students. The visitors were therefore unable to determine if this criterion is met. The visitors require information which clearly articulates student feedback mechanisms and practice placement feedback mechanisms in place for programme monitoring and evaluation.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme

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

Reason: From a review of the CV's submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that some that were included belong to staff members who taught on the social work programme. In reviewing the CV's, the visitors were unable to determine who the teaching staff would be for this programme as the visitors were not provided with any information on how these staff members would be involved in delivering this programme. Furthermore, due to the lack of clarity in who would be delivering the different aspects of the programme, the visitors were unable to determine if there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that there is, or will be, an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver this programme effectively.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be.

Reason: From the review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors were unable to identify who the module leaders were for this programme. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the programme director

would be the module leader for majority of the subjects delivered. From this information, the visitors were unable to determine how subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be, in order to determine how this criterion can be met by the programme.

B.14 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place

Condition: The education provider must identify where students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify the attendance requirements for students or how students were informed about the mandatory elements of the programme. From the practice learning handbook, page 7 the visitors noted that "A record of attendance must be kept by the PE". In discussion with the students there was some confusion regarding understanding of the attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms for this programme. The visitors also discussed the attendance policy with the programme team. It was highlighted that students are required to complete a minimum of 35 days of placements, however, it was clear students were not aware of this requirement or what would happen if they did not meet this minimum requirement. The visitors therefore were unable to determine how the programme team monitor attendance and are able to intervene if attendance became an issue. The visitors could not see where attendance requirements are communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence demonstrating how this criterion is met.

D.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

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

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with Section 2 approval criteria for approving mental health professionals mapping document for the programme which linked the learning outcomes associated with practice placements to relevant standards of competencies. However, from the evidence provided at the visit it was clear that the local authorities as the placement providers, are responsible for providing suitable placements for students, rather than the staff team at the education provider. It was also highlighted in the meeting with the programme team that the outcomes of each of the placements is negotiated between the student and the placement provider at the first placement meeting. From the information provided the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that the local authorities will provide placements to students that will be of sufficient quality, length and variety for them to meet the competencies required. From the documentation

provided, the visitors could also not determine how the education provider will ensure that the allocation of placements will be equitable and provide all students with sufficient placement experience to meet the required competencies in Section 2: Approved mental health professionals. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the allocation of placements work in practice and how the education provider will ensure that the number, duration and range of these placements ensures that all students will be provided with the opportunity to meet the required learning outcomes. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme may meet this criterion.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information clarifying how students are supported in working out of hours whilst on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted through meetings with students and placement educators that students may be required to work out of hours whilst on placement. This would most often be the case where mental health assessments are started during or after normal working hours and extend through to and past midnight. The visitors heard that both the local authorities that offer placements are moving to a 24/7 service or have already done so. In such circumstances, the visitors were unclear what support a student should expect to receive from the education provider and placement provider.

The visitors therefore require further information regarding the support mechanisms available to students on placement, specifically in relation to out of hours work. Any evidence should clearly address what support mechanisms are available from the education provider and placement provider and how this information is communicated to the student.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure a safe and supportive environment at all placement settings.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this criterion. The visitors also noted the student complaints procedure document, page 1, "Complaints relating to a placement may be better resolved within the workplace". From the documentation, the visitors were unsure how the education provider ensures all practice placements provide students with a safe and supportive environment, particularly if students may be expected to seek resolution at their placement without the support of the education provider. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors heard in great detail the efforts taken by the practice placement provider to ensure that all their placements are safe and supportive for students. However, the visitors were unable to determine the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that all placements are safe and supportive. Therefore, the visitors could not determine what the education provider's system for approving and monitoring placements are and how, through using this system, they ensure that all practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students to learn in. To ensure this criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence to show what steps the education

provider takes to ensure that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment for students.

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements

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

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

D.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored

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

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers, as well as the education provider's equality and diversity policies. The visitors reviewed this information but were unable to determine from this how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at the practice placement setting

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. In scrutinising evidence, such as the 'Practice Placement Arrangement' documentation provided and in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the local authorities hold a database of staff that can act as placement educators. Due to the evidence provided and discussions, the visitors were unclear how much responsibility the education provider has and would continue to have for ensuring that the placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further evidence as to how the education provider ensures practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation received, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. For this standard, the education provider referenced the submission document in their SETs mapping document. The visitors had the opportunity to meet with the practice placement providers who spoke in detail about the steps they take to ensure their practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that there is a record kept by the programme team which records the qualification and experience of practice placement educators. However, the visitors were not presented with the record discussed. The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the

education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme. The visitors had the opportunity to meet with the practice placement educators, who revealed that they have not attended practice placement educator training in a number of years. Without training the visitors were unable to determine how practice placement educators are prepared to deliver both formative and summative assessment as well as how this is consistent across placements. The visitors heard that practice placement providers ensure that their own practice educators had undergone their own in house training. But they were unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. From the discussions at the visit, it was clear that no formal training was available to practice placement educators. As such the visitors had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this criterion is met, and require further evidence of that practice placement educators are undergoing appropriate training and have access to regular follow up training.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of their processes to ensure placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that registration of practice educators are held with the local authorities. From this evidence the visitors could not determine what process the education provider had in place to ensure that all placement educators will be appropriately registered and what other arrangements would be agreed if this was not possible. During discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that a register of all practice placement educators will be held by local authorities and that this register will record the practice placement educators' registration status. However, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring placement educators are appropriately registered if the registration of practice educators are held by the local authorities. They were also unclear as to the role of the education provider in agreeing other arrangements should appropriately registered practice placement educators not be available at certain placement sites. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further evidence of the process in place which ensures that placement educators are appropriately registered and what arrangements will be put in place should registered placement educators not be available.

D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider, the visitors noted the collaborative arrangements described in the documentation. However, from the

description the visitors were unsure if the collaborative arrangements involved, included regular meetings or other methods of communication between the education provider and the placement provider. In discussions at the visit with the practice placement providers and practice educators, the visitors heard that there is no formal communication channel operating between the placement providers and the education provider. The placement provider and practice educators expressed concerns around their relationship with the education provider, in particular that there is no system in place where they can comment on their experience of supervising students on placement, influence the structure of practice placement or provide feedback on the programme's planning and design. From the discussions at the visit, the visitors noted that this programme has no formal mechanism in managing the collaborative relationship between the practice placement providers, educators and the education provider. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find evidence from the documentation and discussions to determine how the education provider will ensure regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers and consequently how this criterion is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met.

D.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

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

Reason: The visitors could not determine from the evidence provided how the education provider ensures that students, practice placement providers and educators are fully prepared for placement. In particular they could not identify how they were made aware of the students' ability and expected scope of practice while on placement and what the expectations of both the students and practice placement educators should be at each individual placement to ensure that students gain the experience they require. During the discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the practice provider and educators often felt unprepared to take on students. This was confirmed to the visitors by the students, who described their experience of placement where often it seemed that practice educator or the placement provider were not aware that they were coming for placement. The visitors therefore require information about the mechanisms in place, which demonstrate how the education provider ensures students are fully prepared for placement. In particular this should demonstrate how practice educators are made aware of students' experience and expected scope of practice for each placement and how the expectation of both the students and practice placement educators at placement are managed to ensure that students get the experience they require to meet the relevant learning outcomes. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how placement providers, practice placement educators and students will be prepared for placements by the education provider.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment

Condition: The education provider must submit appropriate programme documentation to clearly demonstrate how they have effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the assessment strategy as outlined in the programme documentation, but were unable to determine from the evidence provided, the process in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment. In discussion at the visit the programme team gave a brief outline of the marking strategy specific to this programme which indicated that assessment would be doubled marked generally by academics but there may be some aspects of the assessment undertaken by individuals outside of the academic programme team, such as local authority partners. In addition, the visitors heard that there is a practice moderation panel that ensures consistency in marking. The visitors could not find detail in the documentation as to these arrangements, or how people outside the programme team would be trained for involvement in assessment. They were also not clear on the details of moderation for the assignments within the academic team, and therefore were unable to determine a clear internal moderation strategy in relation to this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence as to the marking procedures and internal moderation processes in place to ensure that appropriate standards of assessment are met.

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be

from the relevant part of an appropriate professional register. In order to determine this criterion is met, the visitors require further evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Recommendations

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff

Recommendation: The programme team should keep under review the length of time it takes for students gain a library card, and to gain access to learning resources for the programme including IT facilities, to continue to be appropriate to the curriculum, and readily available to students.

Reason: From discussion with the students it was apparent that they were satisfied with the resources associated with this programme. However, some students spoke of difficulties in registering with the library, in particular delays in receiving a library card. The visitors noted that without a library card, students are unable to access the resources including IT facilities. The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to keep under review the length of time it takes for students to gain a library card, and in turn access to the learning resources they need for the programme and to ensure that resources continue to be readily available to all students going forward.

Graham Noyce
Nicholas Drey
David Abrahart

hpc **health & care
professions
council**

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	2 – 3 July 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 20 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 24 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 October 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 10 November 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
	Sue Boardman (Paramedic)
	Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	100 per cohort, 3 cohorts per year
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2015
Chair	Helen Barker (Coventry University)
Secretary	Amelia Hamson (Coventry University)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee a number of conditions are set on the programme, all of which must be met before the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors agreed that 46 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 12 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence of the information made available to potential applicants.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation, the visitors were not given any information that would be provided to potential applicants taking an offer of a place via the 'Tech to Para' route. In addition, the visitors were unsure from the discussions at what point the applicants will become students of Coventry University as applicants will complete one year's training with WMAS and then using Accreditation of Prior Experiential learning (APEL) will join the one year programme delivered by the education provider. The visitors, therefore, require documentation detailing both the admissions procedures and the underpinning course programme for the Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Science. In this way, both the education provider and the applicant can have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. This condition is linked to other standards in SET 2.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding any language requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding any language requirements. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such, the visitors were unclear what the admission procedures for this programme is and how these procedures provide the education provider with the information they require as part of the process to offer an applicant a place on the

programme. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence regarding the admissions procedure for this programme and how the education provider ensures that successful applicants meet the relevant requirements, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding criminal conviction checks. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such, the visitors could not determine how the procedures of WMAS will work with those of the education provider, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with by the education provider to ensure that they are dealt with consistently to determine if any issue arising would prevent an applicant form completing the programme. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto this programme if any issue does arise as the information provided at the visit articulated that applicants would have already employed by WMAS. Therefore the visitors require further information about the DBS checks that are applied at the point of admission for this programme. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how WMAS's processes would work with the education provider's process, and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if an issue arises.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a

pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding health requirements. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such, the visitors could not determine how the education provider's own procedures to apply health checks, will work with WMAS. Nor could the visitors determine how the education provider will identify what adjustments could or could not reasonably be made if health conditions were disclosed, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with consistently, since applicants would have already been accepted onto the training employment programme delivered by WMAS. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto the programme if adjustments would be required. Therefore the visitors require further information about how the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme are used by the education provider to determine if a student can take up a place on this programme. In particular the visitors require clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if adjustments are required, at the point of entry onto this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure or the underpinning "technician" course for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such the visitors, were unsure how the education provider, working with the employer, could apply selection and entry criteria for the programme, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards. Therefore the education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it, as the education provider, ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the admissions procedure for this programme applies selection and entry criteria including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the Coventry University, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS (stated as equivalent to 120 points at level 4), before coming to Coventry University. In assessing the documentation the visitors were not presented with WMAS selection criteria for employment with the trust. As such, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms will be applied as part of the entry criteria. From the discussions at the visit, it was clear that WMAS will manage the academic and professional selection and entry criteria for employment and therefore this would act as the entry criteria for the programme. From the discussions, the visitors could not determine how Coventry, as the education provider, ensures that appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms are being applied and how any decisions to offer a place on the programme would be managed based on these mechanisms. The visitors did not see any overarching policies, systems and procedures for managing WMAS approach to academic and professional selection and entry criteria. As such, the visitors were unsure how the education provider, working with the employer, could apply selection and entry criteria for the programme, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms. Therefore the education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it, as the education provider, ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, through the use of appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that it applies selection and entry criteria including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the documentation submitted indicated that the education provider would be involved in the training delivered in students' first year of employment at WMAS and that subsequently the students would be admitted to the education provider as students in accordance with Coventry's AP(E)L policy to study the second year of the programme. As such the visitors were clear that the in-work-training that a student would undergo in their first year of employment would attract the equivalent of 120 academic credits at level 4 of an undergraduate degree and that are required by students who wish to start the second year at level 5. However, during the course of the

visit, the visitors learnt that the education provider would not have any role in delivering the training to potential students in the first year of employment at WMAS and instead would be responsible for a one year programme of study at level 5 for any of these potential students who successfully completed their year of training at WMAS. As such the programme subject to this approval would only be the one year programme at the education provider and will not include the previous year's training at the employer.

During discussions with the programme team, the visitor learnt that all applicants would be assessed by completing 175 hours at practice and an online care and compassion course. As such, students are awarded "Advance Standing" for 120 credits at level 1 in recognition of technician qualifications / experience.

However, the visitors were not provided with any information on the content of the online course, what the 170 hour should consist of or what mapping exercise was done to award these students 120 credits. As such, the visitors were unable to see how the AP(E)L process would be implemented to ensure that applicants from WMAS would have undertaken training equivalent to that of a full year of undergraduate study. In particular the visitors could not identify how the education provider could ensure that anyone admitted to the programme through this process would have met the required learning outcomes associated with the training programme at WMAS. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the AP(E)L process that will be implemented by the education provider. This evidence should demonstrate how Coventry, as the education provider, will ensure that prospective students will be consistently judged to determine how they have met the required learning outcomes for successful application to this programme, equivalent to those of a first year undergraduate degree.

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that consent to participate in role-play will be discussed with students verbally and written consent is gained for use of photographic images or video footage. Through discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that students were aware that role play was part of the taught element of this programme. However, the visitors noted that there was some confusion among the students regarding giving consent. Discussions with programme team revealed that other HCPC approved programmes, delivered by the education provider, have a consent form which students are asked to sign. The visitors were told that the programme team are intending on introducing a similar protocol in September but were not provided with any evidence of what the consent form would consist of. As such the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate in this form of teaching and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been gained. Also the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how situations where students declined to participate were managed and what alternative learning arrangements would be provided to ensure that there was no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that student' attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was limited information provided on service user and carer involvement within the programme. Discussions with the programme team at the visit indicated that the dedicated service users and carers who contribute to the Foundation programme will also contribute to this programme in a similar way. However, in discussions with the dedicated service user and carers that are involved in the Foundation it was clear that they have not been approached to be involved in this programme. The visitors recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages for this programme and that there is an intention to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this group would be developed, and how service users and carers would be involved in the programme in the future. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided that a plan is in place on how service users will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for service user and carer involvement in this programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme meets this standard. However,

in considering the initial documentation submitted and discussions held at the visit, the visitors could not find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. From discussions with the programme team, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for the approval and monitoring of practice placements. The visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and student feedback feeds into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate what the process in place is and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate how they maintain a through and effective system of approving and monitoring non-ambulance placements.

Reason: The visitors noted a number of different documents submitted by the education provider to demonstrate how the programme team approves and monitors ambulance placements. From the documentation the visitors noted that the range of placement was limited to ambulance setting only. As such, no information was provided on how the programme team monitors and approved non-ambulance placements.
In discussion with the students, the visitors heard that a number of students arranged their own non-ambulance placements without the approval and monitoring of the education provider. The visitors had concerns that there was no policies in place to respond appropriately if any difficulties arise around student experience because these placements were not approved or monitored by the education provider. The visitors discussed this was the programme team and it was revealed that they were not aware that students were arranging their own non-ambulance placements. The visitors were told that students are not expected to go and find their own non-ambulance placement and that it would be made clear to students that this would not be an option. As such, the visitors need confirmation that students will not be permitted to seek their own non-ambulance placements or if they are, that there is an effective and through system for approving these placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid

any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From assessing the documentation and the discussions with programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied this standard is being met. However, the visitors would encourage the programme team to keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers increase in the coming years.

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

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

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

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the range of placements available for students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that students do not experience any non-ambulance unless they go out and arrangement placement. The visitors noted that this meant that students had difference experience on this

programme. The visitor would like to encourage the programme team to continue to review and monitor the range of placement available for students on this programme so that students get the full experience with the range of placements.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

Sue Boardman
Glyn Harding
Sid Jeewa

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Coventry University
Programme name	Foundation Degree in Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	2 – 3 July 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 20 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 28 October 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 10 November 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
	Sue Boardman (Paramedic)
	Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	74 per cohort, one cohort per year
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2015
Chair	Helen Barker (Coventry University)
Secretary	Amelia Hamson (Coventry University)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 53 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 5 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that consent to participate in role-play will be discussed with students verbally and written consent is gained for use of photographic images or video footage. Through discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that students were aware that role play was part of the taught element of this programme. However, the visitors noted that there was some confusion among the students regarding giving consent. Discussions with programme team revealed that other HCPC approved programmes, delivered by the education provider, have a consent form which students are asked to sign. The visitors were told that the programme team are intending on introducing a similar protocol in September but were not provided with any evidence of what the consent form would consist of. As such the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate in this form of teaching and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been gained. Also the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how situations where students declined to participate were managed and what alternative learning arrangements would be provided to ensure that there was no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to identify where attendance is mandatory, where students are informed of this within the programme documentation and how attendance is monitored across all elements of the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors could not identify what the attendance requirements for students were across the programme. The visitors were also unclear as to how students are informed about the elements of the programme where attendance is mandatory. In discussion with the programme team, it was clarified that student's attendance is mandatory across all practical elements of the programme and that this is monitored closely. However, it was also highlighted that while full attendance was expected at all taught modules, an attendance sheet was not completed for every module session. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to clarify where attendance is mandatory for students, and the effects non-attendance may have on their progression through the programme. The visitors also require further evidence of how attendance throughout the course of the programme is monitored.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From assessing the documentation and the discussions with programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied this standard is being met. However, the visitors would encourage the programme team to keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers increase in the coming years.

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

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

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

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the range of placements available for students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that students only experience a week in non-ambulance placement settings, and the week is made up of theatre placement only. The visitor would like to encourage the programme team to continue to

review and monitor the range of placement available for students on this programme so that students get the full experience with the range of placements.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should continue to monitor the number of staff at the placement setting, to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support students, following the increase in student numbers.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that there are currently an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting, and therefore that this standard is met. However, from discussion with the practice placement team and the programme team, the visitors noted the challenges in regards to planning for the provision of practice placements with the recent increase in student numbers. The visitors would therefore suggest that the education provider continue to monitor the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to ensure it continues to be sufficient to meet the needs of the students at the placement setting.

Sue Boardman
Glyn Harding
Sid Jeewa

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Cumbria
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	18 – 19 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

This visit was the result of the education provider amending their current provision for social work. The education provider will continue to run the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, which is approved by the HCPC. They will also offer a new training route. Given the similarity between the approved programme and the new programme, it was agreed the approval of this programme would incorporate those who enrolled for the July 2014 cohort. Those students will be eligible to apply for registration upon successful completion of the programme with the caveat that the education provider will have to meet all conditions in this report including any conditions the visitors set specifically for the first cohort of students who commenced the programme in July 2014.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Patricia Higham (Social worker in England) Deirdre Keane (Lay visitor) Christine Stogdon (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	7per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	July 2014
Chair	Jackie Moss (University of Cumbria)
Secretary	Suzanne Parkes (University of Cumbria)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure potential applicants of the programme are given a complete range of information in order to make an informed choice about the programme.

Reason: In the documents provided prior to the visit, the visitors could not determine how students and potential applicants will be provided with the necessary information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme or otherwise. The visitors were unable to see clearly articulated information on the following:
- number of face to face hours at the education provider;
- information on the range of placements;
- self-study time as part of the programme;
- attendance requirements on the programme;
- access to a computer as per programme's requirement; and
- the details of how the programme will be delivered.

As such, the visitors were unable to determine how key information is communicated to potential applicants, to ensure that they are able to make an informed decision regarding whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme. During the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that the programme team will revisit and produce detailed programme documentation and advertising materials clearly articulating the information students and potential applicants need to make an informed choice. To assess whether this standard is met the visitors need to see the revised programme documentation and the advertising materials.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the admissions guidance to clearly identify which policies and procedures are applied to students on the programme.

Reason: From the review of the documentation, the visitors noted that this programme will only be recruiting students who are employed by Cumbria County Council (CCC). In the documentation, the visitors learnt that the education provider has a range of policies and procedures that are applied to students. These policies included, criminal convictions checks, health requirements, student complaints process and a process for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct. However, similar policies were in place at CCC as well. The visitors were unclear how potential applicants when considering applying for the programme will know which policies apply to them. To ensure the standard is met, the visitors will want to see clearly articulated information about which policies and procedures are applied to students so that potential applicants are clear and can make an informed choice about whether to apply for admission to the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the partnership arrangement between the education provider and partner organisation as well as further evidence of when it will be finalised.

