
Education and Training Committee (Panel) – 20 May 2016

Edge Hill University – Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice (Full time)

Executive summary

This programme was approved for a first intake in September 2009, and has since engaged with the monitoring processes to demonstrate that it continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). In May 2015, the education provider submitted a change notification form (appendix 2) to inform us that they intended to increase student numbers for the programme. The Executive decided that the most appropriate way to review these changes was via the approval process.

The resulting visit was arranged for 11-12 November 2015, and the visitors' report (including the proposed conditions) was sent to the education provider on 1 December 2016 (appendix 3). At this stage, the education provider was given the opportunity to provide observations to the Committee on the visitors' recommendations, but no observations were provided. The Committee considered the visitors' recommendations at its meeting of 15 January 2016 and agreed that the conditions in the visitors' report must be met before the on-going approval of the programme could be confirmed. The Committee's decision notice can be found [here](#) (page 4).

The education provider responded to the conditions on 10 February 2016, and the visitors considered that several of the conditions were not met with the evidence provided. The education provider was given a second opportunity to meet these conditions, and provided additional documentation on 21 March 2016.

The visitors are now satisfied that the conditions for SETs 2.7, 3.8, 3.14, 3.17, 4.1, 6.1 and 6.9 have been met. However, they are not satisfied that the conditions for SETs 2.6 and 5.2 have been met.

This feedback from the visitors (appendix 5) was provided to the education provider on 27 April 2016 and the education provider was given the opportunity to provide observations. Observations were provided on 5 May 2016 (appendix 6).

Decision

The Panel is asked to consider the visitors' feedback and observations from the education provider, in light of their decision of 15 January 2016.

Background information

The Panel is not being asked to consider the ongoing approval of this programme at the outset. This Panel is asked to initially focus on the conditions that they agreed must be met before on-going approval could be confirmed. The ongoing approval of the programme can be considered in due course.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Timeline of the programme’s interaction with the approval and monitoring processes

Appendix 2 – Change notification form (May 2015)

Appendix 3 – Visitors’ report (1 December 2015)

Appendix 4 – Additional documentation request form (8 March 2016)

Appendix 5 – Visitors’ feedback

Appendix 6 – Edge Hill University Response to Visitors Feedback

Date of paper

5 May 2016

Appendix 1 – Timeline of the programme’s interaction with the approval and monitoring processes

A timeline of the programme’s interaction with the approval and monitoring processes is given below:

September 2009	First approved intake of the programme, following HCPC approval.
2009–2015	The programme engaged with the monitoring processes to demonstrate this it continues to meet the standards of education and training (SETs). In this time, the Committee made several decisions that the programme continues to meet the SETs.
14 May 2015	Following an annual monitoring submission from the education provider, the Committee made the decision that the programme continues to meet the SETs. This is the most recent decision made by the Committee on the approval of the programme prior to the ongoing approval process.
May 2015	The education provider submitted a change notification form (appendix 2) to inform us that they intended to increase student numbers for the programme. The Executive decided that the most appropriate way to review these changes was via the approval process.
11-12 November 2015	Resulting approval visit undertaken.
1 December 2015	Visitors’ report (including the proposed conditions) sent to the education provider. The education provider was given the opportunity to provide observations to the Committee on the visitors’ recommendations, but no observations were provided.
15 January 2016	The Committee considered the visitors’ recommendations, and agreed that the conditions in the visitors’ report must be met before the on-going approval of the programme could be confirmed.
10 February 2016	The education provider responded to the conditions (response one of two).
8 March 2016	The visitors considered that several of the conditions were not met with the evidence provided, and requested a second conditions response from the education provider.
21 March 2016	The education provider responded to the conditions (response two of two).
21 April 2016	The visitors provided feedback that they are not satisfied that two of the conditions are met.

