

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	Diploma Higher Education Paramedic Studies
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	24 – 25 September 2015

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 16 November 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 3 December 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 14 December 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 15 January 2016.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval. 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 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	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) David Whitmore (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	330 across five cohorts in the first year, maximum of 100 per cohort Subsequently, 300 across three cohorts, maximum of 100 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	February 2016
Chair	Trevor Bolton (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Melanie J Bird (Internal Panel Member) Selina Okeke (Internal Student Panel Member) Simon Dykes (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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, 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 34 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 24 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.

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 programme documentation, including advertising materials, to clearly articulate the information applicants require to make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: There were discrepancies in the information regarding the admissions requirements provided to potential applicants in the documentation submitted prior to the visit. The visitors noted in the programme specification (page 9), “Those wishing to enter the course will require; must be in employment of and have the support of the NHS Ambulance Trust where employed”. However, in the course information document (page 24), the visitors noted “Normally in order to gain entry to an Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) course, applicants must meet the following criteria, in this case, applicants accessing the course must be employed by EEAST and have the support of the immediate line manager and have access to a Paramedic Educator”. During the programme team meeting, the visitors also learnt that students can enrol on the programme without meeting the above criteria, by applying via the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) system. The visitors noted other instances of inconsistent information provided to potential applicants, including in the advertising materials. Therefore, the visitors require the programme team to revise all documentation including advertising materials to clearly articulate the information potential applicants and the education provider require to make an informed choice of whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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 clearly set out their English language requirements in their documents, including in information available to applicants, to ensure appropriate admissions decisions are made with regards to English language proficiency.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visited highlighted selection and entry criteria for admissions, including requirements for English language proficiency. The visitors noted on page 25 of the course information document “Students who do not have English as their first language will need to be able to provide evidence of achieving an IELTS score of 7.0”. During the visit, the programme team stated that applicants must achieve an overall level of 7.0 in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), but without the need to achieve 6.5 in each element of listening, writing, speaking and reading in the IETLS certification. The visitors highlighted that individuals that complete the programme must meet the standard of proficiency 8.2 for paramedics, which requires students to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The programme team stated that they will update the English language requirements so that applicants must have achieved level 7 in IELTS, with no element below 6.5. The visitors will need to see this change, so they are clear about the education provider’s requirements regarding English language.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure the entry routes to this programme are correctly reflected in the documentation, and ensure that entry requirements to these routes are appropriate, clear and consistent.

Reason: At the visit, the programme team stated that there are two entry routes to the programme. The primary entry route to the programme is via the AP(E)L process, with applicants being employed by East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST). Applicants via this route will likely be exempt from completing certain elements of the programme due to their prior learning and experience with EEAST. There is also a secondary, direct entry route to the programme through the UCAS system. However, some documentation references only one entry route to the programme, namely the AP(E)L route, and there are also inconsistencies in the documents with the entry requirements for this route. Specifically, the requirement to be an EEAST employee is not always made clear. Assuming that the AP(E)L route is only open to EEAST employees, the visitors were satisfied with the entry requirements for both routes as stated in the documentation. If any changes are made to the entry requirement for either of the entry routes, the visitors will need to scrutinise these changes to ensure the selection and entry criteria for the programme remains appropriate. In addition, to ensure this standard is met, the visitors require that both entry routes are consistently reflected in all appropriate documentation, and that the entry requirement to be an EEAST employee for the AP(E)L route is explicit.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it ensures the quality of the assessment of outcomes delivered by East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST) through the AP(E)L process.

Reason: From the documentation provided, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were clear that the primary entry route to the programme is via the AP(E)L process, with applicants being employed by EEAST. Applicants via this route will likely be exempt from completing certain elements of the programme due to their prior learning and experience with EEAST. The documentation submitted prior to the visit detailed the AP(E)L policy for the programme and for the institution. The visitors also noted that the programme has eight modules, delivered over a two years period.

The presentation given to the visitors during the programme team meeting highlighted that applicants employed by EEAST and will be assessed on an individual basis for entry onto the programme via the AP(E)L policy. The programme team stated that most applicants should gain about 90 credits at Level 4 as a result of the prior experience and learning acquired at EEAST, which includes classroom learning. The visitors did not see the content of the training provided by EEAST, and noted that the education provider are not involved in the delivery, content, or quality assurance of this training. The education provider plans to group students with different learning needs together into separate cohorts, and deal with the learning needs of these cohorts as required. Considering this, the visitors highlighted that the education provider expects the majority of students to study very little of the first year of the programme. The visitors questioned whether this admissions route was truly AP(E)L (with an individual assessment of each

student), or whether the training at EEAST should be considered as an “advanced standing” programme required for entry onto a shorter programme at the education provider.

