

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University in collaboration with Bromley College of Further and Higher Education
<b>Validating body / Awarding body</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	BA (Hons) Social Work Studies
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 – 15 April 2016

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	14

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 2 June 2016 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2016. 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 10 June 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 7 July 2016.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider and validating body 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	Richard Barker (Social worker in England) Anne Mackay (Social worker in England) Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	15 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Christopher Stevens (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Alison Coates (Internal panel member) Peter Hall (External panel member) Catherine Meehan (Internal panel member) Susan Riddell (Internal panel member)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<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 Foundation Degree in Social Care Studies 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 44 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 14 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate where applicants will have access to the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on the programme, prior to applying.

**Reason:** To demonstrate how this standard is met the visitors were directed to the student handbook. The visitors were satisfied that the information in the student handbook could give applicants the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme, however, the visitors note that this document is not available to applicants prior to applying. The programme team stated that information would be made available to applicants prior to applying via the programme's web page, however the visitors were not provided with any evidence to demonstrate how this would be presented to applicants and the information that would be included. The visitors note that without seeing how applicants can access the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on this programme prior to applying they cannot be certain that this standard is met. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates where applicants will have access to the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme, prior to applying.

### **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 clarify the length of this programme and how this will be communicated to applicants.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted discrepancies in the stated programme length. For example, page 11 of the student handbook states that students will study for 13 months whereas page 4 of the programme specification states that students will study for 12 months. In addition to this the programme timetable suggests that the programme is 9 months in duration. The visitors were also unable to locate where applicants would have access to information regarding the programme length prior to applying. The visitors note that the programme length is an important factor in applicants being able to make an informed decision about whether to take up an offer of a place on this programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to clearly outline the confirmed duration of this programme and how this will be effectively communicated to applicants prior to applying.

### **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 demonstrate how they explain their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policies to applicants and students.

**Reason:** To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the education providers AP(E)L policies. The visitors were satisfied that the AP(E)L policies were appropriate for this programme, however, the visitors were unable to see how the policy would be effectively communicated to applicants and students. For example, the visitors could not see how applicants would have access to information regarding what might be accepted as AP(E)L and the procedures associated with this. The visitors note that, due to that nature of this programme, there could be a high number of applicants and current students applying to this programme via the AP(E)L route. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates how the education provider will effectively communicate their AP(E)L policies and associated processes to potential applicants and students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must confirm the anticipated student numbers for this programme and provide evidence to demonstrate how they will support this number of students.

**Reason:** From documentation provided prior to the visit the visitors understood that the programme was looking to recruit a maximum of 15 students per year. However, at the visit the programme and senior teams stated that they were unsure of the confirmed student numbers for the programme and were potentially looking at recruiting in excess of 15 students per year. The visitors note that without having confirmation of the anticipated student numbers for this programme they cannot make a judgement on the programme having a secure place in the education provider's business plan. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate a confirmed maximum number of students for this programme and how the education provider will be committed to adequately supporting this.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide an updated and signed copy of the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement or other evidence that demonstrates how this standard is met.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were provided with the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement which outlined the roles and responsibilities of Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and Bromley College. However, the visitors noted that this document has not yet been signed by both parties involved. The visitors note that without seeing a signed Memorandum of Agreement they cannot be certain that all parties will be committed to delivering this programme and therefore cannot be certain that this programme has a secure place in the education providers' business plan. The visitors therefore require further evidence in the way of a signed Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement, or other evidence, to ensure that this standard is met.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must update the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement to accurately reflect the complaints and application processes, and provide a finalised and signed version.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were provided with the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement which outlined the roles and responsibilities of Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and Bromley College. However, the visitors noted that there were some discrepancies in what was stated in this document compared to other documents and comments from the programme team. For example, the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement stated that students will go through Bromley College's complaints process and then onto Canterbury Christ Church University's (CCCU) complaints process if necessary. However, the Bromley College website states that student complaints will go through Bromley College's complaints process and then onto the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) if necessary. In addition, the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement states that applicants will apply direct to Bromley College, however the programme team confirmed that applicants would apply through Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS). The visitors also note that the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement has not been signed by both parties involved. The visitors were satisfied that the information provided by the programme team was appropriate to ensure that the programme is effectively managed. Without seeing this accurately reflected in a finalised and signed Memorandum of Agreement, the visitors are unable to be certain that the aforementioned processes will be applied. The visitors therefore require the programme team to revisit the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement to ensure it accurately reflects the processes for this programme and is in a final and signed state to ensure that the programme is effectively managed.

### **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 demonstrate how academic staff will appropriately support students with academic direction throughout the programme.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors heard contradicting statements regarding the level of support available for students throughout and between modules. Specifically the programme team stated that students would only have access to academic direction for each module within the five weeks that it is running. However, in the same meeting it was stated that students would have access to academic support outside of the five week module period. The visitors note that the current time frames applied to modules is limited and it is therefore imperative that students receive adequate academic support throughout and between each module. From the information provided the visitors were unable to make a judgement on how the academic direction to support student learning effectively supports the required learning and teaching activities of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the academic support available to students throughout and between modules is appropriate to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

### **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 demonstrate that the library resources effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** From a tour of the facilities the visitors noted that there were a limited number of up to date texts available to students in the library at Bromley College. In addition to this, students mentioned buying their own books for the programme to counter the

volume of resources available in the library. The programme team stated that students would have access to facilities at the Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) Campus however this is some distance from Bromley College where the students will be based. The programme team also stated that there was a budget set aside for resources at Bromley College however the visitors received no confirmation of the budget amount, where it would be spent or a commitment from the senior team that this budget would be allocated to library resources for this programme. The visitors note that the current library resources are not adequate to support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme. The visitors also note that without confirmation of the budget amount and which specific resources this will be spent on they cannot be certain that the library resources will be adequate to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme before the intended start date of September 2016. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there are adequate library facilities to support the required learning and teaching activities of this programme, or, a clear outline and commitment to acquiring appropriate resources before the intended start date of September 2016.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that the library resources are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students.