Major change notification form

To help you complete this form please refer to the accompanying guidance

A separate form must be completed for each HCPC approved programme

There are four sections of this form which need to be completed:

- Section 1 About your programme
- Section 2 Outline of change(s)
- Section 3 Your review of the change(s)
- Section 4 Confirmation
- Section 5 Office use only

Section 1 – About your programme	
Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Name of awarding/validating body (if different from education provider)	
Programme title	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full time <input type="checkbox"/> Part time <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please provide details)
Contact details for person responsible for submitting the change to the HCPC	
Name	Philip Crompton
Job title	Head of Paramedic Education
Telephone number	01695657159
Email address	Phil.crompton@edgehill.ac.uk

Section 2 – Outline of change(s)

Please indicate which areas of your programme you feel the change is likely to affect from the list below (delete as appropriate)

Programme resources
Practice placements

Please provide a detailed description of the change. In order to assess how the change will impact on our standards, it is useful if changes are put in the context of our standards. Please see our '**Major change – Supplementary information for education providers**' for guidance surrounding the standards and your change.

Health Education North West (HENW) commissioned student numbers are increasing in academic year 2015/2016. Commissioned student numbers for the two year Dip HE Paramedic Practice will increase from 20 to 30 for the September 2015 cohort. In addition, an extra cohort of 32 one year Technician to Paramedic conversion students will commence in June 2015.

The department has significantly increased staffing levels over the past four years to the current status of 7 WTE paramedic lecturing staff. Furthermore, we are currently working with The North West Ambulance Service Trust in appointing to a point five lecturer/practitioner post. Staff/student ratio is 1: 14. The department also has two honorary lecturers from NWAS. Furthermore, the programme utilises external specialist speakers and subject specialist lecturers from within the wider faculty and institution.

Timetables for the additional cohort of technician conversion students have been scheduled to ensure that they do not conflict with teaching and learning, and placement availability. Practice placements will not be affected by the additional numbers across both cohorts and will continue to be managed and quality assured as part of the HENW Learning and Development Agreement. Additional learning resources have been secured within the institution to maintain an excellent student experience.

The programme continues to deliver a high quality level of education for all students and at periodic review in 2013 was highlighted as a centre of excellence by the external panel members.

If the change detailed above relates to a programme leader or other key contact change please include their details in this section (If not please proceed to section 3)

Title		Postal address
First name		

Second name		
Job title		
Telephone no.		
Email address		

Section 3 – Your review of the change(s)

Is there an event already scheduled to assess the change to the programme or is there a periodic review meeting upcoming?

Yes No

If yes what are the intended dates and format for this event / meeting?

--

Is documentation available now to evidence the change to the programme?

Yes No

If no, when will evidence of the change and how the HCPC standards continue to be met become available?

--

Section 4 – Confirmation

I confirm that all information relating to the programme changes which have been submitted, and the information provided on these changes, is correct.

Name	Philip Crompton
Job title	Head of Paramedic Education
Date	18/05/15

Please return this form to: Education Department, The Health and Care Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU or majorchange@hcpc-uk.org

Section 5 – Office use only

Name of education officer

Abdur Razzaq

Which process is most appropriate to gather evidence on how the programme continues to meet the HCPC standards?

- Approval process**
- Annual monitoring process**
- Major change process**

Please provide a rationale for your recommendation including (if necessary) which standards of education and training appear to require more evidence.

The education provider has highlighted a change to the proposed student numbers for this programme. The practice placement partner has requested the education provider to increase the commissioned student numbers. The current number of students per cohort is 20 with one cohort per year. The education provider is proposing to increase this to 30 per cohort, one cohort per year, this change will come into effect for the 2015–16 academic year.

The education provider has also highlighted that there will be an extra cohort of 32 commencing in June 2015. The students enrol to this cohort will be employed technicians. The entry requirements for this cohort seems to be different to the existing entry requirements as students will be employed technicians at the partner organisation.

This will result in the maximum number of students entering the programme following both routes from 20 to 42 in 2015–16. This is a significant increase to the current student numbers in one academic year.

These changes may impact several standards of education and training (SETs) and will require visitor scrutiny to review the changes.

SET 2: Programme admissions

With the introduction of an extra cohort for employed technicians means that the admission criteria for these potential students will be different to those applicants applying through the already approved admission procedures. The visitors will need to assess the appropriateness of these criteria and how these will be communicated to potential students.