The visitors were unable to see how the education provider will ensure the quality of outcomes from the training at EEAST, if the training at EEAST is either considered as “advanced standing”, or via the AP(E)L process. The visitors were unable to see how applicants’ prior learning would be mapped against the necessary learning outcomes to exempt them from completing certain parts of the programme. The visitors were also unclear how the education provider would make quality judgements about the evidence provided by students, or maintain quality through the AP(E)L process. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how they ensure the quality of decisions made through its AP(E)L process.

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 clarify whether the AP(E)L policy is only available to applicants from East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST), or whether it is more widely available.

Reason: During the meetings with the senior team, practice placement providers and the programme team, the visitors learnt that students will only be enrolled to the programme via the AP(E)L process if they are employed by EEAST. However, from the standards mapping document, the visitors noted that candidates can transfer from other higher education institutions and bring their credits with them. In this situation, a mapping exercise will be used to determine the learning that the applicant would be able to transfer. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that clearly states who is able to access the AP(E)L policy.

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 final partnership arrangements between the education provider and partner organisation to confirm that this programme is secure.

Reason: The visitors noted, in the documentation provided, a supporting statement from the Dean as evidence to show the programme meets this standard. During the meeting with the senior team, the visitors learnt there are formal partnership arrangements between the education provider and East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST). This partnership articulates the responsibilities of each organisation with the intention of ensuring the effective delivery of the programme. The visitors were satisfied that this proposed partnership would ensure that the programme has a secure position in the education provider’s business plan. However, the partnership arrangement document was currently with the legal team of the education provider and had yet to be finally approved. During the senior team meeting, it was agreed that the partnership arrangement document will be finalised and submitted to HCPC to evidence how this standard is met. To make a judgement about whether this standard is met, the visitors require the finalised version of this document, and if the document has not been agreed, an indication of when it will be.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how this programme will be effectively managed considering the large number of students and the two sites of delivery.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit stated the size and number of cohorts on this programme. This programme will enrol approximately 330 students in five cohorts for the first year, and subsequently, 100 students per cohort, three cohorts per year. Furthermore, this programme will be delivered at the education provider's Chelmsford and Cambridge campuses. In the documentation, the visitors noted the management structure of the programme. It included the Head of the Allied and Public Health department at the university overseeing the management of this programme at both strategic and delivery levels. Furthermore, supporting staff will discharge academic staff from their duties to manage this programme. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider will be able to effectively manage this programme. For example the visitors were unclear about how the APEL process, academic and pastoral support, placements and assessments would be effectively managed for the number of students across the two campuses. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to show how the education provider will manage this programme effectively.

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 must provide further evidence to show the mechanisms in place to support the newly appointed programme leader.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit indicated Alan Bell as the programme leader for this programme and the visitors were happy that Alan is appropriately qualified and experienced to lead the programme. However, during the visit, the visitors learnt that the programme leader has changed to Tim Hayes, who is a registered paramedic. The visitors were supplied with the new programme leader's CV, and noted the information provided was limited, and showed limited previous experience in a Higher Education Institution or as a programme leader. The visitors considered the management of the programme to be complex, and were unable to determine what support will be available for the programme leader to undertake their role. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the education provider has a tutoring system for academic staff. Newly appointed staff are allocated senior staff as tutors to provide support. However, the visitors did not see the details of that system. The visitors therefore need to see further evidence to show appropriate mechanisms in place to support the newly appointed programme leader.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme (especially in the assessment of student performance), considering the large number of students and the two sites of delivery.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit stated the size and number of cohorts on this programme. This programme will enrol approximately 330 students in five cohorts for the first year, and subsequently, 100 students per cohort, three cohorts per year. Furthermore, this programme will be delivered at the education provider's Chelmsford and Cambridge campuses. In the documentation, the visitors noted the assessment strategy which will be used to assess students' performance to ensure fitness to practice, and the number of staff that will be in place by January 2016 to deliver and assess the curriculum. The visitors were satisfied that the staff in place is adequate and appropriately qualified and experienced to deliver the content of the curriculum. However, the visitors noted that the work involved with assessments does not lend itself to economies of scale. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will be able to assess such a large number of students' work and ensure the quality of the assessments. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to be satisfied that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver an effective programme. This condition is linked to the condition for SET 6.5.