**Reason:** From a tour of the facilities the visitors noted that there were a limited number of up to date texts available to students in the library at Bromley College. In addition to this, students mentioned buying their own books for the programme to counter the volume of resources available in the library. The programme team stated that students would have access to facilities at the Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) Campus however this is some distance from Bromley College where the students will be based. The programme team also stated that there was a budget set aside for resources at Bromley College however the visitors received no confirmation of the budget amount, where it would be spent or a commitment from the senior team that this budget would be allocated to library resources for this programme. In addition to this, the programme team were not able to confirm intended student numbers for this programme, therefore the visitors are unable to make a judgement on the resources being appropriate for the number of students on this programme. The visitors note that currently they cannot see how the library resources are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students. The visitors also note that without confirmation of the budget amount and allocation for library resources on this programme they cannot be certain that the library resources will be appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students before the intended start date of September 2016. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there are adequate library facilities that are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students, or, a clear outline and commitment to acquiring appropriate resources before the intended start date of September 2016.

### **3.13 There must be a student complaints process in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must confirm the full cycle of the student complaints process and how this is communicated to students.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitors heard contradictions in the process used for student complaints. For example, the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement states that students will go through Bromley College's complaints process and then onto Canterbury Christ Church University's (CCCU) complaints process if necessary. However, the Bromley College website states that student complaints will go through Bromley College's complaints process and then onto the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) if necessary. The programme team confirmed that the correct process was that which is highlighted in the Operational Annex to the Memorandum of Agreement. The visitors were satisfied that this was an appropriate process, however, were not clear how this would be effectively communicated to students. The visitors also note that the information on Bromley College's website could mislead students in understanding the correct complaints process. The visitors therefore require evidence to confirm the complaints process for this programme and how this will be effectively communicated to students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must clarify appropriate attendance requirements and trigger points for this programme, and demonstrate how these are effectively communicated to both staff and students.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit the visitors noted discrepancies in the stated attendance requirements and trigger points for the programme. For example, the Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) attendance policy states that any attendance requirements for professional programmes will be highlighted in the programme handbook, however the visitors were unable to find any additional information in the programme handbook. The visitors were therefore unable to understand the attendance requirements for this programme and how these would be effectively communicate to students. In addition to this, the programme team provided mixed responses to the attendance requirements for this programme and any trigger points at which action would be taken as a result of dissatisfactory student attendance. The visitors were therefore unable to see that the programme team had a clear understanding of the attendance requirements for this programme and the trigger points at which action would need to be taken regarding a student's attendance. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly outlines appropriate attendance requirements and trigger points for this programme, and demonstrate how these are effectively communicate to both staff and students.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must outline a clear and appropriate plan for service user and carer involvement on this programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were directed to the programme specification to demonstrate how service users and carers will be involved in this programme. The programme specification made a number of references to service user and carer involvement, however, the visitors were unable to identify a clear implementation plan to identify exactly how and where service users and carers will be involvement in this programme. In addition to this the visitors met with service users and carers who stated they have not currently had any involvement with this programme and have not been made aware

of any intended involvement. The visitors heard a number of ways that service users and carers are involved with other programmes offered by Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and noted that these could be appropriate to ensure service user and carer involvement on this programme. However, there was no confirmation of this happening or intending to happen. The visitors note that without seeing that service user and carer involvement is in place for this programme, or a clear action plan for how and where this will take place, they cannot be certain that service users and carers are involved in the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence which demonstrates a clear and appropriate process and commitment for how and where service users and carers will be involved in this programme.

#### **4.6 The delivery of the programme must support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the module structure allows students to develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

**Reason:** The documentation provided demonstrated that the programme currently runs each module over a five week period. From this structure the visitors were unable to see how students would have sufficient time and support within and between each module to develop autonomous and reflective thinking. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see where students would be able to find sufficient time and support to reflect on their academic work in the critical literature review. In addition to this, the programme team provided contradictions in the support that was available to students within and between each module. For example, the programme team stated that students would only have access to academic direction for each module within the five weeks that it is running. However, in the same meeting it was stated that students would have access to academic support outside of the five week module period. The visitors note that without confirmation on the level of academic support available to students throughout the programme they cannot make a judgement on how the delivery of the programme supports autonomous and reflective thinking. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how the module structure, including academic support, will support and develop autonomous and reflective thinking.

#### **4.8 The range of learning and teaching approaches used must be appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the module structure for the critical literature review is appropriate to ensure effective delivery of the curriculum and achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme currently runs each module over a five week period, including the critical literature review. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes for the critical literature review are appropriate to ensure that students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. However, the visitors were unable to see how the current module time frames would enable students to meet the learning outcomes for this module. In addition to this, the visitors heard contradicting statements regarding the academic support that would be made available to students for this module. For example, the programme team stated that students would only have access to academic direction for each module within the five weeks that it is running. However, in the same meeting it was stated that students would have access to academic support

outside of the five week module period. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on the level of support available to students in the delivery of the curriculum. In being unable to see how students are able to meet the learning outcomes for this module, adversely the visitors are unable to see how students will meet some SOPs such as 11.1 and 14.6. The visitors note that ability to meet the SOPs for social workers in England is crucial to ensuring that students on this programme are able to practice safely and effectively. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to demonstrate how the module structure for the critical literature review is appropriate to the effective delivery of the curriculum and enables students to successfully meet all learning outcomes for the module.