From the information provided in the notification form, it seems the education provider will APEL potential students to this programme and students will be enrolled on this programme as a conversion programme for technicians to become paramedics without studying for the entire duration (two years) of this programme. All these changes need to be assessed to ensure the programme continues to meet all the standards in SET 2.

SET 3: Programme management and resources

The education provider has mentioned that the total number of full time equivalent (FTE) staff has increased over the recent years and there are plans to appoint another 0.5 FTE. However, the increased number of students and cohort will require the education provider to ensure that the programme is effectively managed and that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Visitors will review these changes to ensure the education standards continue to be met following these changes.

The education provider is required to ensure that the resources available for students are adequate and effectively used for the number of students. Visitors will be required to review resources in place to ensure that the programme continues to meet education standards.

SET 5: Practice placements

The education provider has highlighted there will be no implication on placements following this increase in student numbers and cohort. However, the visitors will want to review the impact of these changes on practice placements in terms of the adequate number, range and duration of placements. Furthermore, the availability of adequate and appropriately qualified practice educators on placement. The safe and supportive environment of placements for students may also be impacted with this increased number of students. Visitors will be required to review the changes to make a decision regarding the provision of practice placements.

Due to the nature of the changes and the fact that the changes impact on education standards in several broad areas, the most appropriate method to review this change is the approval process.

BP Agreed – 03/06/2015

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	11 – 12 November 2015

Contents

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

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 29 December 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 15 January 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 February 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 15 March 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Ian Prince (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
HCPC observer	Aveen Croash
Proposed student numbers	35 year one entry per cohort, one cohort per year 35 year two entry per cohort, two cohorts per year
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2015
Chair	Mairi Byrne (Edge Hill University)
Secretary	Elaine McIntosh (Edge Hill University)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	<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"/>

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"/>

Recommended outcome

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

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

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

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

The visitors have also made a recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it continues to ensure the quality of the assessment and learning outcomes for the programme delivered by North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) through the AP(E)L process.

Reason: From the documentation provided, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were clear that there are two entry routes to the programme, direct entry and entry via the AP(E)L process in year two, with applicants being employed by NWAS. Applicants via the AP(E)L route will be exempt from completing year one of the programme due to their prior learning and experience with NWAS. The documentation submitted prior to the visit detailed the AP(E)L policy for the programme and for the institution. The visitors also noted that the programme has ten modules, delivered over a two year period.

The visitors were provided with a document which benchmarked the first year modules against the IHCD ambulance technician award programme delivered at NWAS. The visitors considered the benchmark exercise however, from this document, they were unable to determine how the learning outcomes of the IHCD ambulance technician award programme delivers all the learning outcomes of year one of this programme. During the programme team meeting the visitors learnt that potential applicants employed by NWAS will be assessed on an individual basis for entry onto the programme via the AP(E)L policy. The visitors were unable to see how applicants' prior learning would be mapped against the necessary learning outcomes to exempt them from completing year one of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further information to demonstrate how they continue to ensure the quality of decisions made through its AP(E)L process.

2.7 The admissions procedures must ensure that the education provider has equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how equality and diversity policies are implemented and monitored through the admissions procedures.

Reason: The mapping document for the Standards of Education and Training (SETs) made reference to documents in relation to this standard. The visitors noted the equality and diversity policy is in place at the education provider. During the visit and from discussions with the programme team, the visitors were satisfied that there was an equality and diversity policy in place in relation to applicants and students, but were not clear how it is implemented and monitored. The visitors therefore require further evidence of the equality and diversity policies in place, together with an indication of how they are implemented and monitored in order to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

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

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

Reason: There were discrepancies in the programme documentation submitted by the education provider. For example, the programme specification on page 2 states “Approved by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) for the purpose of eligibility for entry to the HCPC register as a paramedic”. Similarly, the placement handbook on page 11 states “Your programme has been designed in order that you accrue at least the minimum number of hours stipulated by the HCPC to enable you to register as a qualified paramedic at the end of your programme”. With reference to these examples respectively; completing an approved programme does not give automatic eligibility for entry to the Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice Register however those who successfully complete an HCPC approved programme will be eligible to apply for registration with HCPC. Also, the HCPC does not prescribe minimum hours for placements, we require education providers to have appropriate range, number and duration of practice placements. The visitors noted several other instances of inaccurate information and instances which are not reflective of the current terminology used in relation statutory regulation and the HCPC. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology. In this way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students’ learning are being effectively used and that this standard continues to be met.

