

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	3

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Programme title	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of submission to the HCPC	12 June 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	David Houlston (Biomedical scientist) Ian Davies (Biomedical scientist)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 5: Practice placements
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider has highlighted changes made to placement for the programme at level 5. The placement previously at level 5 will now be in the beginning of level 6. The duration of the placement has also increased from 25 to 40 weeks.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack
- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Work based learning handbook (2014–15)
- Module descriptor (Work Based Learning I–BL2222)
- Module descriptor (Work Based Learning II–BL3222)
- Student handbook (2013–14)

- Placement delivery plan

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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.

Reason: The visitors noted the changes made to placement structure which includes a 15 weeks placement from year 2 being removed and added to the front of the 25 week year 3 placement. The visitors also noted, that the number of placement available is dependent upon availability from the placement provider. The visitors could not see evidence of information given to potential applicants about the availability of placements due to changes made to the structure of placements. As such, little information provided to applicants was included to reassure the visitors that applicants can make a fully informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme. Therefore, the visitors were unsure of the admission procedures in place to ensure that applicants have all the information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence such as information packs, advertising or open day materials, prospectus pages or web links demonstrating that the information provided will enable potential applicants to make an informed choice.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted the changes made to placement structure which includes a 15 weeks placement from year 2 being removed and added to the front of the 25 week year 3 placement. The visitors also noted, that the number of placement available is dependent upon availability from the placement provider. This change of placements structure will have impact on the ability of practice placement provider to support students learning and the effective management of the programme. However, the visitors were not provided with evidence that procedures have been put in place by the education provider and the practice placement provider to ensure that the change in practice placements continues to support student learning and consequently the programme is managed effectively. As such, the visitors require further information that the programme continues to be effectively managed in regards to the changes in placement.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate that the proposed changes would not impact upon support for the delivery of the programme and that the placement provider is still able to provide 40 weeks placement in year 3 of the programme and consequently demonstrating that the programme continues to be effectively managed.

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.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had submitted module descriptors that are intended to support the new practice placement structure. However, upon reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the module descriptors still reflect the old placements structure, of a placement in year 2 level 5 of the programme. In addition, the visitors noted several discrepancies across the submitted documentation. For example, inconsistencies when referring to the 15 and 25 week placement during year two and three of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Documentation showing consistent description of practice placement provision as well as evidence to demonstrate that the number, duration and range of practice placement continues to be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted the additional information provided for this submission, which included minutes from the placement liaison group. However, from the information submitted the visitors were unable to determine the procedures that will be put in place by the education provider and the practice placement provider to ensure that the changes in practice placements continues to support student learning. Furthermore, the visitors were unable to determine how the ongoing partnership arrangements with practice placement educators are managed including links to the management of the programme and how they are monitored regularly. The visitors noted minutes of the collaborative meetings between the education provider and the placement providers, however, these minutes did not provide sufficient details how the programme will be managed effectively in particular the placement provision.

The visitors also could not determine how the programme would be effectively managed with the implementation of the changes in placements. Although, visitors were provided with the minutes of the collaborative meetings, it did not indicate how the practice placement providers will be able to accommodate the changes made to practice provisions as mentioned above. Therefore, the visitors consider a visit to be the most appropriate way to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

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.

Reason: The visitors noted the information provided for this submission, which included a spreadsheet detailing the aims of the programme to support the changes made to placement structure which includes a 15 weeks placement from year 2 being removed and added to the front of the 25 week year 3 placement. From additional evidence submitted the visitors noted that the number of placement available is dependent upon availability from the placement provider. From this the visitors were unable to determine how practice provision continues to be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, if student placements is subject to availability. Furthermore, the visitors were not provided with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the allocation of placements will be equitable and provide all students with sufficient placement experience to meet the required learning outcomes.

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. The visitors therefore consider a visit to be the most appropriate way to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meets this standard.

Major change visitors' report

Contents

Section one: Programme details.....	1
Section two: Submission details	1
Section three: Additional documentation	2
Section four: Recommendation of the visitors	4

Section one: Programme details

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of submission to the HCPC	17 June 2015
Name and role of HCPC visitors	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic)
HCPC executive	Amal Hussein

Section two: Submission details

Summary of change

SET 2: Programme admissions
SET 3: Programme management and resources
SET 6: Assessment

The education provider have informed HCPC that 25 per cent of the programme (which equates to 3 modules of Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice) will be delivered at the Yorkshire Ambulance Trust Manor Mill training site. The education provider had previously informed us commissioners requested an increase in student number. The increase in numbers includes 20 students per annum, who are employed by the ambulance trust as emergency care assistants (ECA's), rather than the current cohort who are employed as ambulance technicians.

The following documents were provided as part of the submission:

- Major change notification form (completed by the HCPC executive)
- Context pack

- Major change SETs mapping document (completed by education provider)
- Programme specification
- Module specifications
- Student handbook
- Annex 1 YAS learning resource
- Annex 2 IT requirement
- Annex 3 Manikin list for YAS
- Annex 4 Library inventory
- Annex 5 Education standard structure
- Annex 6 Faculty Quality and Standards Management and Enhancement Committee (QSME)
- Annex 7 Desk-based assessment of resources available at Yorkshire Ambulance Service (YAS) training site.

Section three: Additional documentation

- The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.
- The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The standards of education and training (SETs), for which additional documentation was requested, are listed below with reasons for the request.

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.

Reason: The visitors noted the information provided for this submission, which included a SETs mapping document. However, no information provided to applicants was included to reassure the visitors that applicants can make a fully informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme. As such, the visitors were unclear of the admission procedures in place to ensure that applicants have all the information to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme. As such, the visitors require further information on how applicants will be informed that the delivery of two of the modules for this programme will be delivered at a different location. .

