

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Forensic psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	6 – 7 September 2016

## 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 'practitioner psychologist' or 'forensic psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 October 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 24 November 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 31 October 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 24 November 2016.

## 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 management and resources and practice placements. 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 programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme, the Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology. A separate visitors' report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist) Anthony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	four per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2017
First approved intake	September 2014
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2017
Chair	Denise Parish (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Jack Morris (Cardiff Metropolitan 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit.

## 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining one SET.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme specification for the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology (Document 3). The document stated that at completion of the 120 level 7 credits, the student would achieve the PG Dip in Forensic Psychology and could progress onto the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology at level 8, exit the programme and be eligible for HCPC registration. The visitors also reviewed the programme specification for the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology, which clearly states on page no two that an applicant must have an MSc in Forensic Psychology before starting the level 8 taught programme. During the visit programme team stated that any student progressing from level 7 to level 8 taught aspect of the programme would have to complete 180 credits at level 7, which includes the 60 credit dissertation module. However the visitors noted that this is not reflected in document 3, which states that the student would only need to achieve 120 credits at level 7 to progress onto level 8. It was later clarified that university requirements allow a student to carry a maximum of 120 credits from level 7 as they exit at level 8, as such the extra 60 credits are an addition and do not count towards the final award at level 8. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the requirements for a student to achieve and progress on this programme is clearly specified in relevant programme documentation. In particular the visitors require further evidence as to how the requirements for a student to progress from level 7 to level 8 of the programme, includes the requirement for the completion of the 60 credit dissertation module. With this information the visitors will be able to determine whether the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme are clearly specified.

George Delafield  
Anthony Ward

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Forensic psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	6 – 7 September 2016

## 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 'practitioner psychologist' or 'forensic psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 October 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 24 November 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 31 October 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 24 November 2016.

## 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 management and resources and practice placements. 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 programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme, the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology. A separate visitors' report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist) Anthony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	25 per cohort, three cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 January 2017 or 1 April 2017 or 1 September 2017
First approved intake	September 2011
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	January 2017
Chair	Denise Parish (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Jack Morris (Cardiff Metropolitan 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit.

## 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining one SET.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme specification for the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology (Document 3). The document stated that at completion of the 120 level 7 credits, the student would achieve the PG Dip in Forensic Psychology and could progress onto the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology at level 8, exit the programme and be eligible for HCPC registration. The visitors also reviewed the programme specification for the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology, which clearly states on page no two that an applicant must have an MSc in Forensic Psychology before starting the level 8 taught programme. During the visit programme team stated that any student progressing from level 7 to level 8 taught aspect of the programme would have to complete 180 credits at level 7, which includes the 60 credit dissertation module. However the visitors noted that this is not reflected in document 3, which states that the student would only need to achieve 120 credits at level 7 to progress onto level 8. It was later clarified that university requirements allow a student to carry a maximum of 120 credits from level 7 as they exit at level 8, as such the extra 60 credits are an addition and do not count towards the final award at level 8. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the requirements for a student to achieve and progress on this programme is clearly specified in relevant programme documentation. In particular the visitors require further evidence as to how the requirements for a student to progress from level 7 to level 8 of the programme, includes the requirement for the completion of the 60 credit dissertation module. With this information the visitors will be able to determine whether the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme are clearly specified.

George Delafield  
Anthony Ward

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Cardiff Metropolitan University
<b>Programme name</b>	Post Graduate Diploma in Practitioner Forensic Psychology
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Part time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Practitioner psychologist
<b>Relevant modality / domain</b>	Forensic psychologist
<b>Date of visit</b>	6 – 7 September 2016

## 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 'practitioner psychologist' or 'forensic psychologist' must be registered with us. The HCPC keep a register of health and care professionals who meet our standards for their training, professional skills, behaviour and health.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 14 October 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 24 November 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 31 October 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 24 November 2016.

## 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 management and resources and practice placements. 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 programmes at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programmes. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit. The visit also considered a different programme, the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology. A separate visitors' report exists for this programme.

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	George Delafield (Forensic psychologist) Anthony Ward (Counselling psychologist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	two per cohort, three cohorts per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 January 2017 or 1 April 2017 or 1 September 2017
First approved intake	September 2011
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	January 2017
Chair	Denise Parish (Cardiff Metropolitan University)
Secretary	Jack Morris (Cardiff Metropolitan 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 did not meet with the service users and carers as they were unable to attend the visit.

## 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 condition is set on the programme, which must be met before the programme can be approved.

The visitors agreed that 57 of the SETs have been met and that a condition should be set on the remaining one SET.