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

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

Reason: From the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a consent form as evidence to determine how this standard continues to be met. However, the visitors could not find Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practiced information about the option for students to opt out of participation. During the visit and discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are appropriate protocols in place to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users. During the programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that the programme team will update the existing protocols including their consent form to ensure students have the option not to participate, this includes confidentiality and managing situations when students decline from participating as service users. The visitors therefore require the programme team to provide updated evidence of the protocols for obtaining informed consent from students and for managing situations where students decline from participating in practical and clinical teaching.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reason: At the visit practice educators stated that although students on the programme through the AP(E)L route will be employees of North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) and they will be treated as students for the duration of their time on this programme. The programme team and practice educators indicated that direct entry students will be supernumerary for the duration of their time whilst on ambulance placements however, students enrolled through the AP(E)L route would not be guaranteed any supernumerary hours whilst on ambulance placements. Whilst the

HCPC does stipulate that students must achieve supernumerary hours during their placement, the visitors were unable to see where AP(E)L route students' time would be protected on placement to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors were unsure how students on direct and AP(E)L route will have parity in their ambulance placements. Furthermore, the visitors could not see how an AP(E)L route student would be prioritised as a student rather than an employee of NWS in emergency situations where they might be required to drive an ambulance or perform other such duties. The visitors noted that whilst the priority is that AP(E)L route students will be expected to perform employer based duties in emergency situations they cannot be sure that these students will gain access to a wide range of learning experiences to support the achievement of learning outcomes and parity in ambulance placements. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate how current placement arrangements appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes, or, that the current arrangements are adjusted to appropriately support the delivery and achievement of the learning outcomes and ambulance placements provide parity in placements for all students.

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

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

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. The visitors were satisfied that the combined learning outcomes contained within all of the modules at level 4 and level 5 enable students to meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, considering the condition set for SET 2.6, the visitors could not determine the criteria or process used to assess whether students entering via the AP(E)L route should be exempt from undertaking particular modules and / or learning outcomes. Therefore, they could not determine how the education provider can be satisfied that these students will meet all of the learning outcomes, and therefore SOPs, on completing the programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence to show how students who are exempt from undertaking particular learning at the education provider, such as those who have entered via the AP(E)L route, are assessed as able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on successful completion the programme. This condition is linked to the condition for SET 2.6 and SET 4.1.

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

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the programme documentation clearly articulates that any aegrotat award given will not provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not identify where it is clearly stated that aegrotat awards do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. The visitors were also unclear as to how this information is clearly communicated to students. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that, should

awards be given, they do not provide eligibility to apply to the Register. This way the visitors can be satisfied that this information is available to students and that this standard continues to be met.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: The education provider should inform HCPC once they have moved to the new campus through the HCPC major change process.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the on-site facilities at the Manchester campus were effectively supporting students through the programme. As such they were content that this standard has been met. However, the visitors were informed at the visit that the education provider intends to move to new building in the near future. The visitors were presented with brief information on where the programme will be relocating to, but were not provided with any information on the resources that will be available at the new location. The visitors want to remind the education provider that they would need to notify HCPC through the major change process once they move to the new location as this may affect how the programme continues to meet this standard.

Glyn Harding
Mark Navins
Ian Prince

Additional documentation request form

Education provider: Edge Hill University

Programme name: Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice

Mode of delivery: Full time

Dates of visit: 11-12 November 2015

Visitors have reviewed the additional documentation submitted by the education provider following the visit to the programme outlined above. The visitors have recommended that the following standards of education and training (SETs) are not met at this time. A reason has been included explaining why they consider several conditions have not been met and gives an indication of the type of evidence that should be submitted to demonstrate how the conditions could be met.