Reason: The visitors noted, in the documentation provided, the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisation Cumbria County Council (CCC) which articulated the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme for the full time route. The visitors were able to identify how the proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and CCC could ensure that the programme has a secure position in the education provider's business plan for the distance learning route. However, in the senior team meeting, it was agreed, that the partnership arrangements need to reflect the new route of the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the detail and indicative content of the partnership agreement including confirmation of when it will be finalised and agreed. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence about the delivery of the distance learning route for this programme to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that this programme will only be recruiting students who are employed by Cumbria County Council (CCC). The visitors also noted that the programme will be delivered through distance learning with some face to face teachings and guided independent study. During the programme team meeting the visitors heard that the programme team will determine the appropriate face to face contact hours for each module and it may differ for each cohort. However, the visitors could not determine the breakdown of teaching methods, including the number of face to face hours students need to be at the education provider and thus consequently the appropriate resources to ensure all students have consistent experience on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the delivery of the distance learning route for this programme and how the education provider is planning to put appropriate resources in place to ensure the programme is effectively managed.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, the programme specification on page 3 states "The number of placement days is determined by the HCPC". The visitors also noted on page 23 of the programme specification "The entry requirements for students applying to the programme are as

stated by the HCPC". With reference to these two examples respectively; the HCPC does not determine placements days, instead HCPC requires the education providers to ensure the number, range and duration of practice placements is appropriate to the programme. Similarly, HCPC does not have entry requirements for students, instead HCPC requires education providers to have appropriate admissions procedures in place to give enough information to students and potential applicants to make an informed choice. The visitors therefore require the documentation to revise all instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard can be met.

3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

Condition: The education provider must provide clarity about the personal tutoring system and how it is communicated to students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that this programme will only be recruiting students who are employed by Cumbria County Council (CCC). The visitors also noted that the programme will be delivered through distance learning with some face to face teachings and guided independent study. The documentation included information about the academic and pastoral support systems in place on the programme. Discussions with students revealed the programme team was considered to be very supportive, but students rarely contacted their personal tutors. Given the demanding nature of this route and the lack of clarity personal tutor system for the students, visitors were concerned about the support needed for students on the programme. The visitors therefore require further information about personal tutoring system and how students are made aware of this system. In this way, the visitors can be assured that this standard is met.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation submitted prior to the visit and noted that this programme will only be recruiting students who are employed by Cumbria County Council (CCC). The visitors also noted that the programme will be delivered through distance learning with some face to face teachings and guided independent study. The documentation did not clearly specify the minimum attendance requirements for this programme with little indication of how time lost through absence will be covered. During discussions with the programme team, it was highlighted that the programme team will identify where students' attendance is mandatory and put procedures and mechanisms in place to monitor it effectively. Therefore, visitors require the programme documentation to be revised to clearly identify where on the programme students' attendance is mandatory with an indication of how time lost through absence will be covered and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of the service users and carers' involvement in the programme for this route. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users in the programme throughout. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- 6.2 be able to use practice to challenge and address the impact of discrimination, disadvantage and oppression; and
- 3.3 understand both the need to keep skills and knowledge up to date and the importance of career-long learning; and
- 9.8 recognise the contribution that service users' and carers' own resources and strengths can bring to social work

Reason: The education provider submitted a SOPs mapping document as part of the documentation for this visit. In the mapping document, the above SOPs were left blank. The visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above SOPs. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the programme team may have missed mapping the curriculum's learning outcomes against these SOPs. The programme team gave examples of the curriculum delivering the above SOPs. As such, the visitors will need to see documentary evidence to be satisfied that these SOPs are delivered in the curriculum. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how in the programme, students will be taught about, and students who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the above SOPs.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- 2.9 recognise the power dynamics in relationships with service users and carers and be able to manage those dynamics appropriately; and
- 13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:
  - social work theory;
  - social work models and interventions;
  - the development and application of relevant law and social policy;
  - the development and application of social work and social work values;
  - human growth and development across the lifespan and the impact of key developmental stages and transitions;
  - the impact of injustice, social inequalities, policies and other issues which affect the demand for social work services;
  - the relevance of psychological, environmental, sociological and physiological perspectives to understanding personal and social development and functioning;
  - concepts of participation, advocacy and empowerment; and
  - the relevance of sociological perspectives to understanding societal and structural influences on human behaviour

Reason: The education provider submitted a SOPs mapping document as part of the documentation for this visit. In the mapping document, the programme team indicated the above SOPs would be delivered within modules HSWG 4001, 4003, 4004, 5002, 5003, 5004, 6001, 6003 and HSWG 6004. The visitors looked at the learning outcomes of these modules and noted that learning outcomes were implicit and therefore visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum, the above SOPs would be addressed. In discussion the programme team highlighted that other modules would cover these SOPs generically. However, the programme team will update the learning outcomes to ensure the above SOPs are covered explicitly. From the documentation however, the visitors could not see where in the modules the learning outcomes ensured these SOPs are delivered and so require further evidence.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will ensure students gain sufficient breadth of social work experience on placement to support students meeting the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their profession.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures students undertake a sufficient range of practice placement settings. During discussions with the programme team and the placement providers, the visitors noted students will have their two placements in both adult and child and family settings. The visitors agreed that child and family focused social work competencies are covered in the final placement; however they were unclear how the competencies not

linked to child and family settings are achieved in the adult settings placement. The visitors were unclear how the programme will ensure all the standards of proficiency for social workers in England and associated learning outcomes that students are expected to meet when completing placements are achieved. Therefore, the visitors require further information that demonstrates how the programme team will ensure students have a sufficient breadth of social work experience on placement to support students meeting the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their profession.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence about their processes to ensure that practice placement educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were made aware that the education provider offers a three day training course to practice placement educators. The programme team meeting indicated that there is additional two days training for practice educators to achieve recognised practice educators qualification. This is delivered in partnership with other regional partners. However, the documentation provide limited information about this training and associated processes including how it is used to ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training. The programme team and placement providers also discussed the various practice educators training that is in place at CCC. The visitors acknowledged that there were training opportunities provided by the education provider for placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require further information of the programme specific training that is offered to practice placement educators to ensure they can assess students in line with the assessment requirements of the education provider and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: The documentation states that the 'link lecturer process' ensures that there are effective links between the education provider and students' placement. The visitors noted this is useful for individual placements and students on these placements. However, this standard requires the education provider to have regular and effective collaboration with all practice placements providers including private, voluntary and independent sector. The visitors met with practice educators and representatives for the partnership from the practice placement provider at the visit. The programme team meeting indicated that the education provider is part of the regional partnership and meets regularly with members of the partnerships. However from the documentation, the visitors were unclear about the nature of this regional partnership and the frequency of their meetings. Therefore, visitors require further evidence that the collaboration and joint work between the education provider and practice placement providers will be regular and effective.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how students will be fully prepared for placement through the 30 'skills days'.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation that the programme will be delivered through distance learning with some face to face teachings and guided independent study. The documentation submitted indicated the programme has 30 'skills days' which students are required to complete before their practice placements can begin. Discussions with the programme team indicated the 'skills days' are designed to prepare students so that each student has a basic level of knowledge and skills they need for practice placements. The visitors learnt, these 'skills days' will be covered in level 4 and level 5 modules. However, in relation to condition under SET 3.2 and due to the nature of the delivery for this programme, the visitors were unable to determine where in the programme these 30 'skill days' are covered. As such, the visitors were unable to determine that students would be fully prepared for placements. Therefore, visitors require further evidence of the detail and indicative content of the 'skills days', and how these 'skills days' will fully prepare students for placements.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy of the programme ensures students who complete the programme successfully meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- 6.2 be able to use practice to challenge and address the impact of discrimination, disadvantage and oppression; and
- 3.3 understand both the need to keep skills and knowledge up to date and the importance of career-long learning; and
- 9.8 recognise the contribution that service users' and carers' own resources and strengths can bring to social work

Reason: The education provider submitted a SOPs mapping document as part of the documentation for this visit. In the mapping document, the above SOPs were left blank. The visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the above SOPs are delivered and consequently assessed. Through discussion with the programme team it was highlighted that the programme team may have missed to map the curriculum against these SOPs. The programme team gave examples of the curriculum delivering and assessing these SOPs. As such, the visitors will need to see documentary evidence to be satisfied that the above SOPs are delivered and assessed in the curriculum. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate how in the

programme, students will be taught about, assessed, and when successfully complete the programme are able to meet the above SOPs.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy of the programme ensures students who complete the programme successfully meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- 2.9 recognise the power dynamics in relationships with service users and carers and be able to manage those dynamics appropriately; and
- 13.4 understand in relation to social work practice:
  – social work theory;
  – social work models and interventions;
  – the development and application of relevant law and social policy;
  – the development and application of social work and social work values;
  – human growth and development across the lifespan and the impact of key developmental stages and transitions;
  – the impact of injustice, social inequalities, policies and other issues which affect the demand for social work services;
  – the relevance of psychological, environmental, sociological and physiological perspectives to understanding personal and social development and functioning;
  – concepts of participation, advocacy and empowerment; and
  – the relevance of sociological perspectives to understanding societal and structural influences on human behaviour

Reason: The education provider submitted a SOPs mapping document as part of the documentation for this visit. In the mapping document, the programme team indicated the above SOPs would be delivered and assessed within modules HSWG 4001, 4003, 4004, 5002, 5003, 5004, 6001, 6003 and HSWG 6004. The visitors looked at the learning outcomes of these modules and noted that learning outcomes were implicit and therefore visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum, the above SOPs would be delivered and assessed. In discussions, the programme team highlighted that other modules would cover these SOPs generically. However, the programme team will update the learning outcomes to ensure the above SOPs are covered and assessed explicitly in the curriculum. From the documentation however, the visitors could not see where in the modules the learning outcomes ensured these SOPs are delivered and assessed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence.

<div align="right">

Patricia Higham
Deirdre Keane
Christine Stogdon

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	MA Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	16 – 17 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan (Social worker in England)
	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
	Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Katherine Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Colin Watt (External Panel Member)
	Caroline Hickman (The College of Social Work)
	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work)
	Frances Scattergood (Internal Panel Member)
	Jacqui Basquill (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular English language requirements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the website was highlighted as the main way to provide detailed information about the programme and the admission process. However, upon reviewing the website the visitors could not determine where applicants were informed about the English language requirement for this programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the website, to ensure potential applicants are informed of the English language requirements for this programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they communicate the attendance policy and monitoring process to students on the programme.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors were directed to the programme handbook where the attendance requirement and the monitoring processes are detailed. From this information, the visitors were satisfied that there was a system in place to monitor attendance, and that the standard has been met. However during the meeting with the students it was noted that some of the students were unaware that attendance requirement was 100 per cent. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how best to communicate the attendance policy and monitoring process to the students on the programme to ensure all students are aware of the required attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms.