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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can 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

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors reviewed the programme specification for the Doctorate in Forensic Psychology (Document 3). The document stated that at completion of the 120 level 7 credits, the student would achieve the PG Dip in Forensic Psychology and could progress onto the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology at level 8, exit the programme and be eligible for HCPC registration. The visitors also reviewed the programme specification for the PG Dip in Practitioner Forensic Psychology, which clearly states on page no two that an applicant must have an MSc in Forensic Psychology before starting the level 8 taught programme. During the visit programme team stated that any student progressing from level 7 to level 8 taught aspect of the programme would have to complete 180 credits at level 7, which includes the 60 credit dissertation module. However the visitors noted that this is not reflected in document 3, which states that the student would only need to achieve 120 credits at level 7 to progress onto level 8. It was later clarified that university requirements allow a student to carry a maximum of 120 credits from level 7 as they exit at level 8, as such the extra 60 credits are an addition and do not count towards the final award at level 8. As such the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the requirements for a student to achieve and progress on this programme is clearly specified in relevant programme documentation. In particular the visitors require further evidence as to how the requirements for a student to progress from level 7 to level 8 of the programme, includes the requirement for the completion of the 60 credit dissertation module. With this information the visitors will be able to determine whether the requirements for student progression and achievement throughout the programme are clearly specified.

George Delafield  
Anthony Ward

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Gloucestershire
<b>Programme name</b>	Postgraduate Diploma Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time accelerated
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	22 – 23 September 2016

## Contents

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

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 7 November 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 24 November 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 November 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 8 December 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	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2017
Chair	Nadine Sulkowski (University of Gloucestershire)
Secretary	Yvonne Metcalfe (University of Gloucestershire)

## 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 the programme is new and has not yet run, so external examiner reports are not available.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the pre-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how applicants are given the information they require about the English language entry requirements in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation reviewed prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the requirement for students for whom English is not their first language is an international English language testing system (IELTS) score of 7. However, the visitors also noted that the website and the prospectus stated that an IELTS score of 6.5 is the requirement. At the visit, the programme team clarified that they require an IELTS score of 7 for applicants for whom English is not their first language. However, the visitors noted that inconsistencies in the documentation may be misleading for prospective applicants. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the information available to applicants, including English language requirements for applicants who do not have English as their first language, so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how potential applicants are given the information they require about the criminal convictions checks process, including any associated costs, in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the document 'Procedures for the Review of Applicants with Declared Criminal Convictions' prior to the visit, the visitors noted that all applicants are required to undertake a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and that the cost would be covered by the applicant. However, the visitors noted that this document is not available to prospective applicants. Therefore, the visitors noted that potential applicants would not be aware of the requirement to undertake a DBS check and the requirement for applicants to cover the cost of this check. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that applicants have the information they require about the DBS process and associated costs for the applicant in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require about the academic entry requirements in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the prospectus and website, that the education provider would consider applicants with a '2.1 honours degree or equivalent in a related subject' or 'a relevant level 6 qualification'. However, it was not clear from the documentation or at the visit which relevant degrees or level 6 qualifications would be accepted as appropriate academic criteria for entry to the programme. Without clarification about the accepted entry requirements, the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require about academic requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the academic entry requirements are clearly communicated to both the applicant and the education provider so that they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic entry standards.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the prospectus and website, that the education provider would consider applicants with a '2.1 honours degree or equivalent in a related subject' or 'a relevant level 6 qualification'. However, it was not clear from the documentation or at the visit which relevant degrees or qualifications would be accepted. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the admissions procedures were applying appropriate academic selection and entry criteria and whether this criteria would be applied consistently. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to clarify the academic entry criteria and how it is appropriate for this 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 clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students from elements of learning and / or assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation it was clear that APEL was not permitted on this programme. At the visit, the programme team initially confirmed that APEL would not be permitted. However, after further discussions, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how the AP(E)L scheme would be used to appropriately exempt students from elements of learning and assessment. Therefore, the education provider must clarify whether AP(E)L will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, how the AP(E)L process will be applied to effectively exempt students from elements of teaching and assessment.

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation prior to the visit that there are currently up to 60 students per cohort per year on the approved BSc (Hons) Social Work programme and that the education provider proposes to recruit up to 40 students per cohort per year for this programme. From a review of the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that there are currently five full time equivalent (FTE) members of staff in place to teach on this programme who also teach on the undergraduate programme. The visitors noted that an additional 1.2 FTE members of staff will be recruited and that there will be visiting lecturers to teach on the programme. The visitors also learnt that visiting lecturers would always be accompanied by the relevant module tutor at lectures. However, the visitors could not determine from discussions at the visit how the current number of teaching staff is sufficient to deliver this programme effectively in conjunction with the current undergraduate programme, particularly as module tutors still have to be present for visiting lecturers' sessions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

**Reason:** From a review of the staff profiles, the visitors were satisfied with the specialist expertise and knowledge of the staff in place on the programme. However, the visitors noted from page 27 of the course handbook that the programme leader is the module tutor for five of the eight modules. In the module descriptors, the programme leader is listed as the module tutor for all modules and in the overview document, the programme leader is listed as the module tutor for three of the modules. At the visit, the programme team clarified that the programme leader would not be the module tutor for all modules or five modules. However, it was not confirmed who would be the tutor for these modules and the documentation currently lists different information about module tutors. As such, the visitors were not clear about who would be the module tutor for each module and so they could not determine that all subject areas would be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In addition, as the visitors were unable to determine whether there will be an adequate number of staff on the programme, the visitors could not determine how the delivery of the subject areas would be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

### **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.**

**Reason:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have the mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance.