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

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

Reason: There were discrepancies in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider. For example, the programme specification on page 16 states "A qualifying mark of 40% is required to meet PSRB (HCPC) requirements". Similarly, the course information document on page 6 "The Academic Regulations allow up to 50% of course credit to be achieved by Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL). This is in line with HCPC requirements and will be one route for admission to this course" and "The proposed course of Paramedic Studies will provide a route to registration as a Paramedic with the HCPC". With reference to these examples respectively; the HCPC does not determine qualifying mark, instead HCPC requires the education providers to ensure the assessment strategy ensure students who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register. Similarly, the HCPC does not prescribe how much of any programme can be accredited based on prior learning, instead we require education providers to have appropriate admissions procedures including an APEL policy and other inclusion mechanisms. Those who successfully complete an HCPC approved programme will be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC only. The visitors noted several other instances of inaccurate information and instances which are not reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC. The visitors therefore require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard is met.

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

Condition: The education provider must submit evidence to demonstrate that any significant changes made as a response to the internal validation event have been mitigated against, so the way the programme meets the SETs is not significantly impacted.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the joint panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that students routinely refer to as an important resource to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set referred to amendments to module assessments, possibly the programme specification document, and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review changes made due to the education provider's response to the internal validation event. To evidence that this condition is met, the education provider may wish to provide the programme documentation that has been revised, or provide an overview of their response to the internal validation event.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how the resources to support student learning will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme in all settings.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit stated the size and number of cohorts on this programme. This programme will enrol approximately 330 students in five cohorts for the first year, and subsequently, 100 per cohort, three cohorts per year. Furthermore, this programme will be delivered at the Chelmsford and Cambridge campuses of the education provider. The visitors were given a tour of the physical learning resources at Chelmsford campus and a short video was shown about the resources available at the Cambridge. Whilst the visitors were happy with size of the classrooms available to students across the two campuses, the visitors were not able to determine if there are appropriate available skills labs and equipment at both campuses. Furthermore, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures appropriate tutor supervision for students to learn practical skills. Therefore, the visitors need to see further evidence to show how the education provider ensures all students will be able to use skills labs and equipment, with appropriate tutor supervision. In this way the visitors will be assured that resources to support student learning in all settings will effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service users and carer involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in many aspects of the programme, such as admissions and programme delivery. Also, during discussions

at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers may be involved in the interview process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. At the visit, the service users and carers indicated that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited details about how the involvement will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussions or from the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence detailing when, and at which setting(s), supernumerary placement hours will be undertaken, to demonstrate how the range of practice placements support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. In the meeting with placement providers it was highlighted that students were required to achieve 150 supernumerary placement hours (acting as a student and not as a member of ambulance staff), but it was unclear when these hours would need to be achieved, or in which setting. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show where and when supernumerary placement hours for students at placement

settings will be achieved, to demonstrate how the range of practice placements support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the range of placement settings that students will experience to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, considering the large cohort size and availability of placement experience.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. However, the visitors could not identify how placements would be sourced and allocated to the large number of students for this programme. The visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the different placement settings, such as the non-ambulance setting, that were on offer to students, and which of these settings students would be required to attend. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures a range of placements to support the delivery of the programme, and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. The visitors were provided with an audit process intended to ensure that the education provider maintains a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements at EEAST. The visitors were provided with completed audit forms as part of the evidence to show the programme meet this standard. However, the visitors noted that the audit forms were waiting to be signed off. The section “audited approved by” were completed as “no- awaiting confirmation”. Whilst the visitor were happy with the details in the audit forms, the information provided in the forms was not officially signed off. In order to make a judgement about whether this standard is met, the visitors will need to see further evidence, such as finalised and signed off audit forms, to be assured that the process in place to maintain a through system for approving and monitoring all placements is thorough and effective.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure equality and diversity policies are in place at alternative (non-ambulance) placement settings.

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

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

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

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

experienced staff are in place within placements at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure that practice placement educators in alternative (non-ambulance) settings have undertaken appropriate placement educator training.

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

placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

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

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

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

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

provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are assessed as able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completing the programme. This condition is linked to the condition for SET 2.6 and SET 4.1.

6.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the assessments methods ensure that the learning outcomes are measured.