Susanne Roff
Anne Mackay
Jane McLenachan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	PG Dip Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	16 – 17 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 6 July 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Jane McLenachan (Social worker in England)
	Anne Mackay (Social worker in England)
	Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Tony Turjansky (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Katherine Griffiths (Edge Hill University)
Members of the joint panel	Colin Watt (External Panel Member)
	Caroline Hickman (The College of Social Work)
	Sue Furness (The College of Social Work)
	Frances Scattergood (Internal Panel Member)
	Jacqui Basquill (Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the admissions information provided to ensure that applicants to the programme are informed of the expectations of the admissions process, and in particular English language requirements.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that applicants to the programme have all of the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the website was highlighted as the main way to provide detailed information about the programme and the admission process. However, upon reviewing the website the visitors could not determine where applicants were informed about the English language requirement for this programme. The visitors consider this to be essential information for applicants and therefore, require the education provider to review the website, to ensure potential applicants are informed of the English language requirements for this programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the programme can meet this standard by ensuring that applicants have all the information they require in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendations

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how they communicate the attendance policy and monitoring process to students on the programme.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors were directed to the programme handbook where the attendance requirement and the monitoring processes are detailed. From this information, the visitors were satisfied that there was a system in place to monitor attendance, and that the standard has been met. However during the meeting with the students it was noted that some of the students were unaware that attendance requirement was 100 per cent. As such, the visitors recommend that the education provider consider how best to communicate the attendance policy and monitoring process to the students on the programme to ensure all students are aware of the required attendance policy and the associated monitoring mechanisms.

Susanne Roff
Anne Mackey
Jane Mclenchan

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Heart of Worcestershire College
Validating body	Birmingham City University
Programme name	BA (Hons) Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	11 – 12 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 23 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 8 July 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sid Jeewa (Lay visitor)
	Teri Rogers (Social worker in England)
	Dorothy Smith (Social worker in England)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Nicola Byrom
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Philip Thickett (Birmingham City University)
Secretary	Faye Bond (Birmingham City University)
Members of the joint panel	Andrea Collins (External panel member)
	Heather Coughlin (External panel member)
	Barbara Neale (External panel member)
	Alan Robson (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC reviewed external examiners' reports from the last two years for the BA (Hons) Social Work validated by University of Worcester, as external examiners' reports have not yet been produced for the programme seeking approval.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BA (Hons) Social Work validated by University of Worcester, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 56 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining two SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the documentation supporting the programme to ensure it is consistent, clear and up-to-date.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit, and noted various inconsistencies or inaccuracies. For example, discussions at the visit confirmed that there would be no compensatable modules on the programme, however module descriptors were inconsistent in reflecting these requirements. There were also instances of inconsistent titling of module SWSS3003, and the visitors highlighted that many of the references to editions of core texts on reading lists within the module descriptors required updating. The module descriptor for SWSS3009 Practice – Achieving Capability states the mode of delivery as 80 days attendance in placement, whereas it was confirmed through other documentation and discussions with the programme team that this should be 100 days. In the Practice Learning Handbook Year 3 (page 8) it also incorrectly states that the amount of placement days specified is a Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) requirement. There were other inaccurate references to the HCPC within the programme resources, for example, "The Health and Social Care Professions Council" (on the programme webpage's Assessment section). The visitors noted that these inconsistencies could be misleading or ineffective in supporting students. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit documentation to ensure it is an effective resource in supporting student learning.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must clarify the attendance requirements for the programme, including the minimum level which would trigger formal procedures, and what those procedures will entail.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the Course Guide (page 49) as evidence for this programme. They noted the attendance requirement is 100 per cent for both academic and practice modules. This section of the Couse Guide also highlights the reporting procedures for absences. It states: "Where attendance requirements and sickness notification have not been met, attendance will be the subject of formal enquiry by the Personal Tutor and could result in the student failing the module on the grounds of not having met attendance requirements." However, the visitors could not find an explicit statement in the documentation as to what the minimum level that is acceptable was for the programme, and what situation would trigger formal procedures. The programme team indicated in discussions that the minimum level was 80 per cent. They also outlined the process of tutor contact following absence and alternative learning assignments, followed by formal procedures where necessary. In discussion with the students, the visitors heard confirmation that any absences were followed up with contact from the programme staff. However, though the expectation of full attendance was made clear, students were unsure as to the minimum level of attendance that would trigger formal procedures, or what the process would be. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how students are informed of the minimum level of acceptance for attendance, and the follow-up procedures that are in place.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to formalise the feedback mechanisms for external contributions to the programme, including from service users and carers.

Reason: The visitors noted that there are regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for the programme's management and teaching and learning activities, and were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. The visitors also noted the approach to working with external speakers as outlined in the flowchart on page 221 of the Additional Evidence booklet, which states that there is 'Evaluation of session', which is then shared with the speakers. These sessions are delivered in partnership with the programme team to ensure quality and the delivery of required learning outcomes. In the meeting with service users and carers at the visit, the visitors heard that the feedback and debriefing following contributions from service users and carers was largely through informal routes from the programme team. In further discussions at the visit, the programme team outlined how they evaluate these contributions with the individuals. Again, it was noted that the monitoring is undertaken as part of wider formal systems such as module evaluations and annual monitoring, and limited directed formal feedback mechanisms are in place for each session. The visitors encourage the education provider to put more formal mechanisms in place for this area of evaluation to ensure that the significant contributions to delivery from external contributors, including practitioners and service users and carers, continue to be effectively evaluated in future.

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

Recommendation: The education provider are advised to further formalise the agreements in place with placement providers to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning annual reports and minutes of Practice Learning Forum meetings as evidence for this standard. The visitors also reviewed the other documents in place to support the arrangement and management of placements for the programme. In discussions with practice placement providers at the visit, the visitors heard of the regular mechanisms in place with the programme team for assuring the quality of practice placement educators who supervise students on the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider delivers joint briefing sessions for students and practice placement educators, to disseminate information about the documentation and requirements specific for this programme. From this evidence, the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has adequate measures in place to ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors also noted that the practice placement providers manage the records of the practice placement educators' qualifications and registration, and share this with the education provider. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider work to internalise the monitoring processes or further formalise associated agreements that are in place with practice

placement providers, to ensure that the practice placement educators continue to have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience for taking students on the programme.

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

Recommendation: The education provider are advised to further formalise the agreements in place with placement providers to ensure that placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning annual reports and the Practice Learning Opportunity Profile form as evidence for this standard. The visitors also reviewed the other documents in place to support the arrangement and management of placements for the programme. In discussions with practice placement providers at the visit, the visitors heard of the regular mechanisms in place with the programme team for assuring the quality of practice placement educators who supervise students on the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider delivers joint briefing sessions for students and practice placement educators, to disseminate information about the documentation and requirements specific for this programme. From this evidence, the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has adequate measures in place to ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate training. The visitors also noted that the practice placement providers manage the records of the practice placement educators' qualifications and training, and share this with the education provider. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider work to internalise the monitoring processes or further formalise associated agreements that are in place with practice placement providers, to ensure that the practice placement educators continue to undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

Recommendation: The education provider are advised to further formalise the agreements in place with placement providers to ensure that placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: The visitors were directed to the Quality Assurance of Practice Learning annual reports and the Practice Learning Opportunity Profile form as evidence for this standard. The visitors also reviewed the other documents in place to support the arrangement and management of placements for the programme. In discussions with practice placement providers at the visit, the visitors heard of the regular mechanisms in place with the programme team for assuring the quality of practice placement educators who supervise students on the programme. The visitors also noted that the education provider delivers joint briefing sessions for students and practice placement educators, to disseminate information about the documentation and requirements specific for this programme. From this evidence, the visitors were satisfied that the education provider has adequate measures in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered. The visitors also noted that the practice placement providers manage the records of the practice placement educators' registration, and share this with the education provider. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider work to internalise the monitoring processes or further formalise associated agreements that are in place with practice placement providers, to ensure that the

practice placement educators continue to be effectively assured as appropriately registered.

Sid Jeewa
Teri Rogers
Dorothy Smith

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	London Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Programme name	Paramedic Programme
Mode of delivery	Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	7 – 8 July 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 25 August 2016 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Clare Bates (Lay visitor)
	Glyn Harding (Paramedic)
	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	18 per cohort, three cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 January 2016
Chair	Nick Drey (City University London)
Secretary	Valentina Bishop (London Ambulance Service)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

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

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the documentation supporting student learning in all settings to ensure it is consistent, clear and up-to-date.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the programme documentation prior to the visit, and noted an incorrect statement within the programme documentation. The visitors noted within the documentation submitted, that the "Evidence-based Practice" module in the Student Handbook, Programme Map, page seven, stated the "Independent / directed study hour as 60 hours". Whereas, the LAS Paramedic Programme Student Handbook, Appendix 4 Brief Module Descriptors, page eleven, stated the same module as requiring 80 hours of Independent / directed study hours. During the visit, the programme team confirmed the number of hours' students will be required to undertake as independent learning as 80 hours in order to achieve the necessary learning outcomes. With this information, the visitors require the programme team to revise the programme documentation to ensure it has correct and up to date and is consequently an effective resource in supporting student learning.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider is advised to monitor how service users and carers are involved in the programme.

Reason: From the documentation submitted the visitor noted the 'LAS Paramedic Programme Service users and Carers Strategy'. The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme. However, the visitors recognise that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages, and the level of involvements may change once the programme starts. As such, the visitors would like to advise the programme team to regularly monitor how service users and cares are involved in the programme.

4.7 The delivery of the programme must encourage evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider how evidence based practice will be delivered and encouraged throughout the programme.

Reason: From the review of the Student Handbook, Appendix 4, Brief Module Descriptors, the visitors noted the 15 credit 'Evidence-based Practice' module on page 10. From a review of this module, the visitors were satisfied that the delivery of the programme encourages evidence based practice and therefore this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that a large number of standard of proficiencies were associated with this module and would therefore like to encourage the programme team to consider reviewing the time allocated for this module to ensure there is sufficient time to cover the standard of proficiencies. In addition, the visitors noted that evidence based practice is solely contained in this module, as such the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to consider integrating evidence based practice associate learning outcomes in other modules. In this way, the delivery of the programme will encourage evidence based practice in variety of modules.

Clare Bates
Glyn Harding
Anthony Hoswell

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	The University of Northampton
Programme name	MA in Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	7 – 8 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 26 June 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 31 July 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Michael Branicki (Social worker in England) Ian Prince (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Eileen Mullan
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2016
Chair	Julie Jones (The University of Northampton)
Secretary	Vivien Houghton (The University of Northampton)
Members of the joint panel	Jeff Ollerton (Internal Panel Member) Udayan Raur-Ray (Internal Panel Member) Mathew Gough (External Panel Member) Gurnam Singh (External Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided and from the meetings with the programme team and the students the visitors noted that applicants are assessed in a number of ways as part of the admissions process. The admission handbook, page 7 states, "If your application meets the set criteria, you may be invited to sit a written entrance test". Similarly, on page 8, the admission handbook states, "The interview panel is usually made up of two panel members which may include practitioners, service users and carers and an academic". The visitors also learnt in the programme team meeting that all potential students will need to pass the written test and the education provider will review the combination of the interview panel members to ensure a consistent approach. The visitors were concerned about the consistency of these written tests and the combination of the interview panel members. The visitors therefore require further evidence about the selection and entry criteria to ensure they are appropriate, clear and consistent. In this way the visitors will be able to consider how the programme can meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise programme documentation to ensure it accurately reflects the current landscape of regulation for social workers, in England.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect terminology associated with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). For example, programme specification section 13 states "To satisfy the HCPC requirements you will need to demonstrate good character and conduct by means of a declaration of criminal convictions and medical conditions and references from people who know you". The HCPC does not specifically require applicants to demonstrate good character and medical conditions but require education providers to have admission criteria including criminal convictions checks and health requirements. The visitors also noted other instances of incorrect terminology throughout the programme documentation. It is important that students are equipped with accurate information, and the visitors considered it to be important the programme documentation accurately reflects HCPC's role in the regulation of the profession. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revise the programme documentation to correct all instances of inconsistent and incorrect terminology, to ensure that students are not unintentionally misinformed either about the HCPC or the current landscape of regulation. In this way the visitors can determine how the resources to support student learning are being effectively used.