**Condition:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that all taught sessions are compulsory and that there is an 80 per cent attendance requirement for this programme. However it was not clear from the documentation, or in discussions at the visit, how attendance will be monitored. In addition, the visitors were unclear about any consequences of missed compulsory sessions, including the consequences for students whose attendance falls below the requirement of 80 per cent. As such, the visitors could not be certain that follow-up action would be taken for missed attendance and that students would gain the required knowledge from missed teaching before they complete the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how attendance is monitored, any consequences of missed compulsory teaching and how this information is clearly communicated to students.

### **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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that, if there is an AP(E)L route for this programme, students are able to meet the SOPs for social workers in England on completion of the programme if they enter the programme via the AP(E)L route.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that AP(E)L is not permitted on this programme. However, at the visit, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where the learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme will achieve all of the learning outcomes and successfully meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate, if there is an AP(E)L route, how the AP(E)L policy ensures that students will achieve the learning outcomes for exempted modules so that they are able to meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure would work in practice and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the

visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that they have a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works in practice. In addition, at the visit, the visitors learnt that the education provider delegates the approval of placements to the placement coordinator at one of the placement providers in attendance at the visit, Hereford County Council. The visitors were also unclear about how this delegation works and whether this responsibility is delegated to the placement coordinators at all placement providers. Furthermore, the visitors could not determine how the education provider's policy ensures that this delegation process is thorough and effective for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the approval and monitoring process for all placements and how the education provider ensures that, when the approval of placements is delegated to a placement coordinator at a placement provider, this is carried out effectively and thoroughly.

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

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that the placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that the practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that the placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be 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 that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. As such, the visitors require further evidence that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As such, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to

determine how this process ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment of learning outcomes ensures that students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme are able to demonstrate that they have met the SOPs for social workers in England if an AP(E)L route is permitted on this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that AP(E)L is not permitted on this programme. However, at the visit, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where the learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how assessment of students will ensure that students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme will achieve all of the learning outcomes and successfully meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how, if there is an AP(E)L route, how the AP(E)L policy ensures that students will achieve the learning outcomes for exempted modules so that they are able to demonstrate that they have met the SOPs for social workers in England.

**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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors did not see any reference to an aegrotat award in the assessment regulations for this programme. In discussions at the visit, it was unclear whether an aegrotat award would be given for this programme. As such it was not clearly specified that, if an aegrotat is awarded, that this does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which clarifies whether aegrotat awards are given for this programme and, where they are given, that it is clearly communicated to students and staff that students who are awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Robert Goemans  
Sheila Skelton  
Mohammed Jeewa

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	University of Gloucestershire
<b>Programme name</b>	Masters Social Work
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time accelerated
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Social worker in England
<b>Date of visit</b>	22 – 23 September 2016

## Contents

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

## Executive summary

The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) approve educational programmes in the UK which health and care professionals must complete before they can apply to be registered with us. We are a statutory regulator and our main aim is to protect the public. We currently regulate 16 professions. All of these professions have at least one professional title which is protected by law. This means that anyone using the title '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 7 November 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 24 November 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 November 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 8 December 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	Robert Goemans (Social worker in England) Sheila Skelton (Social worker in England) Mohammed Jeewa (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	40 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2017
Chair	Nadine Sulkowski (University of Gloucestershire)
Secretary	Yvonne Metcalfe (University of Gloucestershire)

## 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 the programme is new and has not yet run, so external examiner reports are not available.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

The HCPC did not see the specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the pre-registration qualification does not require any specialist laboratories or teaching rooms.

## Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 43 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

## 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 provide further evidence to demonstrate how applicants are given the information they require about the English language entry requirements in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

**Reason:** In the documentation reviewed prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the requirement for students for whom English is not their first language is an international English language testing system (IELTS) score of 7. However, the visitors also noted that the website and the prospectus stated that an IELTS score of 6.5 is the requirement. At the visit, the programme team clarified that they require an IELTS score of 7 for applicants for whom English is not their first language. However, the visitors noted that inconsistencies in the documentation may be misleading for prospective applicants. As such, the visitors require further evidence about the information available to applicants, including English language requirements for applicants who do not have English as their first language, so that applicants can make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how potential applicants are given the information they require about the criminal convictions checks process, including any associated costs, in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on a programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the document 'Procedures for the Review of Applicants with Declared Criminal Convictions' prior to the visit, the visitors noted that all applicants are required to undertake a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and that the cost would be covered by the applicant. However, the visitors noted that this document is not available to prospective applicants. Therefore, the visitors noted that potential applicants would not be aware of the requirement to undertake a DBS check and the requirement for applicants to cover the cost of this check. As such, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates that applicants have the information they require about the DBS process and associated costs for the applicant in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures give both the applicant and the education provider the

information they require about the academic entry requirements in order to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the prospectus and website, that the education provider would consider applicants with a '2.1 honours degree or equivalent in a related subject' or 'a relevant level 6 qualification'. However, it was not clear from the documentation or at the visit which relevant degrees or level 6 qualifications would be accepted as appropriate academic criteria for entry to the programme. Without clarification about the accepted entry requirements, the visitors could not determine how the admissions procedures give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require about academic requirements. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the academic entry requirements are clearly communicated to both the applicant and the education provider so that they are able to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the admissions procedures apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic entry standards.

**Reason:** The visitors noted from the prospectus and website, that the education provider would consider applicants with a '2.1 honours degree or equivalent in a related subject' or 'a relevant level 6 qualification'. However, it was not clear from the documentation or at the visit which relevant degrees or qualifications would be accepted. As such, the visitors could not determine whether the admissions procedures were applying appropriate academic selection and entry criteria and whether this criteria would be applied consistently. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to clarify the academic entry criteria and how it is appropriate for this 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 clarify whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, that it is appropriate to exempt students from elements of learning and / or assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation it was clear that APEL was not permitted on this programme. At the visit, the programme team initially confirmed that APEL would not be permitted. However, after further discussions, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how the AP(E)L scheme would be used to appropriately exempt students from elements of learning and assessment. Therefore, the education provider must clarify whether AP(E)L will be permitted on this programme and, if it is, how the AP(E)L process will be applied to effectively exempt students from elements of teaching and assessment.

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

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

**Reason:** The visitors noted in the documentation prior to the visit that there are currently up to 60 students per cohort per year on the approved BSc (Hons) Social Work programme and that the education provider proposes to recruit up to 40 students per cohort per year for this programme. From a review of the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that there are currently five full time equivalent (FTE) members of staff in place to teach on this programme who also teach on the undergraduate programme. The visitors noted that an additional 1.2 FTE members of staff will be recruited and that there will be visiting lecturers to teach on the programme. The visitors also learnt that visiting lecturers would always be accompanied by the relevant module tutor at lectures. However, the visitors could not determine from discussions at the visit how the current number of teaching staff is sufficient to deliver this programme effectively in conjunction with the current undergraduate programme, particularly as module tutors still have to be present for visiting lecturers' sessions. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

**Reason:** From a review of the staff profiles, the visitors were satisfied with the specialist expertise and knowledge of the staff in place on the programme. However, the visitors noted from page 27 of the course handbook that the programme leader is the module tutor for five of the eight modules. In the module descriptors, the programme leader is listed as the module tutor for all modules and in the overview document, the programme leader is listed as the module tutor for three of the modules. At the visit, the programme team clarified that the programme leader would not be the module tutor for all modules or five modules. However, it was not confirmed who would be the tutor for these modules and the documentation currently lists different information about module tutors. As such, the visitors were not clear about who would be the module tutor for each module and so they could not determine that all subject areas would be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. In addition, as the visitors were unable to determine whether there will be an adequate number of staff on the programme, the visitors could not determine how the delivery of the subject areas would be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that subject areas will be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

### **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.**

**Reason:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that they have the mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance.

**Condition:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that all taught sessions are compulsory and that there is an 80 per cent attendance requirement for this programme. However it was not clear from the documentation, or in discussions at the visit, how attendance will be monitored. In addition, the visitors were unclear about any consequences of missed compulsory sessions, including the consequences for students whose attendance falls below the requirement of 80 per cent. As such, the visitors could not be certain that follow-up action would be taken for missed attendance and that students would gain the required knowledge from missed teaching before they complete the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how attendance is monitored, any consequences of missed compulsory teaching and how this information is clearly communicated to students.