## **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 clearly outline the number and range of placement settings that will be available to students on this programme and that they are appropriate to support the student numbers, delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to see that an appropriate number and range of practice placements would be available to students on this programme. The programme team discussed a range of placements that could be appropriate to support this programme. However, the placements discussed were in place for other programmes at Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and were not confirmed as placements that were available to this programme. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on the range of practice placements being appropriate to support this programme. In addition to this, the programme team were unable to confirm the student numbers for this programme. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgment on the number of placements available being appropriate to support the programme. The visitors therefore require documentation which clearly outlines the range of placements available for this programme and that they are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. In addition to this, the visitors require evidence to clearly outline the student numbers for this programme and that the number of secured practice placements is appropriate to support the student numbers and consequently the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that a clear process is in place to deliver appropriate compulsory initial and refresher training to practice educators, specifically related to this programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were unable to see a clear process for initial and refresher training for practice educators. Specifically the visitors were unable to see how practice educators would be trained to support students from this particular programme. The programme teams stated that most practice educators are already in place for other programmes at Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and have therefore already undergone practice educator training. However the visitors note that, due to the nature of this programme, the students going on placement

will have different learning needs compared to those on other programmes at CCCU. Also, this programme will have different learning outcomes to any other delivered at CCCU. In addition to this, the visitors heard that some practice educators do not attend any refresher training as it is felt that they do not require it. The visitors note that it is a requirement that all practice educators undergo some form of initial and refresher training to ensure their knowledge is up to date in line with the programme and its learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that both initial and refresher training are in place, in an appropriate capacity, and compulsory for all practice educators on this programme. In addition to this, the visitors require evidence to demonstrate that both initial and refresher training are appropriate to specifically support students on this programme.

### **6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the standards of proficiency for Social workers in England.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design appropriately supports the module structure for the critical literature review, and ensures that all students are able to meet the standards of proficiency for social workers in England.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the programme currently runs each module over a five week period, including the critical literature review. The visitors noted that the learning outcomes for the critical literature review are appropriate to ensure that students are able to meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England. However, the visitors were unable to see how the current assessment strategy and design appropriately supports the current module time frames to enable students to meet the learning outcomes for this module. In addition to this, the visitors heard contradicting statements regarding the academic support that would be made available to students for this module. For example, the programme team stated that students would only have access to academic direction for each module within the five weeks that it is running. However, in the same meeting it was stated that students would have access to academic support outside of the five week module period. The visitors were therefore unable to make a judgement on the level of support available to students leading up to and during assessment. In being unable to see how students are appropriately assessed to meet the learning outcomes for this module, adversely the visitors are unable to see how students will meet some SOPs such as 11.1 and 14.6. The visitors note that ability to meet the SOPs for social workers in England is crucial to ensuring that students on this programme are able to practice safely and effectively. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design appropriately supports the module structure for the critical literature review and ensures all students are able to meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

## Recommendations

### **3.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the ways in which it communicates the support systems available to students.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that there were clear support systems in place for students and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors noted that students were not always aware of all the support systems that were available to them. For example, some students were unaware that they were able to access support systems at both Bromley College and Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) campus. Whilst the visitors were satisfied that students were aware of adequate support available to them they noted there is a risk that students may not be aware of all support systems available to them. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider reviews how they communicate with students regarding available support systems.

Richard Barker  
Anne Mackay  
Frances Ashworth

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	29 – 30 March 2016

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	18

## 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 23 May 2016 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2016. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 July 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 25 August 2016.

## Introduction

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

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider 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	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Sue Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	David Grummit (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Secretary	Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University)
Members of the joint panel	Matthew Catterall (External panel member) Alison Coates (Internal panel member) Sue Soan (Internal panel member) Kristina Masuwa-Morgan (Internal panel member)

## Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<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 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 already running FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice) and 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 35 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for this programme and how they are communicated to applicants.

**Reason:** Throughout the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate any information which outlined the IELTS requirements for this programme. At the visit the programme team stated that the IELTS requirement for this programme is 6.5 with no element below 5.5. The visitors were satisfied that this criteria was appropriate to the level and content of the programme, however, without seeing this clearly articulated in the programme documentation the visitors cannot be certain that this will be consistently applied to all applicants. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates where the IELTS requirements for this programme are articulated within the programme documentation and how this is communicated to applicants.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarity on whether Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) or South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) will implement criminal convictions checks and demonstrate that the processes associated with the checks are appropriate and relevant.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit the visitors were unclear who was responsible for ensuring criminal convictions checks are undertaken. In a meeting with practice educators it was stated that SECAMB would hold responsibility for ensuring all applicants undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check before entering onto the programme. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was stated that CCCU hold this responsibility. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify who would be responsible for ensuring criminal convictions checks are implemented for each applicant. In addition to this the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the policies and processes associated with criminal convictions checks. For example, the visitors were unable to see what would happen if an applicant declares a criminal conviction or how recent the criminal conviction check needs to be. The visitors note that due to the nature of the 'In Service' entry route for this particular programme, currency is imperative to ensuring criminal convictions checks are appropriate and relevant. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly outlines who has responsibility for implementing criminal convictions checks and that the processes associated with this are appropriate and relevant.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarity on whether Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) or South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) will implement health checks and demonstrate that the processes associated with the checks are appropriate and relevant.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit the visitors were unclear who was responsible for ensuring health checks are undertaken. In a meeting with practice educators it was stated that SECamb would hold responsibility for ensuring all applicants meet the health requirements of the programme. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was stated that CCCU hold this responsibility. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify who would be responsible for ensuring applicants meet the health requirements for the programme. In addition to this the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the policies and processes associated with health checks. For example, the visitors were unable to see what would happen if an applicant does not meet the health requirements of the programme or how recent the health check needs to be. The visitors note that due to the nature of the 'In Service' entry route for this particular programme, currency is imperative to ensuring health checks are appropriate to the content of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly outlines who has responsibility for implementing health checks and that the processes associated with this are appropriate to the content of the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate appropriate academic and professional entry requirements for the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that applicants are expected to demonstrate qualifications at level 2 as part of the entry requirements for this programme. Applicants will not be expected to demonstrate any level 3 qualifications. The programme team stated that students might complete the Associate Practitioner (AP) course designed by SECamb which they classify as equivalent to a level 3 diploma. However, this is not a requirement. The visitors also noted that, as part of the entry criteria, applicants are expected to have a minimum of one years' experience in the ambulance service. However, there was no clarity of what kind of service was required and requirements for any skills that are expected to be met in this time. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the academic level or professional experience required before entering onto a programme, the visitors cannot see how the current academic or professional entry requirements will adequately prepare applicants for the level and content of this programme. In addition to this, in a meeting with students it was stated that those who had not been required to demonstrate level 3 qualifications at entry found the transition into the first year at level 4 particularly challenging. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the academic and / or professional entry standards for this programme are appropriate to the level and content of the programme.