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of the service users and carers' involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users throughout the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence to demonstrate that curriculum is up to date and relevant to current practice.

Reason: The visitors were provided with evidence of the currency of the curriculum within the Standards of Education and Training (SETs) mapping for this programme including module specifications. The visitors were unable to find any reading lists for each module to determine if the curriculum remains up to date and relevant to current practice. Although the visitors were satisfied the programme team will ensure currency of the curriculum going forward, they require further evidence to demonstrate that this programme, as it stands, remains up to date and relevant to current practice. The education provider may wish to provide the reading lists for all modules as one of the evidence to show this programme meets this standard.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider has systems in place for the regular and annual review of placements. During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider has service level agreements with placement providers that ensure placements are appropriate. However, the visitors did not see those agreements with all placement providers. In addition to this, the visitors learnt through discussions that the education provider will strengthen and update the system to approve and monitor placements. Due to the placement audit systems being in development and not enough evidence, the visitors are unable to determine how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence of how the updated system along with other mechanisms will be used to ensure the education provider maintains overall responsibility for the approval and monitoring of placements.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information on how the programme will continue to provide an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting.

Reason: In discussions with the programme team and practice educators, the visitors heard that one of the education providers' main placement providers, Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) keeps a record of their practice educators and inform the education provider about them. However, NCC only provides approximately 14 placements per year. It was highlighted that many placements would provide their own placement educators. With the increase in student numbers, because of the introduction of this programme, more placements will be required and therefore more placement educators need to be available to support students. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that the current BA (Hons) in Social Work students were supported adequately by the number of placements and placement educators available, they could not be sure that this would be maintained for future students on both programmes. The visitors therefore require further clarity from the education provider on placement educators that will in place to support student cohorts (across both programmes).

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

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

Reason: The SETs mapping referred to a standalone module that is offered to placement educators as part of their continuous professional development route for post qualification career. However, during the meeting with practice placement educators, the visitors learnt that practice educators were not aware of all the training available for practice educators and therefore did not attend training. The programme team and placement providers discussed the various practice educator training opportunities that iare in place and what level of qualification is required from the practice educators for each placement. The visitors acknowledged that there were several training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feed into partnership agreements with

the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. To ensure that this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to articulate clearly the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice.

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

Condition: The programme team must ensure programme documentation clearly articulates the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: From review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that students will be offered SWKM016 and SWKM017 as elective on-line modules to enhance the chances of employability of the students. Students do not need to pass these modules to successfully complete this programme. However, the visitors noted in the appendix one of the programme specification "Students wanting to register as a Social Worker with the HCPC they must undertake and successfully complete SWKM016 and SWKM017". During discussions with the programme team the visitors learnt the programme team will update the programme documentation to reflect the correct requirements for students to progress in this programme. Therefore the visitors require the programme team to revisit their programme documentation to ensure this information is clearly articulated to students so that they are aware of the requirements for progression.

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

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

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

Richard Barker
Michael Branicki
Ian Prince

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	MSc Art Psychotherapy (International)
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Arts therapist
Relevant modality / domain	Art therapist
Date of visit	12–13 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 7 August 2015 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Julie Allan (Art therapist) Jonathan Isserow (Art therapist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	Full time 30 per cohort, per year Part time 30 per cohort, per every two years
First approved intake	September 2010
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	October 2015
Chair	Richard Bent (Queen Margaret University)
Secretary	Dawn Martin (Queen Margaret University)
Members of the joint panel	Sally Chalmers (Queen Margaret University) Louise Cotton (Queen Margaret University) Mairghread Ellis (Queen Margaret University) Gemma Holloway (Queen Margaret University)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure it is accurate and reflects the current regulation for art therapists.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noticed a number of inaccuracies. For example the student handbook, page 36, states "On qualifying, students can register with the Health and Care Professions Council". This is incorrect as students will be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, students will not automatically be registered with the HCPC. Further to this, the visitors noted a number of reference to music therapy. For example the Art Psychotherapy Student Handbook, page 14, states "The MSc Art Psychotherapy programme aims to prepare students for registration as a music therapist…" This is incorrect as successful completion of the programme will provide eligibility to apply for registration as an art therapist, not a music therapist. The visitors noted that the above mentioned information, alongside a number of other noted inaccuracies, could be confusing to a student on the programme and provides incorrect information. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the programme documentation to ensure that it is accurate and reflects the current regulation of art therapists.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the service user and carer involvement in the programme and how they are adequately supported.

Reason: From the documentation and meetings with different stakeholders during the visit, the visitors were unable to determine if the education provider has an effective service user and carer involvement strategy. The visitors met with service users and carers at the visit where they heard that they were benefitting greatly from receiving art therapy on the programme, however, were not currently involved in the programme itself. It was stated that this meeting was the first time they had been asked to assist the programme in some way, other than receiving art therapy, and was also the first time they had met the programme team. Further to this it was noted that the service users and carers did not seem to be well supported in their role for the meeting, in particular there were some gaps in assisting them with accessible documentation as well as travel and directions to the campus. From discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users throughout the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the involvement of service users and carers on the programme to ensure that they are both involved and adequately supported in their role.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the requirements for practice educators to attend practice educator training to ensure that attendance is compulsory.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors could see that the education provider facilitates training sessions for practice placement educators. For example the Art Psychotherapy Validation Document, Page 49, states "Practice Educators are invited to attend an annual meeting at the University specific to art psychotherapy, as well as practice education training days provided by QMU". However in a meeting with practice placement educators, the visitors heard that initial or refresher training was not compulsory, it was always offered by the education provider but was not always undertaken. Further to this, some practice educators stated that they had not attended training at all. The visitors noted that practice educator training is imperative to ensuring students are well supported on placement and the practice educators are up to date on the current curriculum. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit the requirements for attendance at the current practice educator training session, or, for other training arrangements to be made. The visitors will also require evidence of how the education provider is monitoring the attendance of practice educators to both initial and refresher training sessions to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider reviewing and updating the information that is provided to practice educators.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and meeting with both practice educators and the programme team the visitors were satisfied that there is regular and effective collaboration and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However the visitors noted that there were some areas of information which were not as clearly communicated to practice educators as others. For example the programme intends to reduce the number of placement days which students are required to attend, however, some practice educators were not currently aware of this. Also, the visitors note that there was some confusion around the clinical responsibility of students whilst on placements, as discussed in the recommendation under SET 5.12 of this report. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisits their current communication strategy with practice placements to ensure that this standard will continue to be met.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Recommendation: The education provider may wish to consider providing further clarity on the ownership of the clinical supervisor role.

Reason: The visitors note that there was some confusion around the clinical responsibility of students whilst on placements. The practice educators thought this responsibility stayed with them whilst the education provider stated it was with themselves. From conversations at the visit, the visitors were satisfied that students were being well looked after and it was clear that clinical responsibility was being delivered throughout the placement. However, the visitors note that with the current confusion there is a risk that the responsibility of clinical responsibility would be lost and therefore a risk to safe and effective practice whilst on placement. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team revisits their current communication on the role and ownership of clinical responsibility to ensure that this standards continues to be met.

Julie Allan
Jonathan Isserow
Ian Hughes

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Salford
Programme name	MSc Podiatry
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Relevant entitlements	Local anaesthetic Prescription only medicine
Date of visit	9 – 10 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 29 July 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Gordon Burrow (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor) Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie (Chiropodist / podiatrist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Debbie Whittaker (University of Salford)
Secretary	Julie Evans (University of Salford)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as the programme is new and there is currently no external examiner. However, visitors did review external examiners' reports for BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme.

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit admissions documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy in the information made available to applicants including appropriate and / or professional entry standards.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were directed to the programme's specification to evidence this standard. The visitors noted instances of inconsistent information. For example, the programme specification section 17 entrance requirements states "A Bachelor's degree with Honours, normally a 2:2 degree or above", however the course finder document in section entry requirements states "specific/subject-specific requirement: Health related subject". In addition, the visitors noted that the minimum average score of 6 or above (and for each component 5.5 or above) from the Cambridge / British Council English Language Testing Service (IELTS) was a requirements for students whose first language is not English. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team will revisit the admission criteria to increase the required IELTS score to 7 with no elements below 6.5 and update this section. The visitors noted that the inconsistent information could be misleading to potential applicants for the programme. Therefore the visitors require further evidence to show that all information available to applicants is accurate and consistent to enable an applicant to make an informed choice on whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of the service users and carers' involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme. Also, during discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users in the programme throughout. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and relevant entitlements.

Reason: From the documentation the visitors were satisfied that anyone successfully completing this programme would be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC. The visitors noted in the programme specification section 20 that "This non-standard programme will provide students with a master's level academic qualification together with a professional practice qualification, which is a pre-requisite for eligibility to apply for registration to the Health and Care Professions Council". However, the visitors were unable to see where in the documentation students were explicitly informed that anyone who receive this award will also be eligible to apply to get the entitlements of local anaesthetic and prescription only medicine. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the programme team ensure that students understand which awards confer eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register and the relevant entitlements.

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the Register. In discussion with the programme team it was indicated the programme team would take account of this standard and update programme documents. In order to determine this standard is met, the visitors need to

see evidence of the HCPC requirements regarding external examiners within the programme documentation.

Gordon Burrow
Christine Morgan
Sharon Wiener-Ogilvie

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Surrey
Programme name	PhD in Health Psychology with Stage 2 Training
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Practitioner psychologist
Relevant modality / domain	Health psychologist
Date of visit	3 – 4 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 3 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Kathryn Thirlaway (Health psychologist) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	10 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 October 2015
Chair	Chris France (University of Surrey)
Secretary	Shane Dowle (University of Surrey)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 44 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The programme team must clarify the selection and entry criteria that will be used in relation to applicants' command of English, and how this will be assessed in applications.