### **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 provide further evidence to demonstrate that, if there is an AP(E)L route for this programme, students are able to meet the SOPs for social workers in England on completion of the programme if they enter the programme via the AP(E)L route.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that AP(E)L is not permitted on this programme. However, at the visit, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where the learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme will achieve all of the learning outcomes and successfully meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate, if there is an AP(E)L route, how the AP(E)L policy ensures that students will achieve the learning outcomes for exempted modules so that they are able to meet the SOPs for social workers in England.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure would work in practice and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the

visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that the practice placement settings provide a safe and supportive environment.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that they have a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works in practice. In addition, at the visit, the visitors learnt that the education provider delegates the approval of placements to the placement coordinator at one of the placement providers in attendance at the visit, Hereford County Council. The visitors were also unclear about how this delegation works and whether this responsibility is delegated to the placement coordinators at all placement providers. Furthermore, the visitors could not determine how the education provider's policy ensures that this delegation process is thorough and effective for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the approval and monitoring process for all placements and how the education provider ensures that, when the approval of placements is delegated to a placement coordinator at a placement provider, this is carried out effectively and thoroughly.

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

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that the placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that the practice placement settings have equality and diversity policies in relation to students. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that the placement providers have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be 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 that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting. As such, the visitors require further evidence that there will be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement setting.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this process ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. As such, the visitors require further evidence about how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Reason:** In the documentation and at the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider follows a Quality Assurance of Practice Learning (QAPL) procedure for approving all placements as a means of ensuring that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. However, the visitors were unclear about how this QAPL procedure works and whether the university carries out the audit of all placements. From the evidence and the discussions at the visit, the visitors were unable to determine whether the education provider has a thorough and effective system for approving all placements. As such, the visitors were unable to

determine how this process ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment of learning outcomes ensures that students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme are able to demonstrate that they have met the SOPs for social workers in England if an AP(E)L route is permitted on this programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that AP(E)L is not permitted on this programme. However, at the visit, the programme team stated that they may consider exempting students from certain modules if they had previously studied programmes where the learning outcomes of the modules were the same. Therefore, the visitors were unclear about whether accreditation of prior (experiential) learning would be accepted for this programme and, if it is, how assessment of students will ensure that students who are exempt from certain elements of the programme will achieve all of the learning outcomes and successfully meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for social workers in England at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how, if there is an AP(E)L route, how the AP(E)L policy ensures that students will achieve the learning outcomes for exempted modules so that they are able to demonstrate that they have met the SOPs for social workers in England.

**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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify the requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors did not see any reference to an aegrotat award in the assessment regulations for this programme. In discussions at the visit, it was unclear whether an aegrotat award would be given for this programme. As such it was not clearly specified that, if an aegrotat is awarded, that this does not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which clarifies whether aegrotat awards are given for this programme and, where they are given, that it is clearly communicated to students and staff that students who are awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Robert Goemans  
Sheila Skelton  
Mohammed Jeewa

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	Liverpool John Moores University
<b>Programme name</b>	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	23 – 24 August 2016

## 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 13 October 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 24 November 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 31 October 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 24 November 2016.

## Introduction

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

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

## Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Susan Boardman (Paramedic) Vincent Clarke (Paramedic) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Rebecca Stent
Proposed student numbers	Year 1 direct entry 50 students per cohort, 1 cohort per year Year 2 24 students per cohort, 1 cohort per year  Total 74 students in year 2
First approved intake	September 2009
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2016
Chair	Tony Hall (Liverpool John Moores University)
Secretary	Lucy McKenzie (Liverpool John Moores University)
Members of the joint panel	Sarah Edge (Student representative) Pauline Brookes (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CertHE Urgent and Emergency Care Information Pack	<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 ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

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

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must update their programme documentation to accurately reflect the mode(s) of study for the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there is a part time route listed for the programme on page 2 of the programme specification. However, at the visit, the programme team clarified that this was an error and there is only a full time route. Therefore, the education provider must update their programme documentation to accurately reflect the mode(s) of study for the programme, so that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on a programme.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how the admissions procedures ensure that all successful applicants have a good command of reading, writing and spoken English, including those who do not have English as their first language.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider currently accepts Emergency Medical Technicians level 2 (EMTs level 2) directly onto year two of the programme via their accreditation of prior (experiential) learning (AP(E)L) process. From September 2016, the education provider plans to admit Emergency Medical Technicians level 1 (EMTs level 1) onto year two of the programme via the AP(E)L process. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the English requirements for EMTs level 1 or EMTs level 2 who can access year two of the programme. At the visit, the programme team also stated that there is an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score which students have to demonstrate in order to be accepted onto the programme where English is not their first language. However, the visitors did not see evidence of the required IELTS score for applicants for whom English is not their first language. Therefore, the visitors require additional evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures all applicants meet the English requirements, including those who do not have English as their first language, 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 and professional entry standards for entry to year two of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the education provider currently accepts Emergency Medical Technicians level 2 (EMTs level 2) directly onto year two of the programme if they hold an Ambulance Technician 2 Institute of Health Care Development (IHCD) award. From September 2016, the education provider plans to admit Emergency Medical Technicians level 1 (EMTs level