## **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 evidence of an appropriate Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme and clarify how this relates to the entry requirements for 'In Service' applicants.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit, the visitors were unable to identify a clear AP(E)L policy for this programme. The programme team stated that AP(E)L will be applied on a case by case basis, however the visitors were

unable to see what this process looks like within the context of this programme. The visitors also note that AP(E)L may be considered as part of the entry requirements for the programme where 'In Service' applicants are asked to demonstrate a minimum of one years' service in the ambulance trust. However the visitors were unclear as to whether this was AP(E)L or in fact an entry requirement for the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly outlines an appropriate AP(E)L process for this programme. In addition to this, the visitors require evidence which clearly clarifies if the one years' experience in the ambulance trust will can be accredited as AP(E)L, or, if this is an entry requirement only.

### **3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how practice placement providers outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) are effectively managed.

**Reason:** Throughout the documentation provided the visitors noted that students would experience their placements in two types of settings, ambulance settings with SECamb and non-ambulance settings across a range of other providers. The visitors were satisfied that placements with SECamb are effectively managed, however the visitors were unable to see effective management of placements in the non-ambulance setting. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify a clear process for managing these placements and the lines of responsibility for those involved. The programme team stated that they attend regular meetings with non-ambulance placement settings and that there is continued communication throughout the placement process. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. In addition to this, there were no representatives from non-ambulance placement settings present at the practice educator meeting, the visitors were therefore unable to further ensure that there will be continued communication throughout the placement process. The visitors therefore require evidence which outlines a clear and effective management process for non-ambulance placement settings to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate effective monitoring and evaluation for placements outside of South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECamb).

**Reason:** Throughout the documentation provided the visitors noted that students would experience their placements in two types of settings, ambulance settings with SECamb and non-ambulance settings across a range of other providers. The visitors were satisfied that there were regular monitoring and evaluation systems for placements at SECamb, however the visitors were unable to see regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for placements in the non-ambulance setting. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify a clear audit process used for non-ambulance placements and how feedback is gathered in relation to these placements. The visitors note that without seeing clear audit and feedback processes for non-ambulance placements they are unable to see that monitoring and evaluation systems are in place across all placement settings. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there are appropriate and regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for all placement settings.

### **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 evidence to demonstrate an adequate number of staff will be in place to deliver this programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that this programme will run alongside the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science and eventually replace the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). It was also noted that staff members will work across all three programmes until the phase out of the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). However this programme intends to recruit 30 students per year in contrast to the 15 students per year currently on the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). The visitors noted to the programme team that the current staff numbers are not adequate to effectively deliver this programme alongside the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science and the phase out of the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). The programme team stated that they were advertising for one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) member of staff to join the programme by September 2016 and another by September 2017 to counter the increase to student numbers each year. The visitors were satisfied that this would ensure an appropriate number of staff were in place, however, could not see any evidence to support this such as a job advert or a commitment to timelines for appointment. The visitors note that without seeing any documentation to support the statements made by the programme and senior teams they cannot be certain that the mentioned FTE will be recruited. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate a clear outline and process for the programme's recruitment strategy and a commitment from senior staff that this will be implemented.

### **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 to demonstrate that the resources for practical teaching sessions are appropriate to support the increase to student numbers.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were shown a number of teaching spaces including specialist labs and tutorial rooms. The programme team stated that due to the nature of the programme and the paramedic profession students did not often use the specialist labs and would spend more time in standard teaching rooms or alternative settings within the university using specialist equipment. The visitors were satisfied that the teaching rooms and alternative settings were appropriate to support the delivery of practical teaching, however, were not provided with any further information regarding the equipment available to be used in these settings. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify the ratio of equipment to student numbers for practical teaching sessions. In addition to this, student feedback at the visit suggested that there were not an adequate number of resources to support their learning in practical sessions. The visitors note that this programme intends to recruit 30 students per year and are therefore unable to see how the current resources for practical teaching will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme with an increase to student numbers. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in practical teaching sessions are adequate to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme and the increase to student numbers.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate an appropriate number of staff are in place to deliver academic and pastoral support.

**Reason:** With reference to the condition under SET 3.5 of this report, the visitors are unable to see that the current staff numbers are adequate to ensure that the programme's system of academic and pastoral student support will be available to students in all settings. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider could continue to run their personal tutor system under current staff numbers alongside the increase to student numbers. The visitors note that the programme team intends to recruit one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) member of staff before September 2016 and another before September 2017. The visitors are satisfied that this change in staffing will support the programme to effectively deliver a system of academic and pastoral support, however, were not provided with any evidence to support the commitment of recruiting these staff members. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate a clear outline and process for the programme's recruitment strategy and a commitment from senior staff that this will be implemented to ensure that the programme team can effectively deliver their system of academic and pastoral support.