Reason: Discussions with the programme team highlighted that the admission entry test is the main way the programme team ensures that entrants are able to communicate clearly and accurately in spoken and written English. However the visitors were unclear what criteria would be used to measure this. It was also not clear if, or what, International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level was required for entry to the programme for applicants whose first language is not English. The visitors therefore require the education provider to revisit programme documentation to clearly state what measures will be used to ensure that the English language requirements needed for entry to the programme are met.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the programme management structure, highlighting the lines of responsibility of everyone involved in the day to day management of the programme.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with staff curriculum vitae's (CVs) for members of the team responsible for the delivery and management of the programme. From the information provided, it was not clear which members of the programme team would be responsible for which aspects of the programme management, and, who would be delivering specific areas of the programme as the visitors were only provided with two CVs. At the visit the visitors were informed that recruitment of staff for the programme was on-going and that a Stage 2 convenor will be recruited for this programme. This meant that the visitors could not be provided with a clear indication of who was responsible for which areas of the programme and if some staff will be full time or part time members of the programme team. In addition to this, the visitors were unsure how, in the absence of a Stage 2 convenor, this programme will be effectively managed. The visitors therefore require further information regarding the structure for the day to day management of the programme, the lines of responsibility of the teaching team, and how this is conveyed to students to ensure that they can refer to this information, and have a clear understanding regarding which members of the team will deliver each area of the programme. In this way the visitors can determine how the management of the programme will work in practice, and how students will be supported through the programme by members of the programme team.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the 'Stage 2' part of the programme will be monitored and evaluated by the Stage 2 convenor. The visitors were informed that to assist with the Stage 2 monitoring and evaluation, students will be invited to feedback on all aspect of the Stage 2 programme, this feedback will then be given to the Stage 2 convenor. However, the visitors noted that a Stage 2 convenor has yet to be recruited for this programme and the visitors were not given a timeline as to when this individual would be recruited to the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine what regular monitoring and evaluation systems are in place for this programme. In addition to this, the visitors could not determine how student feedback will be considered and actioned in the absence of a Stage 2 convenor. The visitors therefore, require further evidence to clearly articulate the regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme, how these systems will be implemented and how they will be used to quality assure the delivery of this programme to ensure that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how the learning outcomes of the programme allow students to meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
    - understand the need to act in the best interests of service users at all times
- **1b.3 be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and careers**
    - understand the need to provide servicer users (or people acting on their behalf) with the information necessary to enable them to make informed decisions
    - understand the need to use an appropriate interpreter to assist servicer users whose first language is not English, wherever possible
    - recognise that relationships with service users should be based on mutual respect and trust, and be able to maintain high standards of care even in situations of personal incompatibility

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above standards of proficiency. From the standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above SOPs were being taught within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards of proficiency, specifically SOPs 1a.1 and 1b.3 are addressed within the curriculum.

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

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

Reason: The visitors reviewed the standards of education and training (SETs) mapping document provided prior to the visit and noted that consent to participate in role-play will be discussed with students verbally. Through discussions with the students, the visitors learnt that students were aware that role play was part of the taught element of this programme. However, the visitors noted that there was some confusion among the students as to when and if they gave consent to participate as service users. Discussions with programme team revealed that other HCPC approved programmes, delivered by the education provider, have a consent form which students are asked to sign. The visitors were told that the programme team are intending on introducing a similar protocol in September but were not provided with any evidence of what the consent form would consist of. As such the visitors could not determine how students were informed about the requirement for them to participate in this form of teaching and how records were maintained to indicate consent had been gained. Also the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, how situations where students declined to participate were managed and what alternative learning arrangements would be provided to ensure that there was no impact on their learning. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide evidence of the formal protocols that are in place to obtain informed consent.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors noted that there was limited information provided on service user and carer involvement within the programme. Discussions with the programme team at the visit indicated that the dedicated service users and carers who contribute to the clinical psychology programme will also contribute to this programme in a similar way. However, in discussions with the dedicated service user and carers that are involved in the clinical psychology it was clear that they have not been approached to be involved in this programme. The visitors recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages for this programme and that there is an intention to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this group would be developed, and how service users and carers would be involved in the programme in the future. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided that a plan is in place on how service users will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating current and future plans for service user and carer involvement in this programme.

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the 'Finding a placement' document submitted by the education provider. However, from the documentation submitted by the education provider the visitors were not clear how the education provider effectively monitors practice placements. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the programme team undertakes informal placement monitoring in the form of an initial meeting with the practice placement educator. However, the visitors were unable find any evidence of overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements used by the programme. As such, the visitors could not determine the criteria used by the programme team to assess a placement and the overall process undertaken to approve it, as well as how activities such as the practice educator and students' feedback will feed back into this. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the overarching policies, systems and procedures in place regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, and how they are put into practice, to ensure this standard is met. In particular, the visitors require further evidence of the criteria used to approve placement providers and settings, the overall process for the approval and ongoing monitoring of placements, and how information gathered from placement providers at approval, or during a placement experience is considered and acted upon. Any such evidence should articulate the process in place and how this supports the review of the quality of a placement

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

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

Reason: The visitors noted the 'Finding a placement' document submitted by the education provider. However, from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. Subsequently the visitors were unclear as to how the programme team checks that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at a practice placement. An adequate number of appropriately qualified staff to supervise students is required to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced members of staff and how the team will check that this is the case on practice placements. This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: The visitors noted the 'Finding a placement' document submitted by the education provider. However, from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. Subsequently the visitors unclear as to how the programme team checks that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. This also affects how the programme continues to meets other standards in SET 3. Practice placement educators should have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. Subsequently the visitors require evidence of what the programme team considers relevant knowledge, skills and experience and how the team will check that educators on practice placements meet these standards.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: The visitors noted the 'Finding a placement' document submitted by the education provider. However, from the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. The visitors were also unclear as to what the programme team considers appropriate practice placement educator training and the monitoring systems in place to check that practice placement educators have had appropriate training. Practice placement educators should have relevant training to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers appropriate practice placement educator training and how the monitoring mechanisms in place to check that educators on practice placements meet this requirement. This is to ensure that the practice placement educators are appropriately trained and that the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the education provider ensures practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason: From the documentation and discussions with the programme team and placement providers the visitors were unable to find enough evidence to determine how this standard is met. As such they are unclear as to how the programme team checks that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, which also affects how the programme continues to meets other standards in SET 5. Practice placement educators should be appropriately registered to ensure that all students on placement have as consistent experience as practicably possible when trying to achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence of what the programme team considers an appropriately registered member of staff and how the monitoring mechanisms in place to check that this is the case on practice placements

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence of regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Reason: From the documentation provided and during the programme team and practice placement provider meetings, the visitors were made aware service level agreements with practice providers were informal and based on the nature of their good relationships with the placements providers. The visitors discussed this with the programme team and it was indicated that the programme team are in the process of developing a system to maintain regular and effective collaboration with placement providers. Therefore, the visitors were unable to find evidence from the documentation and discussions to determine how the education provider will ensure they have regular and effective collaboration with the practice placement providers and consequently how this standard is met. The visitors require further evidence to show this standard is met**.** This standard is linked to other standards in SET 5.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates that the assessment strategy and design ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the following standards of proficiency (SOPs):

- **1a.1 be able to practise within the legal and ethical boundaries of their profession**
    - understand the need to act in the best interests of service users at all times
- **1b.3 be able to demonstrate effective and appropriate skills in communicating information, advice, instruction and professional opinion to colleagues, service users, their relatives and careers**
    - understand the need to provide servicer users (or people acting on their behalf) with the information necessary to enable them to make informed decisions
    - understand the need to use an appropriate interpreter to assist servicer users whose first language is not English, wherever possible
    - recognise that relationships with service users should be based on mutual respect and trust, and be able to maintain high standards of care even in situations of personal incompatibility

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were unable to determine where in the curriculum the assessment of the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the above standards of proficiency (SOPs). From the standards of proficiency mapping document, the visitors were unable to determine how the above SOPs were being taught and assessed within the curriculum in such a way to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. The visitors require the education provider to provide further evidence that demonstrates that the learning outcomes ensure all standards of proficiency, specifically SOPs 1a.1 and 1b.3 are addressed within the curriculum.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved psychology department into a new school through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan. As such, they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intent to move the psychology department into a new school of faculty in the near future. The visitors had an opportunity to discuss with the new head of school some of the changes that may occur as a result of this move. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change once they move to the psychology department to a new school, as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard. In this way the HCPC can ensure that the programme continues to have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

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

Condition: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have appointed a Stage 2 convenor for this programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors were informed that recruitment for the role of Stage 2 convenor is ongoing, and were provided with a CV for the interim programme leader. The visitors were satisfied with the current arrangements for the interim Stage 2 convenor, and that they are adequately supported in their role and therefore this standard is met. However, the visitors would like to remind the education provider that they would need to notify the HCPC through the major change process once a Stage 2 convenor has been recruited to the programme. In this way, the visitors can be assured that there is a named person who has overall professional responsibility for the programme, that they are appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are agreed, on relevant part of the Register.

Kathryn Thirlaway
Frances Ashworth

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Winchester
Programme name	MSc Social Work
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Social worker in England
Date of visit	5 – 6 May 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 1 July 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Childs (Social worker in England) Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Christine Morgan (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
HCPC observer	Laura Coveney
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort, one per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Judith Mcullouch (University of Winchester)
Secretary	Emma Woolf (University of Winchester)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Social Work programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 51 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining seven SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the information available to applicants ensuring that all information about a graduate's entitlement to apply for registration with the HCPC is correct.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the programme webpage where it was stated that "Successful completion [of the programme] leads to automatic inclusion onto the professional register for social workers in England." The visitors noted that this is an incorrect and potentially misleading statement by the education provider. After completion of the programme the graduate is eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, they are not entitled to automatic registration as the webpage currently suggests. This statement could impact an applicant's decision to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme, therefore the education provider must revise the information made available to applicants ensuring that information about registration with the HCPC is correct.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation and guidance made available in relation to any selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the programme information on page 7 where it stated that applicants would be subject to an initial "Fitness/Suitability to practice" assessment, which includes any relevant medical information. It further stated that a self-declaration form will be completed by applicants. During the meeting with the programme team this was discussed further where the purpose of this assessment was explained. The role of the assessment is to identify where students may require reasonable adjustments so they can do the programme and to identify if there are any health condition which would impair their ability to do the programme and practice as a social worker in England. The programme team further stated that the applicant declares any health condition which the applicants thinks may impair their ability to study on the programme. However it was stated that applicants must declare if they have ever been detained under the Mental Health Act 1983. In this situation the student would be referred to the student services to make an assessment about their suitability to the programme and may have to provide a note from their doctor declaring that they are fit to study. The visitors noted that this was not clear in the documentation and could therefore potentially be misleading to potential applicants. Therefore the education provider is required to revise the documentation made available to applicants, including advertising materials clearly outlining the selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements in relation to the declaration of any previous mental health conditions.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained an instance of incorrect terminology in relation to the role of the HCPC. The programme handbook, page 32 states "The programme is subject to relevant Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) requirements with regard to the number of days in placement that make up the full training". This statement is incorrect as the regulatory body, the HCPC does not require a set amount of placement days on a social work programme it is something set out by the College of Social Work. The visitors noted other instances of inaccurate statements such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation to ensure that the consent form accurately reflects the protocols of attaining consent when students participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the consent form which students sign at the start of each academic year. The form states that students do not have to participate in any practical learning situation where they would feel uncomfortable, it further states that this would not be a barrier to a students continued "...eligibility to participate in skills learning exercises or the programme." During the meeting with the programme team this was discussed further. It was noted that when a student abstains from practical learning this is recorded by the module leader and they ensure that the student undertakes compensationary work so that they can still achieve the learning outcomes. The visitors noted that the full procedure was not clear in the consent form and that this could potentially mislead students who think they may not be able to meet the learning outcomes by refusing to take part in practical teaching sessions. Therefore the education provider must revise the documentation used to gain consent of students for practical teaching sessions ensuring that students are aware of the protocols in place to gain consent and ensure that students are still able to meet the learning outcomes in teaching sessions.