AP(E)L policy

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it continues to ensure the quality of the assessment and learning outcomes for the programme delivered by North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) through the AP(E)L process.

Reason: To evidence how this condition is met, the education provider provided additional documentation relating to the NWAS training course, and the post training length of service required at NWAS before they could enter the programme. The visitors considered this documentation, but were still unclear how the education provider ensures the quality of the training and assessment that students undergo at NWAS. The visitors are therefore unclear how the education provider ensures that applicants who have completed training at NWAS have the experience or learning equivalent to all level 4 elements of the programme and are eligible to enter the programme at level 5. The visitors are also currently not satisfied, from the evidence provided, that the education provider has oversight of the assessment procedures at NWAS, or can satisfy itself that the assessments undertaken are consistent and of the required quality to exempt students from such a significant amount of the programme.

Suggested documentation: Further evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures the quality of the training and assessment of the IHCD technician course delivered by NWAS.

Students meeting the standards of proficiency for paramedics

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

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

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

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

Reason: To evidence how these conditions are met, the education provider provided an updated mapping document of the IHCD training course delivered by NWAS to the learning outcomes from the first year of the programme (at level 4). This document now contains the “standards met through experiential learning and those achieved through completion of a Professional Portfolio of Development.” In considering this evidence, the visitors were not satisfied that the education provider has demonstrated how all of the learning outcomes delivered at level 4 of the programme are covered by applicants entering the programme at level 5. Particularly, the visitors are unclear how the education provider ensures the learning outcomes covered by experiential learning and the Portfolio of Evidence, which appear to ‘top up’ the more formal learning delivered through the IHCD programme, are adequately assessed through the AP(E)L process. The visitors were unclear who makes the judgement that students meet these learning outcomes (NWAS or the education provider), and how the education provider ensures the quality of these assessments. Therefore, with the information provided, the visitors cannot be satisfied that all students will meet the SOPs for paramedics through the programme.

Suggested documentation: Evidence that demonstrates how the education provider ensures that each student entering the programme at level 5 has met the required learning at level 4.

Duration of practice placements

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

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

Reason: To evidence how this condition is met, the education provider provided amendments to documentation provided as part of the approval process. Specifically the Programme Handbook has been amended to state that “All students across the programme will complete a minimum of 120 supernumerary hours per year within the ambulance HUB placement” and “Across the programme, all students will complete 6 weeks per year under supervision in a range of health and social care settings” (page 19). The education provider also made amendments to the Submission Document, but the visitors were not satisfied that this constitutes as evidence of how the programme will run if it is approved, as it was a document specifically produced for this approval assessment.

At the visit, the visitors understood that direct entry students will be supernumerary for the duration of their time whilst at ambulance placements (750 hours). However, the amended documentation suggests that all students will undertake 120 supernumerary hours. If there is a difference in the required number of supernumerary hours for students on different routes through the programme, the visitors are unclear of the rationale for this difference. The visitors are also unclear of the rationale for setting the requirement at 120 supernumerary hours at the HUB placement. In particular they are not clear about why the programme team have determined that this number of supernumerary hours is appropriate to ensure a wide range of learning experiences to support the delivery of the programme and students’ achievement of the required learning outcomes.

Suggested documentation: Confirmation of the required number of supernumerary hours for students on both routes through the programme, and a rationale of how the number(s) of required supernumerary hours are appropriate to ensure that all students gain access to a wide range of learning experiences in the placement environment, which support achievement of the learning outcomes.

Visitors' feedback

Name of education provider	Edge Hill University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	11 – 12 November 2015

The visitors have considered the education providers' two responses to the conditions, and are now satisfied that the conditions for SETs 2.7, 3.8, 3.14, 3.17, 4.1, 6.1 and 6.9 have been met. However, they are not satisfied that the conditions for SETs 2.6 and 5.2 have been met. Their feedback is provided below:

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it continues to ensure the quality of the assessment and learning outcomes for the programme delivered by North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (Nwas) through the AP(E)L process.