### **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 communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the level at which learning outcomes should be delivered the visitors noted that there could be significant changes to the learning outcomes as a result of the internal panel requirements. Without seeing the changes to learning outcomes the visitors cannot make a judgement on how they enable students to meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

### **4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs).

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there was disparity in the views of teaching staff and students regarding the teaching of the SCPEs. In the documentation provided the visitors were advised that the SCPEs are delivered throughout the programme. The

programme team also stated that the SCPEs would be covered in year one of the programme alongside teaching of the role of the HCPC. However, the students that the visitors met with did not know what the SCPEs were and had no recollection of these being taught. In addition to this the students were not aware of the role and remit of the HCPC. Although the students that the visitors met with were not on this programme the visitors were concerned that this issue could be transferred to this programme. The visitors note that, whilst it is clearly the intention of the programme team to deliver teaching on the SCPEs, this may not currently be effective in ensuring that students understand the implications of the SCPEs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to clearly outline where students are taught about the SCPEs and how the programme team ensure that these are understood by students.

### **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 clarification on which placement settings will be offered to students outside South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) and the learning outcomes associated with them.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that students would experience some time in placement settings outside of the SECamb ambulance setting. However the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the locations of these alternative settings or the learning outcomes associated with them. At the visit the visitors were provided with additional documentation which outlined a placement timetable and made reference to a number of non-ambulance placement settings, however no further detail was provided on these non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that without clarification of which placement settings will be offered outside of the SECamb ambulance setting they cannot be certain that the current range of practice placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. In addition to this the visitors note that without clarification of the learning outcomes associated with non-ambulance placements they cannot be certain that the range of practice placements support the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly outlines each of the non-ambulance placement settings and the learning outcomes associated with them to ensure that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) to ensure a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECamb and are therefore satisfied that all SECamb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECamb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and

managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure they provide a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAMB.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) to ensure an effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAMB and are therefore satisfied that all SECAMB placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAMB in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately approved and monitored. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAMB.

#### **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 demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) to ensure equality and diversity policies in relation to students will be implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAMB and are therefore satisfied that all SECAMB placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAMB in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that equality and diversity policies are in place in relation to students. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAMB.

## **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 that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAMB and are therefore satisfied that all SECAMB placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAMB in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAMB.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB) to ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAMB and are therefore satisfied that all SECAMB placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAMB in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAMB.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to mentor students on this programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the practice educators mentoring students are not registered paramedics. Some of the mentors are ambulance technicians. The programme team stated that this programme would not accept any mentors that were not registered paramedics and that the information provided was for other programmes currently run by the university. However, practice educators stated that ambulance technicians could mentor students but this would be limited to students in year one of the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear on the requirements of knowledge, skills and experience for practice educators and mentors on this programme. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the level at which practice educators must be qualified, the visitors were unable to see how ambulance technicians, acting as practice mentors, would be able to support students and provide a safe environment for effective learning. The visitors therefore require clarification on the knowledge, skills and experience required to be a practice mentor on this programme. In addition to this, if ambulance technicians are acting as practice mentors, the visitors require a clear rationale which outlines their knowledge skills and experience and subsequently their ability to mentor students at this level.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other agreements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECamb and are therefore satisfied that all SECamb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECamb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECamb.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that the mentors for this programme will be registered paramedics, or demonstrate how they ensure that any mentors who are not registered paramedics have relevant experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the practice educators mentoring students are not registered paramedics. Some of the mentors are ambulance technicians. The programme team stated that this programme would not accept any mentors that were not registered paramedics and that the information provided was for other programmes currently run by the university. However, practice educators stated that ambulance technicians could mentor students but this would be limited to students in year one of the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear on the requirements for practice educators and mentors to be registered paramedics. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that all practice educators must be registered with us the visitors require information about their experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement to ensure they are able to deliver their role effectively. The visitors therefore require clarification on the requirements for practice educators to be registered paramedics. Where practice educators and mentors are not registered paramedics the visitors require supporting evidence which demonstrates how their experience, qualifications and training are appropriate to act as a practice educator or mentor on this programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration with placement providers outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB).

**Reason:** With reference to the conditions under SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of this report the visitors cannot be certain that there is regular and effective collaboration with non-ambulance placement providers. Specifically the visitors note that without seeing a clear audit process for approving and monitoring all non-ambulance placement settings they cannot be certain that there is regular and effective collaboration in place. The programme team stated that they attend regular meetings with non-ambulance placement settings and that there is continued communication throughout the placement process, however, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. In addition to this, there were no representatives from non-ambulance placement settings present at the practice educator meeting, the visitors were therefore unable to triangulate the information they had heard. The visitors therefore require evidence which outlines a clear audit process and regular communication with non-ambulance placement settings to ensure that this standard is met.

**5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how students and practice educators are appropriately prepared for placements outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAMB).

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team it was stated that students are advised of what to expect in non-ambulance placement settings. However, in discussions with the students it was stated that they felt unprepared for non-ambulance placements. Specifically, students were unaware of the learning outcomes associated with the placements and what the intended outcome was. In addition to this, with relation to the condition under SET 5.10 of this report, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider effectively communicates with non-ambulance placements to ensure they are prepared to take students. The visitors note that having a clear understanding of the learning outcomes associated with each placement is imperative to ensuring both students and practice educators are prepared for placement. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly demonstrates that students and placement providers are provided with clear learning outcomes and objectives for non-ambulance placement settings to ensure they are fully prepared for placement.