3.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must revise the information available to students about the current attendance policy so that the protocols in place are clear to students.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the definitive document, where on page 21 it states that students are expected to attend all taught sessions and that "…significant absences will affect a students' ability to undertake their duty of care to service users and carers." Further the programme handbook stated on page 17-18 that there is currently no mandatory attendance policy and that the university is currently developing an attendance policy and details of this new policy will be circulated to students. This was further discussed at the meeting with the programme team. The programme team stated that attendance is recorded by a register at each teaching session. If a student's attendance falls below 80 per cent then they receive an email from the programme team enquiring as to why they have missed the taught session and if any reasonable adjustments need to be made. The visitors noted that the protocol for monitoring attendance was not clear and therefore there was potential that it would not be clear to students on the programme. Therefore the education provider is required to revise the information available to students about the current attendance policy so that the protocols in place are clear to students.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation available to students and practice placement educators ensuring that it is clear that it is the responsibility of the placement provider to provide a safe and supportive environment for students when in the placement setting.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the Placement handbook where, on page 18 the responsibilities of the on-site practice placement educator were outlined. The third duty stated that the practice educator must "…ensure that the student is aware of the agency's health and Safety responsibilities, and appropriate agency policies and procedures". During the meeting with both the practice placement providers and the programme team it was clarified that it was the responsibility of the practice placement educators to ensure that the student was in a safe and supportive environment. The visitors noted that this was not reflected in the documentation and that the practice placement educator and student may potentially be unaware whose responsibility it is to ensure that the placement setting provides a safe and supportive environment. Therefore the education provider is required to revise the documentation available to students and practice placement educators so that it states that it is the responsibility of the practice placement educator to ensure that the student is in a safe and supportive environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation available to students surrounding the process for multiple attempts and exceptional circumstances making it clearer to students.

Reason: For this standard the visitors were directed to the programme handbook where the requirements for student progression and achievement are outlined. However on page 27 it states that if a student fails an assignment they will have a second chance to re-submit. It further states that "as all modules are compulsory this programme may allow exceptional third attempts." The visitors noted that these statements conflict and the visitors were unsure about the exact policies surrounding retakes and exceptional

circumstances and that this is potentially unclear to students. Therefore the education provider must revise the documentation available to students surrounding the process for multiple attempts and exceptional circumstances making it clearer to students.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the programme team keep the process for applying selection and entry criteria in regards to mental health under review to ensure that the process does not potentially create any unnecessary barriers for potential applicants.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors were directed to the programme information on page 7 where it stated that applicants would be subject to an initial "Fitness/Suitability to practice" assessment, which includes any relevant medical information. It further stated that a self-declaration form will be completed by applicants. The programme team further stated that the applicant declares any health condition which the applicants thinks may impair their ability to study on the programme. The visitors noted that the standard meets the standard as the process aims to identify where any reasonable adjustments may need to be made, however it was stated that applicants must declare if they have ever been detained under the Mental Health Act 1983. In this situation the student would be referred to the student services to make an assessment about their suitability to the programme and may have to provide a note from their doctor declaring that they are fit to study. The visitors noted that this may potentially create further barriers in the application process to any applicant who has been detained under the Mental Health Act 1983 and potentially deter an applicant with a previous or current mental health issue from applying to the programme. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provide keep this process under review in the future, so to ensure that the process does not create any potential barriers or deter any applicants from applying to the programme.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that further consideration is given to ensuring that the balance of expertise in delivering the programme includes an adequate number of staff who are appropriately qualified and experienced in adult social care as well as those in child social work.

Reason: In meeting this standard the visitors were directed to the Curriculum Vitae of the staff on the programme and the structure of the teaching staff, and during the meeting with the programme team the visitors asked the staff for the background they have in social work. The programme team stated that there was one member of staff who was from an adult social work background who has just been appointed. The programme team further stated that they had acknowledged that there is a lack of adult experience on the programme and to compensate for this they bring in visiting lecturers from an adult background. The visitors recommended that this standard was met, however they highlighted that with the experience of a majority of the staff from a child social work background there was potential for the programme to focus more on child social work rather than adult. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider ensure that enough experience from an adult social work background is secured for both the teaching and the design of the programme.

David Childs
Robert Goemans
Christine Morgan

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	9 – 10 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Robert Herbert (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Teresa Nahajski (University of Worcester)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details of the module leaders for this programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. The documentation did not have accurate details of who would be the module leaders**.** During discussion at the visit it was highlighted recruitment for staff to the programme was on-going and the final arrangements as to the module leaders and module contributors were on-going. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be in order to determine how this standard can be met by the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, FD Paramedic Science Direct Route 201-15 CH, page 17 "be successful in each of the summative assessments in order to achieve registration on HCPC Professional Register". This does not clearly articulate the fact that completion of approved programmes gives students 'eligibility to apply' for HCPC registration, but students will still need to go through the application process. The visitors also noted, FD Paramedic Science Direct Route 201-15 MS, page 25 "Health Professions Council (HPC)". This should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council' or HCPC. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were sign-posted to module FDPH2001 to evidence how service users and cares are involved in the programme. Upon reviewing the evidence, the visitors were unsure how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Discussions with the programme team at the visit indicated that the dedicated service users and carers who contribute to the other health programmes at the education provider will also contribute to this programme in a similar

way. However, in discussions with the dedicated service user and carers that are involved in other health programme, it was clear that discussions to get involved in this programme has not begun. The service users and carers spoke about their future involvement with the development of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic programme but it was clear that they were not involved with this programme. The visitors recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages for this programme and that there is an intention to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this group would be developed, and how service users and carers would be involved in the programme in the future. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided that a plan is in place on how service users will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for service user and carer involvement in this programme.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made very broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map onto the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcome were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes where being covered. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme can meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes had been determined but the programme documentation did not reflect this. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the learning outcomes that will ensure that students can meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the learning outcomes associated with all aspects of this programme and how these outcomes will ensure that students completing the programme can meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that the programme reflected the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge articulated in the College of Paramedic (CoP) 2008 (version 2) curriculum guidance. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider is currently developing

an undergraduate programme in paramedic, as a result there is no future plans to develop the curriculum for this programme and map the programme against the latest curriculum guidance produced by CoP 2015 (version 3 rev 1). From the discussions the visitors were unable to determine how, without the reflection of the most current curriculum guidance, student completing this programme are able to practise safely and effectively. The visitors therefore, require further information determine how the programme team ensure students completing the programme are safe and effective in the absence of the programme not being mapped to the most latest curriculum guidance.

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. However, the visitors were not provided with West Midlands policies around equality and diversity. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the West Midlands Ambulance Trust hold a database of staff. Also, the visitors were told that local and regional work is currently on going to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at practice placement setting via the HEI consortium, working group. The visitors acknowledge that this group is still at early development stage. However, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced and, where required, registered staff.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are two types of mentors available to the education provider. A '1 day mentor' and a '5 day mentors', the visitors were told that the '5 day mentors' known as Clinical team mentor (CTM) were preferably the ones to sign off student passports. The visitors were provided with a list of registered practice educators available to take on students. From the list, the visitors noted that majority of the practice educators were '1 day mentors' as opposed to '5 day CTM mentors' who can sign students off. In discussions with the practice educators, the visitor noted that there was some concerns raised by the CTM that with the increase in student number there might not be enough CTM mentors to sign off student passport. From the information provided, the visitors were unsure with the increase in student's number, how the education provider will ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced staff who can sign off student's competencies.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme. In scrutinising evidence, and in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been developed by West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust (WMAS) in partnership with the education provider. The visitors learnt that all placement educators will be expected to undergo the mentorship programme prior to supervising a student undertaking this programme. The visitors were also aware that there is on offer a variety of training courses for placement educators once they have undertaken this initial mentorship training. However the visitors were informed that the mentorship programme will be delivered locally and as such they were unclear as to how the education provider, University of Worcester, would play a role in this local delivery to ensure that the delivery of this programme would ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience having undergone the programme. The visitors were also made aware that the education provider will not hold a register of practice placement educators and the training that they have undertaken, this will be held instead by the employer, WMAS The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to

make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educators training options that are offered to practice educators including a general update review and a 5 day mentorship programme. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map on to the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcome were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes where being covered or assessed. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the assessment of modules and the associated learning outcomes were linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme has demonstrated that they meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes and associated assessments were in place but were yet to be finalised throughout the documentation. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The

visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the assessment of the learning outcomes that will ensure that students meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the assessment of students associated with all aspects of this programme and how these assessments will ensure that students completing the programme have demonstrated that they have meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider ensure the information provided through the admissions procedures is consistent.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit highlighted information was provided to potential applicants to the programme through different ways. The visitors were satisfied applicants to the programme had the information they require to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors noted the information presented at the open day and recruitment day was not included in the online materials. The visitors recommend the programme time should consider updating their website material to ensure the information presented to potential applicant is consistent across all channels.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From assessing the documentation and the discussions with programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied this standard is being met. However, the visitor would encourage the programme team to keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers increase in the coming years.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the role play consent form so that the information provided is clear and easy to understand.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the role play consent form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing how they communicate the requirements around signing the consent form and what it entails. This will contribute to a greater understanding from students as to what they are signing for and why.

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

Condition: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the range of placements available for students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In the meeting with the students, it was highlighted that not all students had the same opportunity to experience as much variation in their placements between urban and rural areas. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continues to develop further the variety of placements available to students so that all students experience a wide range of different placement settings.

Bob Fellows
Paul Blakeman
Ian Hughes

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para)
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	9 – 10 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 August 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 27 August 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 24 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 24 September 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	100 per cohort, 3 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Robert Herbert (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Teresa Nahajski (University of Worcester)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the 'FdSc Paramedic Science Direct Entry' as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 41 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 17 SETs.