Suggested documentation: Further evidence such as information packs, advertising or open day materials, prospectus pages or weblinks demonstrating that the information provided will enable potential applicants to make an informed choice.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider, that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. However, from the information submitted the visitors were unable to see how the programme will be effectively managed if some of the programme is being delivered at a different location. In particular, how the modules being delivered offsite will be managed alongside the rest of the programme that is being delivered at the education provider. The visitors were provided with a structural organisation diagram, but no assurance that the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in the

programme management remains appropriate across the two sites. The visitors therefore, require further information to demonstrate how the programme team will effectively manage students at a different site and how they will manage student access to comprehensive services available at the education provider from the offsite location.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence to demonstrate the effective systems in place to manage the programme offsite. This could include, collaborative meetings and any other related documentation that ensures the education provider has strategic and ongoing oversight of their external delivery at another premise

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider, that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. However, from the information submitted the visitors were unable to see how the external delivery element of the programme will be included in the monitoring and the ongoing evaluation of the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme has regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place which include the monitoring of the 25 per cent of the programme that is being delivered offsite. The visitors therefore require further evidence.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate how the external element of the programme being delivered offsite will be included in the programme regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider, that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. The visitor also noted that the delivery of these modules will be done by the current programme team. The visitors were unable to see information on how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will manage the same number of staff delivering modules at external sites as well as an increase in student numbers, while maintaining their commitment to their existing programme on site. The visitors therefore, require information to determine that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme on two different sites. This could include information on the teaching loads for staff teaching at the different sites.

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

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider, that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. The visitors were provided with information on the resources that would be available at the training site. However, the visitors were unable to determine how students at the Trust training site were able to access the academic and pastoral student support that is in place. As such, the visitors require further information on the system of academic and pastoral support in place and how students on the Trust training site are able to access it.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate how students will be able to access the system of academic and pastoral student support in place.

3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation submitted by the education provider, that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. From the information provide, the visitors were unclear how any concerns raised by student regarding the quality of their experience or access to resources offsite is being managed within the existing complaints system. Therefore the visitors require further information to demonstrate that students are aware that the complaints process applies to all areas of the education provider including the Trust training site.

Suggested documentation: Further information to demonstrate how students will be made aware of the complaints process in relation to the Trust training site.

Section four: Recommendation of the visitors

To recommend a programme for ongoing approval, the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the standards of education and training (SETs) and that those who complete the programme have demonstrated an ability to meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- There is sufficient evidence to show the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to demonstrate an ability to meet the standards of proficiency.
- There is insufficient evidence to determine if or how the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training listed. Therefore, a visit is recommended to gather more evidence and if required place conditions on ongoing approval of the programme.

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.

Reason: The visitors noted the information provided for this submission, which included an interview presentation document and general briefing interview candidate which provided the visitors with information about how initial information will be provided to applicants. However, the documentary evidence provided makes reference to two different intake dates, which have a different programme structures. One intake date (September) requires students to undertake two modules at the ambulance trusts training site in Leeds, while the April intake requires students to undertake three modules at the Leeds site. The visitors were unclear from their scrutiny of the documentation how this information would be communicated to potential applicants and how applicants, or the education provider, will determine which students start in September and which in April. Therefore, the visitors are unclear as to how applicants will make an informed choice as to whether they take up a place on the programme. On the basis of the variance in the information provided, the visitors considered that a visit would be the most appropriate way to gather evidence to ensure that the programme continues to meet this standard.

3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Reason: The visitors noted the additional information provided for this submission, which included the away day minutes. However, from the information submitted the visitors were unable to see how the current management structure of the programme will be extended to ensure all elements of the programme will be effectively managed if some of the programme is being delivered at a different location. The visitors noted references in the evidence provided to collaborative meetings to be held 'where possible' and that 'email or phone call' contact could be made in the event of problems. However the visitors were unable to determine how, over and above these informal arrangements, the programme will be formally managed and what effective systems are in place to manage the programme at different locations. Therefore as the visitors could not determine how the programme would be effectively managed with the implementation of these changes they consider a visit to be the most appropriate way to gather evidence to ensure the programme continues to meet this standard.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the additional information provided for this submission, which included team meeting minutes. From the information provided it was clear that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the Trust training centre. Furthermore, the visitors noted that there will be no additional staff recruited to facilitate delivery of the programme at multiple sites. The visitors also received a document outlining the proposed increase to the faculty size, and an assertion that an appropriate staff-to-student ratio would be maintained. As part of this evidence the visitors noted that two members of staff will be assigned to manage the teaching load at the Leeds site, with a proportion of their workload assigned to this task. However it was unclear from the documentation provided as to how these staff members would be supported to undertake the additional workload associated with the new elements to their roles. The visitors were also unclear from the evidence provided what systems the education provider has in place to manage events that may occur at the Leeds site, such as unplanned staff absence, which may have consequences such as leaving off-site students unsupported for periods of time. On the basis of the evidence provided the visitors felt a visit was required to determine how the education provider

will ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of staff in place to deliver this programme effectively.

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

Reason: The visitors noted the additional information provided for this submission, which included team meeting minutes. From the information provided it was clear that the intention is to deliver 25 per cent of the programme at the ambulance trust training centre in Leeds. The visitors were provided with information on the academic and pastoral support available to the student off-site, specifically page 43 of the current course document. The visitors noted that access to the student support services was apparently available to the off-site students, however no detail of how face-to-face meetings would work in practice was provided, therefore, the off-site students may be potentially disadvantaged in comparison to those studying at the Sheffield site. On the basis of the evidence provided the visitors felt a visit was required to assess this SET.