**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 communicate any changes to the assessment strategy and design as a result of the changes to learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes and associated assessment methods ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. The visitors note that changes to the learning outcomes for the programme will subsequently impact the assessment strategy and design in ensuring that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes and associated assessment methods, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes and respective assessment methods.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current assessment methods are effective in measuring the learning outcomes. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that level at which learning outcomes should be delivered it is noted that there could be significant changes to the learning outcomes as a result of the internal panel requirements. The visitors note that without seeing the changes to learning outcomes they cannot be certain the assessment methods employed will measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that the assessment methods employed effectively measure the learning outcomes.

## Recommendations

### **6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the Workplace Evidence Tool (WPET) document to more clearly outline student's developmental needs.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the WPET document contains a section for placement providers to note any developmental needs for students. This information can be accessed by the student's next placement mentor. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors note that the section within the WPET for highlighting developmental needs could provide more clarity in highlighting developmental needs to each student's next placement mentor and that there is a risk that this information could be overlooked. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider revisits the WPET document to provide clearer guidance on noting students' developmental needs and how this can be picked up by their next placement mentor.

Paul Bates  
Mark Nevis  
Sue Roff

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Leicester
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Operating department practitioner
<b>Date of visit</b>	19 – 20 April 2016

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	11

## 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 'operating department practitioner' 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 8 June 2016 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2016. 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 June 2016. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 7 July 2016.

## 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	Tony Scripps (Operating department practitioner) Andrew Steel (Operating department practitioner) Susanne Roff (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, 2 cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Robert Norman (University of Leicester)
Secretary	Day 1 – David Parker (University of Leicester) Day 2 – Beverley Island (University of Leicester)

## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Internal programme review reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mentor database and handbook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E-portfolio examples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service user and carer involvement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The visitors reviewed the external examiners' and internal programme review reports from the DipHE in Operating Department Practice programme as the programme seeking approval 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 DipHE in Operating Department Practice 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 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining ten SETs.

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

The visitors have also made one recommendation for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the advertising materials provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the admissions procedures were incorporated in the student handbook which, the programme team confirmed, was not available to applicants. While the visitors received a promotional brochure, they were informed the programme was currently unable to advertise on the university website due to an internal policy restricting them from doing so until HCPC approval had been granted. Therefore only limited information was available to applicants on the website at the time of the visit. The visitors were unclear how the programme team disseminated information to all potential applicants around the design of the programme. Particularly, the visitors noted that potential applicants would need to know about the 48 week university year and the 65 / 35 per cent clinical placement / academic split. In addition they were unclear how applicants were informed about Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks, and entry requirements relating to health, English language and accreditation of prior (experiential) learning. To ensure all applicants understand the commitment and entry requirements of the programme so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme, the visitors require further evidence.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate who pays for Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks and how this is communicated to applicants.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the admissions procedures were incorporated in the student handbook which, the programme team confirmed, was not available to applicants. This included information about the process to undertake enhanced DBS checks prior to admission to the programme and the process to follow if an issue was raised. From their review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine who paid the costs associated with an enhanced check. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates who covers the costs associated with an enhanced DBS check and how this is communicated to applicants.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the admissions procedures apply appropriate academic entry standards.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the admissions procedures were incorporated in the student handbook which, the programme team confirmed, was not available to applicants. This included information

about the academic and professional entry standards in place. From the promotional brochure the visitors noted the entry requirements of a BBC / 280 UCAS points and possible alternate entry routes for applicants with equivalent qualifications. At the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of the DipHE in Operating Department Practice application form which they were informed contained all the entry requirements for the programme seeking approval. From this, the visitors noted that applicants were required to have five GCSEs at Grade C or above, including mathematics, English language and science. Due to inconsistencies in the documentation and limited information available to applicants, the visitors were unclear as to what the academic entry requirements were for all applicants. Therefore to demonstrate this standard is met, the visitors require additional evidence.

## **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 demonstrate the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms applicable to the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted the admissions procedures were incorporated in the student handbook which, the programme team confirmed, was not available to applicants. This included detailed information about the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) policy. In the minutes of the programme approval panel from December 2014, it was specifically stated there was no AP(E)L for any part of this programme and the programme specification makes no mention of an AP(E)L policy. During discussions with the programme team it was confirmed that, on a case by case basis, AP(E)L would be considered using the process in the handbook; though due to the design of the programme, it was difficult to offer AP(E)L to individuals. Due to inconsistencies in the evidence provided, the visitors were unsure of the policy for the programme. To be sure of the AP(E)L policy for the programme the visitors require additional evidence which demonstrates the mechanisms in place.

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

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

**Reason:** Within the programme documentation, the visitors noted discrepancies in terminology in relation to HCPC regulation. For example, page 5 of the promotional brochure states "You will then be fit to practise as an ODP upon graduation and eligible to apply for registration with the Health and Care Professions Council". Similarly the Course handbook states on page 4 "The aim of this programme is to provide the student with the educational opportunities to gain the BSc ODP Award and as such be fit to practise as an ODP upon qualification". When students successfully complete an approved programme, they become fit for award by the education provider. They become fit to practise when they have applied for and gained registration with the HCPC.

Also in the Course handbook page 72 states "The BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice is the nationally recognised qualification for eligibility to register as an

Operating Department Practitioner as approved by the HCPC". References to HCPC registration should state 'eligibility to apply' so it is clear there is a supplementary process students need to go through before they are gain registration. In addition, SET 1 outlines the normal level of entry for operating department practice as a Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE). While programmes can be delivered above this, the DipHE is the nationally recognised level. The visitors therefore require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology and clarify the role of HCPC regulation. 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.