1) onto year two of the programme if they have at least two years' experience as an EMT level 1 and hold a CertHE Urgent and Emergency Care award from Liverpool John Moores University. In addition, the education provider clarified that only applicants employed by North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) would be accepted onto year two of the programme. However, this professional entry standard was not clearly communicated in the programme documentation. Furthermore, it was not clear at the visit whether CertHE awards from other universities will be accepted, or how the admissions procedures ensure that EMTs level 1 and EMTs level 2 will have appropriate literacy and numeracy standards for entry to year two of the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether EMTs who can access the programme at year two will have the appropriate academic and professional standards to enter this programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how the admissions procedures ensure that successful applicants are to an appropriate academic and professional standard to study the programme, and how these requirements are communicated to applicants.

## **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 how the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning procedure for this programme is appropriate to exempt students from elements of learning and / or assessment.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted that applicants who have completed the CertHE Urgent and Emergency Care programme at Liverpool John Moores University and have at least two years' experience as an Emergency Medical Technician level 1 (EMT level 1) can apply for year two of the programme. In addition, the education provider clarified that only applicants employed by North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) would be accepted onto year two of the programme. However, it was not clear at the visit whether CertHE awards from other universities will be accepted and, if they are, how the education provider makes a judgement about whether to accept these awards. The education provider stated that all EMT applicants would be subject to the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning process before they would be accepted onto year two of the programme, regardless of which CertHE award they had completed. However, the visitors did not see evidence of how the AP(E)L process would be used to appropriately exempt students from elements of learning delivered and assessments. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information about the admissions procedure for EMTs level 1, who will be exempt from year one of the programme, to demonstrate how their AP(E)L process is effectively exempting students from elements of the teaching and assessment.

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

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

**Reason:** In the programme documentation, the visitors noted references to an HCPC requirement of 1500 practice hours. However, the HCPC does not stipulate the number of practice hours that students must complete. The visitors also noted references in the programme documentation that students will be "prepared for registration with the

HCPC". However, students who successfully complete the programme are only eligible to apply to register with the HCPC – registration is not guaranteed on completion of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence that the programme documentation has been updated to ensure the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflective of the language associated with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance, as well as how they clearly communicate attendance requirements, including any consequences of missed teaching, to students.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were unclear about how attendance is monitored for taught sessions, and how attendance requirements are clearly communicated to applicants. Therefore, the visitors decided to question this area at the visit – even though this is an approved programme – to ensure that this standard continues to be met. In meetings at the visit, the programme team stated that they expect 100 per cent attendance on the programme and that they monitor attendance closely as a team so that they are able to identify where students have missed a session. However, the visitors could not identify a formal mechanism for monitoring attendance and were unable to find evidence of attendance requirements in the documentation for students. Therefore, the education provider must provide evidence of formal mechanisms in place for monitoring attendance and how they clearly communicate attendance requirements and any consequences of missing teaching to students.

### **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 provide evidence to demonstrate that students who enter the programme via the AP(E)L route are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics on completion of the programme.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and at the visit, the visitors were uncertain about the admissions requirements and the AP(E)L policy for EMTs level 1 who are able to enter year two of the programme, as detailed under the condition for SET 2.6. As such, the visitors could not determine that students who enter year two of the programme will achieve all of the learning outcomes and successfully meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how the admissions requirements and AP(E)L policy ensure that students will achieve the learning outcomes for the exempted modules so that EMTs level 1 will be able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how practice placement educators at practice placements have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training.

**Reason:** At the visit, the visitors noted that senior paramedics at placement are the practice placement educators who sign off students' placement experience. However, the visitors also noted that it is 'mentors' – registered paramedics within the placement team – who directly work with the students on placement. The visitors heard that mentors are expected to undertake training in their own time and that senior paramedics advise the mentors about skills that need development. However, the visitors could not identify a required training programme for mentors or senior paramedics and how the education provider ensures that this training takes place. As such, they were unable to determine whether all practice placement educators will have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training. Even though this is an approved programme, the visitors must see evidence that all practice placement educators have undertaken appropriate practice placement educator training in order to ensure that this standard continues to be 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 are fully prepared for placement, including information about the the roles and responsibilities of practice placement educators.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted multiple references to a variety of practice placement educator titles, specifically 'mentor' and 'named mentor'. At the visit it was confirmed that there was a variety of practice placement educators with a range of titles and subsequent responsibilities. However, from the documentation the visitors were unable to determine the distinction of the different titles. In particular they could not determine whether a 'named mentor' and 'mentor' had the same role at placement or, if they are different, how the roles and responsibilities are clearly outlined to students. As such the visitors note that there was a potential risk that students would not be made fully aware of the roles and lines of responsibility of the practice placement educators. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence which clearly outlines the roles and responsibilities of practice placement educators and how this information is provided clearly and consistently to 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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment of learning outcomes ensures that Emergency Medical Technicians level 1 (EMTs level 1) who enter year two of the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation and at the visit, the visitors were uncertain about the admissions requirements and the AP(E)L policy for EMTs level 1 who are able to enter year two of the programme, as detailed under SET 2.6. As such, the visitors could not determine how assessment of students will ensure that students who enter year two of the programme have met the SOPs for paramedics at the end of the programme. Therefore, the education provider must demonstrate how the admissions requirements and AP(E)L policy ensure that students will achieve the learning outcomes for the exempted modules so that EMTs level 1 will be able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must update the programme documentation so that the assessment of the objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs), including the challenge test, is consistent and ensures fitness to practice in relevant areas.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors noted inconsistencies in the documentation about whether the OSCEs, including the challenge test, were assessed as pass / fail or whether they had a minimum pass mark of 40 per cent. At the visit, the programme team confirmed that the OSCEs and challenge test were assessed as pass or fail. The visitors were satisfied that this was appropriate, but require the programme documentation to reflect this, in order to determine that the measurement of student performance is consistent and ensures fitness to practice for all students.