Visitors' feedback: The visitors reviewed the further documentation submitted by the education provider, including the application process for IHCD technicians, and a statement explaining the education provider's recognition or prior (experiential) learning (RP(E)L) process and how it is applied to this programme. However, the visitors were not satisfied that this condition has been met after reviewing this evidence and commented that:

“Without the EP (education provider) evidencing how the credit values are measured and rated; we are not satisfied the threshold level has been met.”

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

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

Visitors' feedback: The visitors reviewed the further documentation submitted by the education provider, including a rationale for the number of supernumerary hours set for IHCD technicians entering at year two of the programme. However, the visitors were not

satisfied that this condition has been met after reviewing this evidence and commented that:

“The EP (education provider) states there will be 120 hours supernumerary for IHCD Technicians, this indicates that they believe this is adequate when related to the full time course (750 hours), the EP has not provided adequate evidence that this reduced timescale can deliver the practical outcomes required for a student to progress from the Technician standard of competency to a Paramedic standard of competency.

We are not satisfied that a HCID Technician can progress to Paramedic standards of competency with just 16% of the supernumerary hours allotted to the full time students. In arriving at this conclusion we have accounted for the standard of competency the HCID Technicians have already attained within their role, and the concerns expressed by the Technician students in our discussions with them during the visit about the amount of supernumerary hours allocated to them. We are not satisfied the threshold level has been met.”

Appendix 6 – Edge Hill University Response to Visitors Feedback

**HCCP Visitors' Feedback, following 2nd conditions response
DipHE Paramedic Practice – Visit: 11/12 November 2015**

Edge Hill University Observations

Please see EHU's observations to the, as yet, still unresolved conditions. The main concern in this extremely difficult situation remains explicitly focussed upon that of our students, both existing as well as those due to enrol. To have our students under threat of not being able to progress runs counter to our whole ethos, and we continue to seek resolution via assuring the committee of the fair, equitable and transparent processes of recruitment and support provided.

The two conditions that remain outstanding centre upon two areas which are not stipulated within the HCCP standards - credit values and the requirement for parity of student experience of specific supernumerary hours. Despite this we endeavoured to satisfy the visitors of our RP(E)L criteria through mapping, and have increased the supernumerary hours in our programme, over and above that which the HCCP had already previously approved.

Finally, we wish to further clarify previous misconceptions of the Education Officers and positively affirm that the IHCD entry was approved by HCCP at our initial approval in 2009, and each subsequent re-approval since, as appropriate, which has not changed. The approval request in 2015 related solely to additional student numbers.

Please see additional specific observations below.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to demonstrate how it continues to ensure the quality of the assessment and learning outcomes for the programme delivered by North West Ambulance Service NHS Trust (NWAS) through the AP(E)L process.

Visitors' feedback: The visitors reviewed the further documentation submitted by the education provider, including the application process for IHCD technicians, and a statement explaining the education provider's recognition or prior (experiential) learning (RP(E)L) process and how it is applied to this programme. However, the visitors were not satisfied that this condition has been met after reviewing this evidence and commented that:

“Without the EP (education provider) evidencing how the credit values are measured and rated; we are not satisfied the threshold level has been met.”

Observation

The IHCD technician programme accounts for approximately 60 of the 120 Level 4 credits, with the remaining 60 arising from the experiential aspect of the applicants' learning via a combination of portfolio and interview assessment.

At pre-entry interview, there is an expectation that candidates will be cognisant of the focus of the Level 4 Programme Learning outcomes and be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding at this level. Although we do not specify a set volume for the experiential learning to marry with the 120 credits all such applicants must have a minimum of two years' experience and, indeed, the majority

of our applicants entering directly to year two of the programme have well in excess of this carrying an average of five years' experience, with many having in excess of ten plus years.

The initial IHCD technician mapping has been updated to include standards achieved via the professional portfolio. The professional portfolio criteria is assessed against the LOs of year one (level 4) and encompasses the ability to research and reference through literature search, reflection on practice, evidence of current CPD activity, evidence of clinical supervision training and assessment, personal development and action plans, evidence of mandatory and core skills and feedback from the NWS clinical education team. In addition, up to date references from their Advanced Paramedic must be included.