### **3.9 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 demonstrate how the resources to support student learning effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

**Reason:** At the visit, the visitors were shown the clinical skills facilities for the programme and observed the hand washing facilities. The programme team highlighted that the taps were incorrect as separate handles for hot and cold water had been installed. In operating theatres, the visitors' experience is of single handled taps so individuals can adjust and turn off the water with one elbow, thus meaning they can wash their hands in a sterile manner. In the first module (OP1001), the visitors noted the lecture "Infection control – universal principles" and in the practice placement associated with this module, the competency "Recognise the risks associated with infection in the Operating Department and describe effective control strategies". With the current set up of the taps, the visitors were unclear how students learnt how to use single handled taps before going out to their practice placement. Therefore to ensure the resources to support student learning effectively support the teaching and learning activities, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

### **3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum.

**Reason:** At the visit, the visitors were shown the clinical skills facilities for the programme and observed the hand washing facilities. The programme team highlighted that the taps were incorrect as separate handles for hot and cold water had been installed. In operating theatres, the visitor's experience is of single handled taps so individuals can adjust and turn off the water with one elbow, thus meaning they can wash their hands in a sterile manner. In the first module (OP1001), the visitors noted the lecture "Infection control – universal principals" and in the practice placement associated with this module, the competency "Recognise the risks associated with infection in the Operating Department and describe effective control strategies". With the current set up of the taps, the visitors were unclear how students learnt how to use single handled taps before going out to their practice placement. Therefore to ensure the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and are readily available to students, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how this standard is met.

### **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 demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how these are implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** From practice placement educators, the visitors learnt that students were treated as a normal member of staff and, as with everyone working in the National Health Service, all relevant policies and procedures applied to them. This included equality and diversity policies. The programme team informed the visitors they were in discussions with independent hospitals and other sites to expand the number and range of placements available. From the Practice placement audit and Placement provider information form the visitors could not determine how the programme team checked whether equality and diversity policies were in place. To ensure students are told about the equality and diversity policies at each practice placement site, whether it is in the NHS or not, and what they should do if they felt they had been discriminated against, the education provider must ensure these are in place. Therefore further evidence is required to demonstrate how the education provider ensures equality and diversity policies are in place at all placements and how these are implemented and monitored.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure there is a sufficient number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place at practice placements to determine student competences have been met.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of the mentor database. At the visit it became clear this was an abbreviated version of the information held by the programme team about their Associate and Lead mentors. It is the Lead mentor who determines whether a student has achieved a competency; the Associate mentor supports the student in the clinical environment and provides formative feedback only. The programme team confirmed that Lead mentors are required to hold the Nursing and Midwifery (NMC) Level 6 mentoring qualification as well as attend initial training provided by the programme team. The visitors met with students currently on the DipHE in Operating Department Practice programme and heard of some difficulties finding a Lead mentor when needed. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to identify who had acquired the Level 6 mentoring qualification and therefore how many Lead mentors were in place to determine whether students had met the competences. To ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to do this, the visitors require additional evidence.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure Lead mentors attend regular refresher training.

**Reason:** Prior to the visit, the visitors were provided with a copy of the mentor database. At the visit it became clear this was an abbreviated version of the information

held by the programme team about their Associate and Lead mentors. From discussions the visitors learnt that Lead mentors are required to attend initial programme specific training and are invited to attend regular refresher training through activities such as workshops or updates in the practice placement setting. The visitors were unclear how the programme team ensured all Lead mentors attended refresher training on a regular basis and therefore how changes, such as those associated with the change from DipHE to BSc (Hons), would be communicated. To demonstrate this standard is met, the visitors require additional evidence to show Lead mentors undertake regular refresher training.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should continue discussions with practice placement providers to allow students to use their Pebble pad at all sites.

**Reason:** From discussions with students, the visitors learnt about differences in the Wi-Fi access at placement sites due to Trust policy. Some students were unable to access Wi-Fi due to the firewall in place, or only in a very specific spot away from their normal working location. As all students had been issued with a Pebble pad to complete their electronic portfolio, there were some difficulties in being able to update information at the placement site. From the programme team the visitors learnt that an application for phones had been developed so that students could record their observations / reflections more easily and upload them to the Pebble pad at a later time. The visitors were therefore satisfied there was an alternative in place, however, to enhance the effective use of the electronic portfolio, they recommend that the programme team continue discussions with the practice placement providers about expanding Wi-Fi capability to their students.

Tony Scripps  
Andrew Steel  
Susanne Roff

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Wolverhampton
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	14 – 15 April 2016

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	10

## 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 2 June 2016 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2016. 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 June 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 7 July 2016. If the visitors require a second conditions response, they may need to make this recommendation to a later meeting of the Committee.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	John Donaghy (Paramedic) Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) Manoj Mistry (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive office (in attendance)	Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	30 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2016
Chair	Ann Cysewski (University of Wolverhampton)
Secretary	Rebecca Bates (University of Wolverhampton)
Members of the joint panel	Gill Conde (Internal Panel Member) Laura Clode (Internal Panel Member) Gary Strong (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' report from the last two years prior to the visit as external examiners' reports have not been produced 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 Dip HE in Paramedic Science (full time) programme, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it, as it is a new programme.

## Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made two recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure appropriate criminal conviction checks are undertaken for all applicants, including those without UK citizenship.