#### **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 provide evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

**Reason:** From a review of the programme documentation, the visitors did not see evidence in the assessment regulations which specifies requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register. In the undergraduate assessment regulations, the visitors noted that “where there is insufficient evidence to determine the recommendation of an award but the Board of Examiners is nevertheless satisfied that the student would have qualified for the award had it not been for illness or other valid cause, an aegrotat award may be recommended.” At the visit, the programme team stated that they do not provide aegrotat awards. However, the visitors did not see information available to students and staff that an aegrotat award would not be awarded for this programme or, if an aegrotat award is awarded, that this would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which clarifies whether aegrotat awards are given for this programme and, where they are given, that it is clearly communicated to students and staff that students who are awarded an aegrotat award are not eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC.

Susan Boardman  
Vincent Clarke  
Kathleen Taylor

## Visitors' report

<b>Name of education provider</b>	St George's, University of London
<b>Programme name</b>	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (In Service)
<b>Mode of delivery</b>	Full time
<b>Relevant part of the HCPC Register</b>	Paramedic
<b>Date of visit</b>	25 – 26 August 2016

## Contents

Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details .....	3
Sources of evidence .....	4
Recommended outcome .....	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	12

## 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 17 October 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 24 November 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 November 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 24 November 2016.

## Introduction

The HCPC originally visited the programme at the education provider's request with the intention of considering major changes proposed to the programme however, upon further review at the visit, it became clear that the visitors were there to consider the approval of a new programme. Therefore the visit assessed whether the new programme met the standards of education and training (SETs) and ensured that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider and endorsing body did not validate or endorse 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	Anthony Hoswell (Paramedic) Glyn Harding (Paramedic) Nick Drey (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
HCPC observer	Tamara Wasylec
Proposed student numbers	70 per cohort, one cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	January 2017
Chair	Jane Lindsay (St George's, University of London)
Secretary	Derek Baldwinson (St George's, University of London)

## 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"/>

The HCPC met with students from the Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic 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 43 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 did not set any conditions for the programme.

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

## Conditions

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

**Condition:** The education provider must ensure that the resources to support student learning throughout the programme are clear and consistently reflective of the current setting for registration of paramedics.

**Reason:** In review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC. For instance it refers to the HCPC's former name, 'Health Profession Council' on page 6 of the 'module descriptor'. In addition to this, the visitors noted on page 22, that there is reference to HCPC's Standards of proficiency (SOP) 18, however, there is no SOP 18 for paramedics. Also within the programme documentation there are a number of references to the 'Health Profession Council Codes of conduct'. These references do not accurately reflect the HCPC as the regulatory body, and could potentially lead to misinterpretation as to its requirements and guidance for students. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be reviewed to ensure that all references are clear and accurate. 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.

### **3.14 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 further evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from students when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching, and the protocols for managing situations when students decline from participating.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted a consent form was included in the submission. In assessing the evidence the visitors note that the consent form makes reference to London Ambulance Service (LAS). However, the programme currently seeking approval is in partnership with South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAMB). The visitors were therefore unable to determine how applicants from SECAMB would consent when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching would be gained. In addition, from this evidence the visitors could not determine the protocols whereby the education would manage a situation where a student does not give consent in practical or clinical teaching. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the formal protocols to obtain informed consent from SECAMB students when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching and for managing situations when SECAMB students decline from participating.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates where students' attendance is mandatory and how the attendance mechanisms are effectively communicated and monitored.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted on page 18 of the student handbook that “100% attendance is required in both university lectures, skills, simulation and practice placements”. In discussions with the programme team it was confirmed that students are expected to attend all practice placements including non-ambulance settings as these placements are integral to the programme. However, in discussions with the practice placement providers it was revealed that non-ambulance placements are not mandatory, this was echoed by students and their experience of being able to substitute their non-ambulance placement for traditional ambulance placements. From the discrepancies regarding non-ambulance placement, the visitors were unable to determine which aspect of placement is mandatory and how students starting the programme would be informed of this attendance policy, how it would be enforced and what, if any, repercussions there may be for students who fail to attend. Therefore the visitors require further evidence of the attendance policy, what parts of the programme are mandatory and how this is communicated to students. They also require further evidence to demonstrate how students are made aware of what effect contravening this policy may have on their ability to progress through the programme.