From this, we remain confident that all successful applicants demonstrate achievement of the required RP(E)L mapping. Set 2.6 exemplifies the overriding perspective of EHU, having been satisfied of an experiential match to Level 4 programme learning outcomes, that we do not set any applicant up for failure. Indeed, we work hard to, *"... make sure that students who are eligible for AP(E)L or another inclusion mechanism are able to meet the standards of proficiency for their profession when they successfully complete the programme."*

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

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

Visitors' feedback: The visitors reviewed the further documentation submitted by the education provider, including a rationale for the number of supernumerary hours set for IHCD technicians entering at year two of the programme. However, the visitors were not satisfied that this condition has been met after reviewing this evidence and commented that:

"The EP (education provider) states there will be 120 hours supernumerary for IHCD Technicians, this indicates that they believe this is adequate when related to the full time course (750 hours), the EP has not provided adequate evidence that this reduced timescale can deliver the practical outcomes required for a student to progress from the Technician standard of competency to a Paramedic standard of competency.

We are not satisfied that a HCID Technician can progress to Paramedic standards of competency with just 16% of the supernumerary hours allotted to the full time students. In arriving at this conclusion we have accounted for the standard of competency the HCID Technicians have already attained within their role, and the concerns expressed by the Technician students in our discussions with them during the visit about the amount of supernumerary hours allocated to them. We are not satisfied the threshold level has been met."

Observation

Please be advised the visitors have made a fundamental error in their understanding of the supernumerary hours for our conversion students, in saying they receive only 16% of the overall hours. The 16% referred to reflect the hub placement hours, ignoring the spoke placements in hospital and the wider health and social care areas. The total supernumerary hours are in fact 49.3%, a total of 370 hours minimum, of placements when both the hub and spoke placements are taken into consideration. Students' practice experience is based around the pragmatic reality of the real life work setting and the knowledge that whilst students, they are also employees with significant work

based experience, and also in full cognisance that even though in 'employee' roles students continue to learn.

Notwithstanding, in relation to whether the number, duration and range of practice placement are appropriate to support attainment of the threshold standards required of the programme inevitably is affirmed when reviewing pass rates and classifications of previous students. The extremely high pass rate with the high percentage of distinction grades, and external examiner feedback which fully endorses the high quality of this programme, has previously been submitted.

The mixed entry behaviour of both types of students is best reflected via an andragogical rather than pedagogical approach, (notwithstanding they purport the same perspective), as it more appropriately acknowledges the wealth of life, work and knowledge skills and experience such students bring. The approach of maximising the strengths of both types of students ensures a rich tableau of, and for, learning. The pace of learning is inevitably varied, and the team rightly focus upon student support, irrespective of type of student, albeit in recognition of their different learning needs.

The HCPC have already confirmed that we have met the following SETs:-;

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.'

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.'

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

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

All of these state that students must have met the SOPs which are mapped against the learning outcomes. This would appear to contradict the claim that the supernumerary hours prohibit attainment of the learning outcomes when they have already approved these SETs.

In conclusion, the team dispute the standpoint of the visitors. We firmly believe, we have met all the conditions and justified our position against, crucially, the HCPC standards as well as via an educational perspective. And at risk of repetition, for aspects of programme delivery and management we have had on-going approval since 2009.

The Dip HE Paramedic Practice Programme delivered at EHU has for the past six years' had 100% graduate employment, 97% retention and a high first time pass rate on all modules. In addition, the vast majority of graduates pass with distinction or merit grades. The team are highly experienced in the delivery of the EMT2 conversion programme and this was highlighted by the HCPC Education Officer at the re-approval event in November 2015. Although the HCPC Education Officer stated that commendations are not part of the process, he did acknowledge the excellent level of student support that was in place and that the students were really complimentary about the teaching team. As a positive measure of this, the team are rightly proud of their record which has been top of NSS (National Student Survey) for the past 3 years.

Seth Crofts
Pro-Vice Chancellor and Dean
Faculty of Health & Social Care
4.5.16