**Reason:** From the programme documentation and from discussion at the visit, the visitors noted that all students are required to have an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check prior to commencing the programme. The visitors also noted that applicants “need to be a citizen of the UK, EU, EEA, or have definite leave to remain in the UK for the duration of the course.” The visitors considered that appropriate criminal convictions checks were undertaken for UK citizens, but were unclear how the education provider would undertake appropriate criminal convictions checks for any international applicants. Therefore, the visitors require information to demonstrate how the education provider undertakes criminal conviction checks for all applicants to 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 demonstrate how placements in non-ambulance settings support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were given a clear breakdown what placements third year students could expect, and were given an indication of the range, including those placements in non-ambulance settings. However, the visitors were unclear about the detail of placements in non-ambulance settings, including how the education provider will ensure there are sufficient non-ambulance placements for all students. The visitors noted that due to the planned total duration of non-ambulance placements, there could be significant impact on these placement sites, which already support students from other professional programmes. The visitors were also unclear how the range of experience in non-ambulance settings links to the intended learning outcomes for these placements, and how all students will be able to access the required range of placements to achieve the learning outcomes associated with these practice placements. Therefore, for this standard to be met, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures that placements in non-ambulance settings support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

### **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 that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in non-ambulance settings.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were clear how the education provider ensures there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the ambulance setting. This was in part

due to the education provider utilising these placements for their existing HCPC approved DipHE paramedic programme, and were therefore able to demonstrate how relationships worked with placements in this setting. The visitors noted that non-ambulance placements account for a significant amount of placement experience in year 3 of the programme, and some in year 2. The visitors also noted that the detail of how placements at non-ambulance settings will work had not been finalised by the education provider, as the placements will not be required until students are on the second year of the programme. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in non-ambulance placement settings, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that placement educators in non-ambulance settings will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were clear how the education provider ensures that placement educators in ambulance settings will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. This was in part due to the education provider utilising these placements for their existing HCPC approved DipHE paramedic programme, and were therefore able to demonstrate how relationships worked with placements in this setting. The visitors noted that non-ambulance placements account for a significant amount of placement experience in year 3 of the programme, and some in year 2. The visitors also noted that the detail of how placements at non-ambulance settings will work had not been finalised by the education provider, as the placements will not be required until students are on the second year of the programme. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure that placement educators in non-ambulance settings will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that placement educators in non-ambulance settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were clear how the education provider ensures that placement educators in ambulance settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. This was in part due to the education provider utilising these placements for their existing HCPC approved DipHE paramedic programme, and were therefore able to demonstrate how relationships worked with placements in this setting. The visitors noted that non-ambulance placements account for a significant amount of placement experience in year 3 of the programme, and some in year 2. The visitors also noted that the detail of how placements at non-ambulance settings will work had not been finalised by the education provider, as the placements will not be required until students are on the second year of the programme. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure that placement educators in non-ambulance

settings undertake appropriate practice placement educator training, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that placement educators in non-ambulance settings are appropriately registered, or agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were clear how the education provider ensures that placement educators in the ambulance setting are appropriately registered. This was in part due to the education provider utilising these placements for their existing HCPC approved DipHE paramedic programme, and were therefore able to demonstrate how relationships worked with placements in this setting. The visitors noted that non-ambulance placements account for a significant amount of placement experience in year 3 of the programme, and some in year 2. The visitors also noted that the detail of how placements at non-ambulance settings will work had not been finalised by the education provider, as the placements will not be required until students are on the second year of the programme. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure that placement educators in non-ambulance settings are appropriately registered, or whether the education provider intends to agree other arrangements with the HCPC, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

### **5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:**

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that placement educators in non-ambulance settings are fully prepared for supporting paramedic students on placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation, and from discussions at the approval visit, the visitors were clear how the education provider ensures that placement educators in ambulance settings are fully prepared for supporting students on placement. This was in part due to the education provider utilising these placements for their existing HCPC approved DipHE paramedic programme, and were therefore able to demonstrate how relationships worked with placements in this setting. The visitors noted that non-ambulance placements account for a significant amount of placement experience in year 3 of the programme, and some in year 2. The visitors also noted that the detail of how placements at non-ambulance settings will work had not been finalised by the education provider, as the placements will not be required until students are on the second year of the programme. As such the visitors could not see how the education provider has processes in place to ensure placement educators in non-ambulance

settings are fully prepared for supporting paramedic students on placement, and require further evidence to demonstrate that this standard is met.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should proactively engage with the HCPC's monitoring processes should the student intake increase in the future, and / or if staff recruitment plans change.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied with the number of staff in place for the programme with the next two intakes of 30 students (September 2016 and September 2017). At the approval visit, the education provider stated that there may be an increase in student numbers (possibly to 45 per cohort) for the September 2018 intake onwards. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans in place to recruit further staff for the 2018 intake whether the cohort size increases or not. If these plans change and additional staff are not recruited, the visitors are not satisfied that the current staff numbers will be sufficient to support the delivery of an effective programme for 30 (or more) students in 2018. Therefore, the education provider should proactively engage with the HCPC prior to the 2018 cohort entering the programme, so we can be assured that the staffing remains appropriate for the programme.

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

**Recommendation:** The education provider should proactively engage with the HCPC's monitoring processes should the student intake increase in the future, and / or if there are changes to plans about future access to resources to support student learning.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied with the resources to support student learning in place for the programme with the next two intakes of 30 students (September 2016 and September 2017). At the approval visit, the education provider stated that there may be an increase in student numbers (possibly to 45 per cohort) for the September 2018 intake onwards. The visitors also noted that the education provider has plans in place to use their resources in the school differently for the 2018 intake whether the cohort size increases or not. If these plans change and students from other professional programmes still need to access the resources alongside students from this programme, the visitors are not satisfied that the current resources will be sufficient to support the delivery of an effective programme for 30 (or more) students in 2018. Therefore, the education provider should proactively engage with the HCPC prior to the 2018 cohort entering the programme, so we can be assured that the resources remain appropriate for the programme.

John Donaghy  
Anthony Hoswell  
Manoj Mistry