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

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service user and carer involvement in the programme. The programme documentation suggested service users and carers will be involved in programme delivery. During discussions at the visit, it was indicated service users and carers are only involved in ad hoc delivery of one module of the programme. From the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans to involve service users and carers throughout the programme have yet to be finalised. At the meeting with service users and carers, the visitors met with the programme team who will be managing service users and carer involvement. During this meeting, the visitors heard that although no formal plans were in place for involvement, the intention is to involve service users and carers however, limited details about how the involvement will work was provided by the programme team. 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.

### **4.9 When there is interprofessional learning the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group must be adequately addressed.**

**Condition:** The programme team must provide further evidence on how they will ensure paramedic specific skills and knowledge are being adequately addressed within the ‘inter-professional learning’ (IPL) module.

**Reason:** From a review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors noted that there are two modules whereby IPL will take place as well as a stimulation scenario known as ‘SLAM collaboration’. In assessing the collaborative curriculum for the interprofessional learning that students will undertake as part of this programme the visitors were unable to determine how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this IPL. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors

heard that the 'SLAM collaboration' which will include a paramedic has yet to be finalised. As such the visitors did not see the finalised version of the collaborative curriculum and how profession specific skills and knowledge will be addressed as part of this interprofessional learning. In addition, in assessing the modules the visitors were unable to determine how paramedic specific skills and knowledge will be addressed in the IPL modules identified. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence about the collaborative curriculum for the programme. In this way the, the visitors will be able to review the revised collaborative curriculum to ensure that when there is interprofessional learning in the programme the profession-specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further evidence of the number, duration and range of placement settings that students will experience to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would have the opportunity to experience placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. However, the visitors were unable to gain a clear understanding of the different range of non-ambulance placement settings, such as the non-ambulance setting, that were on offer to students, and which of these settings students would be mandatory and have associated learning outcomes attached. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures there is an appropriate range of placements to support the delivery of the programme, and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

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

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

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

visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures a safe and supportive environment at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would be expected to undergo placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process which demonstrated that equality and diversity policies are in place for practice placements at SECamb. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that there is a process to ensure there are equality and diversity policies at alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the ones in place for placements at SECamb,

but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that equality and diversity policies are in place at alternative (non-ambulance) settings.

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would be expected to undergo placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process which demonstrates that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience in practice placements at SECamb. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show there is a process to ensure staff at alternative (non-ambulance) settings have relevant skills, knowledge and experience. The programme team informed visitors that that there

are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the one in place for placements at SECAMB, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

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

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

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

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

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

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would be expected to undergo placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors were provided with an audit process which demonstrated how the education provider ensures practice placement educators at SECAMB are appropriately registered. However, the visitors did not see evidence to show that the education

provider has a process in place to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered in alternative (non-ambulance) settings. The programme team informed visitors that there are similar processes in place in alternative (non-ambulance) settings as the one in place for placements at SECamb, but did not see these processes reflected in the documentation, and were therefore unable to judge whether they were appropriate. The visitors noted that there may be differences in policies for ambulance service and non-ambulance service placements, due to the nature of the placement experience, and due to the background of the staff at these placements. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures all practice placement educators at alternative (non-ambulance) settings are appropriately registered, or to agree other arrangements with the HCPC.

**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 programme team must provide further information on the learning outcomes for alternative (non-ambulance) placements, including methods of assessment, and any alignment to academic modules.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors understood that the majority of placements would take place in an ambulance service setting. This was confirmed in meetings with the programme team and with placement providers. These discussions also clarified that students would be expected to undergo placements in alternative (non-ambulance) settings, such as the accident and emergency department of a hospital. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring students have sufficient exposure to a variety of situations such as within hospital settings and other non NHS placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation to support these placement experiences, regarding how these placements will be integrated with the programme, or information of the learning outcomes and associated assessments. They therefore require further evidence that the students and placement educators in non-ambulance placement settings are given sufficient information to understand the learning outcomes to be achieved, and are therefore fully prepared for placement in non-ambulance settings.

Anthony Hoswell  
Glyn Harding  
Nick Drey