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, during the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team will update some of the assessment methods based on the initial feedback given by the internal validation panel. For example, module preparation for clinical practice in pre hospital assessment will change assessment from 3000 essay to poster presentation. Because the visitors have not seen the final assessment strategy for the modules following the feedback, the visitors were unable to determine if the assessments of learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics. Therefore, visitors will need the finalised assessment strategy for all modules to ensure those who complete this programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

6.5 The measurement of student performance must be objective and ensure fitness to practise.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show how the programme will ensure the measurements of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practise, considering the large number of students and the two sites of delivery.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit stated the size and number of cohorts on this programme. This programme will enrol approximately 330 students in five cohorts for the first year, and subsequently, 100 students per cohort, three cohorts per year. Furthermore, this programme will be delivered at the education provider's Chelmsford and Cambridge campuses. In the documentation, the visitors noted the assessment strategy which will be used to assess students' performance to ensure fitness to practice, and the number of staff that will be in place by January 2016 to deliver and assess the curriculum. The visitors were satisfied that the staff in place is adequate and appropriately qualified and experience to deliver the content of the curriculum. However, the visitors noted that the work involved with assessments does not lend itself to economies of scale. The visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will be able to assess such a large number of students' work and ensure the quality of the assessments. Therefore, the visitors need further evidence to be satisfied that the measurements of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practise. This condition is linked to the condition for SET 3.5.

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

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

Reason: In the documentation submitted by the education provider there was insufficient detail about the external examiner recruitment policy. It was not evident that there was an explicit requirement for at least one of the external examiners to be from the relevant part of the HCPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC. The visitors were satisfied with the current external examiner for the programme. However, the visitors need to see evidence that HCPC requirements regarding the external examiner on the programme have been included in the documentation to demonstrate that this standard is met.

Anthony Hoswell
David Whitmore

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Portsmouth
Programme name	Cert HE Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time Work based learning
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	3 – 4 November 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 22 December 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 3 December 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 January 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 23 March 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	John Donaghy (Paramedic) David Whitmore (Paramedic) Diane Whitlock (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
HCPC observer	Sagitta Fernando
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 March 2016
Chair	Jane Portlock (University of Portsmouth)
Secretary	Becky Isaia (University of Portsmouth)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Descriptions of the modules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practice placement handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External examiners' reports from the last two years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programme team	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Placements providers and educators / mentors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service users and carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The HCPC met with students from the FdSc Paramedic Science, 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 50 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining eight 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

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further clarity on the structure of the academic timetable, specifically the structure of study blocks and required access to the simulation centre.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with a copy of the 'Key Dates' document which outlines when students will be in university and when they will be on placement on a weekly basis. The visitors noted that there are a number of study blocks highlighted within this document where students will be on campus, however, the visitors were not provided with any detail on the structure of the study blocks. In particular, the visitors were unable to identify when students will need access to the simulation centre. The programme team stated that the simulation centre was used across a number of different programmes, whilst the visitors were satisfied that the simulation centre was a suitable platform to deliver practical learning they were unable to see when and how often students on this programme would require and receive access to the simulation centre. The visitors noted that without a clear understanding of how frequently students on this programme will require and receive access to the simulation centre, they cannot make a judgement on how resources such as the simulation centre effectively supports the learning and teaching activities on the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to provide clarity on the academic timetable to demonstrate appropriate access to the simulation centre and ensure that the resources to support student learning 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.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates how students gain access to a wide range of learning experiences in the placement environment which support achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: At the visit practice educators stated that although students will be employees of South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) they will be treated as students for the duration of their time on this programme. However, the programme team and practice educators indicated that students would not be guaranteed any supernumerary hours whilst on placement. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that students must achieve supernumerary hours during their placement, the visitors were unable to see where students' time would be protected on placement to ensure achievement of the learning outcomes. Specifically, the visitors could not see how a student would be prioritised as a student rather than an employee of SCAS in emergency situations where they might be required to drive an ambulance or perform other such duties. The visitors note that whilst the priority is that students will be expected to perform employer based duties in emergency situations they cannot be sure that students will gain access to a wide range of learning experiences to support the achievement of learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how current placement arrangements appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes, or, that

the current arrangements are adjusted to appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate an effective system for approving and monitoring all placements, including mechanisms to ensure there are appropriately qualified practice placement educators at the practice placement.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with the Supporting Learners in Practice Database, however, the visitors noted that all entries of practice placement educators in the database were out of date. The programme team and practice educators stated that this database is completed and maintained by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). It was also stated that The University of Portsmouth have their own monitoring system for practice placement educators, however, there were inconsistencies between the systems of the two organisations. The visitors highlighted that approving and monitoring placements is the education provider's responsibility and without seeing how the University of Portsmouth approves and monitors practice placement, including mechanisms to ensure there are appropriately qualified practice placement educators, they cannot be assured that the education provider maintains thorough and effective systems for approving and monitoring all placements. Further to this, the visitors were not provided with up to date and accurate information regarding practice placement educators and were therefore unable to confirm that monitoring of placements is effective.