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

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

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence of the information made available to potential applicants.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes. 'Direct entry' or via the 'Tech to Para' route. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation, the visitors were not given any information that would be provided to potential applicant taking an offer of a place via the 'Tech to Para' route. In addition, the visitors were unsure from the discussions at what point the admission procedures will begin as applicants will complete one year's training with WMAS and then using Accreditation of Prior Experiential learning (APEL) will join the one year programme delivered by the education provider. The visitors, therefore, require documentation detailing both the admissions procedures and the underpinning course programme for the FdSc Paramedic Science (Tech to Para). In this way, both the education provider and the applicant can have the necessary information to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. This condition is linked to other standards in SET 2.

2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding any language requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes, 'Direct entry' or 'Tech to Para'. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding any language requirements. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such, the visitors were unclear what the admission procedures for this programme is and how these procedures provide the

education provider with the information they require as part of the process to offer an applicant a place on the programme. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence regarding the admissions procedure for this programme and how the education provider ensures that successful applicants meet the relevant requirements, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding Disclosure and Barring Service checks.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes, 'Direct entry' or 'Tech to Para'. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding health requirements. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such**,** the visitors could not determine how the procedures of WMAS will work with those of the education provider, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with by the education provider to ensure that they are dealt with consistently to determine if any issue arising would prevent an applicant form completing the programme. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto this programme if any issue does arise as the information provided at the visit articulated that applicants would have already employed by WMAS. Therefore the visitors require further information about the DBS checks that are applied at the point of admission for this programme. In particular the visitors require further evidence of how WMAS's processes would work with the education provider's process, and clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if an issue arises.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure to detail how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's health requirements.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes, 'Direct entry' or 'Tech to Para'. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the

'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding health requirements. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such, the visitors could not determine how the education provider's own procedures to apply health checks, will work with WMAS. Nor could the visitors determine how the education provider will identify what adjustments could or could not reasonably be made if health conditions were disclosed, and how any issues that may arise would be dealt with consistently, since applicants would have already been accepted onto the training employment programme delivered by WMAS. In particular the visitors could not determine who makes the final decision about accepting a student onto the programme if adjustments would be required. Therefore the visitors require further information about how the health declarations that are applied at the point of admission to this programme are used by the education provider to determine if a student can take up a place on this programme. In particular the visitors require clarification of who makes the final decision about accepting an applicant onto the programme if adjustments are required, at the point of entry onto this programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes, 'Direct entry' or 'Tech to Para'. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS, before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation the visitors were unable to find any information about the admissions procedure or the underpinning "technician" course for this programme and how it ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements regarding appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards. The visitors were provided with additional information around admission procedures during the visit, but due to time constraints, they were unable to review these. As such the visitors, were unsure how the education provider, working with the employer, could apply selection and entry criteria for the programme, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards. Therefore the education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it, as the education provider, ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the admissions procedure for this programme applies selection and entry criteria including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that potential applicants are able to enter this programme via two routes, 'Direct entry' or 'Tech to Para'. Prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the 'Tech to Para' route is delivered in partnership by the University of Worcester, who act as the education provider and the West Midlands Ambulance Services (WMAS) acting as the 'employer'. The visitors heard during discussions with the programme team that applicants entering via the 'Tech to Para' route will be expected to be working for WMAS as technicians, and to have completed a pre – programme training delivered by the WMAS (stated as equivalent to 120 points at level 4), before undergoing the education provider admission processes. In assessing the documentation the visitors were not presented with WMAS selection criteria for employment with the trust. As such, the visitors were unclear as to how the education provider ensures that appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms will be applied as part of the entry criteria. From the discussions at the visit, it was clear that WMAS will manage the academic and professional selection and entry criteria for employment and therefore this would act as the entry criteria for the programme. From the discussions, the visitors could not determine how Worcester, as the education provider, ensures that appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms are being applied and how any decisions to offer a place on the programme would be managed based on these mechanisms. The visitors did not see any overarching policies, systems and procedures for managing WMAS approach to academic and professional selection and entry criteria. As such, the visitors were unsure how the education provider, working with the employer, could apply selection and entry criteria for the programme, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms. Therefore the education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it, as the education provider, ensures that successful applicants meet the education provider's requirements, through the use of appropriate accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for this programme and how it ensures that it applies selection and entry criteria including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) and other inclusion mechanisms.

Reason: Prior to the visit, the documentation submitted indicated that the education provider would be involved in the training delivered in students' first year of employment at WMAS and that subsequently the students would be admitted to the education provider as students in accordance with Worcester's AP(E)L policy to study the second year of the programme. As such the visitors were clear that the in-work-training that a student would undergo in their first year of employment would attract the equivalent of 120 academic credits at level 4 of an undergraduate degree and that are required by

students who wish to start the second year at level 5. However, during the course of the visit, the visitors learnt that the education provider would not have any role in delivering the training to potential students in the first year of employment at WMAS and instead would be responsible for a one year programme of study at level 5 for any of these potential students who successfully completed their year of training at WMAS. As such the programme subject to this approval would only be the one year programme at the education provider and will not include the previous year's training at the employer

During discussions with the programme team, the visitor learnt that all applicants would be assessed by completing 175 hours at practice and an online care and compassion course. However, the visitors were not provided with any information on the content of the online course or what the 170 hour should consist of. As such, the visitors were unable to see how the AP(E)L process would be implemented to ensure that applicants from WMAS would have undertaken training equivalent to that of a full year of undergraduate study. In particular the visitors could not identify how the education provider could ensure that anyone admitted to the programme through this process would have met the required learning outcomes associated with the training programme at WMAS. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the AP(E)L process that will be implemented by the education provider. This evidence should demonstrate how Worcester, as the education provider, will ensure that prospective students will be consistently judged to determine how they have met the required learning outcomes for successful application to this programme, equivalent to those of a first year undergraduate degree.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details of the module leaders for this programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. The documentation did not have accurate details of who would be the module leaders**.** During discussion at the visit it was highlighted recruitment for staff to the programme was on-going and the final arrangements as to the module leaders and module contributors were on-going. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be in order to determine how this standard can be met by the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, FD Paramedic Science Tech to Para 201-15 CH, page 13 "be successful in each of the summative assessments in order to achieve registration on HCPC Professional Register". This does not clearly articulate the

fact that completion of approved programmes gives students 'eligibility to apply' for HCPC registration, but students will still need to go through the application process. The visitors also noted, FD Paramedic Science Tech to Para 201-15 MS, page 6 "Health Professions Council (HPC)". This should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council' or HCPC. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors were sign-posted to module FDPH2001 to evidence how service users and cares are involved in the programme. Upon reviewing the evidence, the visitors were unsure how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Discussions with the programme team at the visit indicated that the dedicated service users and carers who contribute to the other health programmes at the education provider will also contribute to this programme in a similar way. However, in discussions with the dedicated service user and carers that are involved in other health programme, it was clear that discussions to get involved in this programme has not begun. The service users and carers spoke about their future involvement with the development of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic programme but it was clear that they were not involved with this programme. The visitors recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages for this programme and that there is an intention to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this group would be developed, and how service users and carers would be involved in the programme in the future. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided that a plan is in place on how service users will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for service user and carer involvement in this programme.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made very broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map onto the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcome were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes where being covered. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student

completing the programme can meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes had been determined but the programme documentation did not reflect this. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the learning outcomes that will ensure that students can meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the learning outcomes associated with all aspects of this programme and how these outcomes will ensure that students completing the programme can meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that the programme reflected the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge articulated in the College of Paramedic (CoP) 2008 (version 2) curriculum guidance. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider is currently developing an undergraduate programme in paramedic, as a result there is no future plans to develop the curriculum for this programme and map the programme against the latest curriculum guidance produced by CoP 2015 (version 3 rev 1). From the discussions the visitors were unable to determine how, without the reflection of the most current curriculum guidance, student completing this programme are able to practise safely and effectively. The visitors therefore, require further information determine how the programme team ensure students completing the programme are safe and effective in the absence of the programme not being mapped to the most latest curriculum guidance.

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. However, the visitors were not provided with West Midlands policies around equality and diversity. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the West Midlands Ambulance Trust hold a database of staff. Also, the visitors were told that local and regional work is currently on going to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at practice placement setting via the HEI consortium, working group. The visitors acknowledge that this group is still at early development stage. However, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are two types of mentors available to the education provider. A '1 day mentor' and a '5 day mentors', the visitors were told that the '5 day mentors' known as Clinical team mentor (CTM) were preferably the ones to sign off student passports. The visitors were provided with a list of registered practice educators available to take on students. From the list, the visitors noted that majority of the practice educators were '1 day mentors' as opposed to '5 day CTM mentors' who can sign students off. In discussions with the practice educators, the visitor noted that there was some concerns raised by the CTM that with the increase in student number there might not be enough CTM mentors to sign off student passport. From the information provided, the visitors were unsure with the increase in student's number, how the education provider will ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff who can sign off student's competencies.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme. In scrutinising evidence, and in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been developed by West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust (WMAS) in partnership with the education provider. The visitors learnt that all placement educators will be expected to undergo the mentorship programme prior to supervising a student undertaking this programme. The visitors were also aware that there is on offer a variety of training courses for placement educators once they have undertaken this initial mentorship training. However the visitors were informed that the mentorship programme will be delivered locally and as such they were unclear as to how the education provider, University of Worcester, would play a role in this local delivery to ensure that the delivery of this programme would ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience having undergone the programme. The visitors were also made aware that the education provider will not hold a register of practice placement educators and the training that they have undertaken, this will be held instead by the employer, WMAS The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educators training options that are offered to practice educators including a general update review and a 5 day mentorship programme. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors

require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map on to the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcome were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes where being covered or assessed. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the assessment of modules and the associated learning outcomes were linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme has demonstrated that they meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes and associated assessments were in place but were yet to be finalised throughout the documentation. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the assessment of the learning outcomes that will ensure that students meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the assessment of students associated with all aspects of this programme and how these assessments will ensure that students completing the programme have demonstrated that they have meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

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

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From assessing the documentation and the discussions with programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied this standard is being met. However, the visitors would encourage the programme team to keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers increase in the coming years.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the role play consent form so that the information provided is clear and easy to understand.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the role play consent form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing how they communicate the requirements around signing the consent form and what it entails. This will contribute to a greater understanding from students as to what they are signing for and why.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the range of placements available for students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In the meeting with the students, it was highlighted that not all students had the same opportunity to experience as much variation in their placements between urban and rural areas. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continues to develop further the variety of placements available to students so that all students experience a wide range of different placement settings**.**

<div align="right">

Bob Fellows
Paul Blakeman
Ian Hughes

</div>