The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are appropriate approval and monitoring processes in place, at the education provider, for practice placements including mechanisms to ensure there are appropriately qualified practice placement educators in all practice 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 demonstrate an effective system for approving practice placement educators, in particular how they ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with the Supporting Learners in Practice Database, however, the visitors noted that all entries in the database were out of date. The programme team and practice educators stated that this database is completed and maintained by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). It was also stated that The University of Portsmouth have their own monitoring system for practice placement educators, however, this does not marry up with the SCAS system. The visitors note that without seeing how the University of Portsmouth approves and monitors practice placement educators in line with SCAS processes they cannot be assured that the education provider maintains thorough and effective systems for approving and monitoring all placements. Further to this, the visitors were not provided with up to date and accurate information regarding practice placement educators and were therefore unable to confirm that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are appropriate approval and monitoring processes in place, at the education provider, to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate an effective system for approving practice placement educators, in particular how they ensure that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with the Supporting Learners in Practice database, however, the visitors noted that all entries in the database were out of date. The programme team and practice educators stated that this database is completed and maintained by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). It was also stated that The University of Portsmouth have their own monitoring system for practice placement educators, however, this does not marry up with the SCAS system. The visitors note that without seeing how the University of Portsmouth approves and monitors practice placement educators in line with SCAS processes they cannot be assured that the education provider maintains thorough and effective systems for approving and monitoring all placements. Further to this, the visitors were not provided with up to date and accurate information regarding practice placement educators and were therefore unable to confirm that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are appropriate approval and monitoring processes in place, at the education provider, to ensure that Practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate an effective system for approving practice placement educators, in particular how they ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with the Supporting Learners in Practice database, however, the visitors noted that all entries in the database were out of date. The programme team and practice educators stated that this database is completed and maintained by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). It was also stated that The University of Portsmouth have their own monitoring system for practice placement educators, however, this does not marry up with the SCAS system. The visitors note that without seeing how the University of Portsmouth approves and monitors practice placement educators in line with SCAS processes they cannot be assured that the education provider maintains thorough and effective systems for approving and monitoring all placements. Further to this, the visitors were not provided with up to date and accurate information regarding practice placement educators and were therefore unable to confirm that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are appropriate approval and monitoring processes in place, at the education provider, to

ensure that practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

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

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate an effective system for approving practice placement educators, in particular how they ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors were provided with the Supporting Learners in Practice database, however, the visitors noted that all entries in the database were out of date. The programme team and practice educators stated that this database is completed and maintained by South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS). It was also stated that The University of Portsmouth have their own monitoring system for practice placement educators, however, this does not marry up with the SCAS system. The visitors note that without seeing how the University of Portsmouth approves and monitors practice placement educators in line with SCAS processes they cannot be assured that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. Further to this, the visitors were not provided with up to date and accurate information regarding practice placement educators and were therefore unable to confirm that practice placement educators are appropriately registered. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates that there are appropriate approval and monitoring processes in place, at the education provider, to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates how the current supervision arrangements on placement encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Reason: At the visit practice educators stated that although students will be employees of South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) they will be treated and supervised as students for the duration of their time on this programme. However, the programme team and placement educators stated that students would not be guaranteed any supernumerary hours whilst on placement. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that students must achieve supernumerary hours whilst on placement, the visitors were unable to see where students' time would be protected on placement to encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct. Specifically, the visitors could not see how a student would be prioritised as a student rather than an employee of SCAS in emergency situations where they might be required to drive an ambulance or perform other such duties. The visitors note that whilst the priority is that students will be expected to perform employer based duties in emergency situations they cannot be sure that students will receive appropriate supervision which ensures they are exposed to a range of situations to prepare them for entry into their profession. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how current or amended supervision arrangements ensure that learning, teaching and supervision encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct and that placements are appropriately preparing students for entry into their profession.

John Donaghy
David Whitmore
Diane Whitlock