HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Birmingham City University
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Operating Department Practice (Royal Devon and Exeter), Birmingham City University, full time
Approval visit date	10 August 2017
Case reference	CAS-12042-F6C2R5

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Julie Weir	Operating department practitioner
Nick Clark	Operating department practitioner
Prisha Shah	Lay
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Nick Morton	Chair	Birmingham city university – education provider
Clare Portlock Eleanor Statham	Secretaries	Birmingham city university – education provider
Dawn Parsons	External panel member	University Campus Suffolk – academic advisor

| Andi Sambrook | External panel member | University of Surrey – academic advisor |

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Operating Department Practice (Royal Devon and Exeter)
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2001
Maximum student cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01871

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process due to the outcome of a previous assessment. The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major changes affected the following standards - programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes

Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers and educators	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 52 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 05 October 2017.

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials to clearly articulate to applicants any additional costs that students may be liable to pay when on the programme.

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors could not see how the education provider informs potential applicants about the requirement to travel and the costs that students will have to pay as a result of taking a place on the programme. In the programme team meeting and in discussion with students the visitors heard there are costs that the students pay that are not stated in the admissions information, such as travel costs that must be paid when on the programme. The visitors therefore require additional evidence to identify how the admissions procedures give applicants the information they require about all costs incurred by the student, so they can make an informed choice to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the criteria that is used to assess applicants' command of English and how applicants are made aware of the criteria.

Reason: In their reading of the documentation, the visitors noted that applicants are required to sit literacy and numeracy tests as part of the admission procedure. In discussions with the students the visitors heard that students did not sit a literacy and numeracy test when they applied for a place on the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that applicants will not be required to sit a literacy and numeracy test. However, applicants will be required to hold a minimum of three GCSEs at grade C or above and must include English language, to be considered for a place on this programme. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require further evidence that clarifies the entry criteria used to assess an applicant's command of English. The visitors also need to see how this is information is communicated to potential applicants to ensure the information provided to applicants clear and consistent.

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: The visitors noted the programme documentation submitted by the education provider did not fully comply with the relevant guidance issued by HCPC. For example, the visitors were referred to page six of the student handbook where it is stated that successful completion of the programme leads to "eligibility to register" rather than eligibility to apply to the HCPC Register. The statement is incorrect and inaccurate and may mislead students and provide an incorrect impression of the HCPC as a statutory regulator. Additionally, the visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider contained inaccuracies and information that is not applicable to students on this programme. For example, the course flyer refers to placements in Birmingham rather than placements in Devon and Exeter and there was reference to the "welcome week" which takes place in Birmingham for students on a different programme. As such, the visitors noted that some of the information provided is not applicable to the students on this programme. The visitors also noted that the staff contact details were not fully completed, in the documentation provided and could not ascertain how students would be aware of how to contact those staff members. Within the programme handbook, the visitors noted that a weblink to the assessment regulations is yet to be inserted, as such the visitors could not determine how students would know how to access the assessment regulations. The programme team noted that the documentation requires updating so that the information is accurate and relevant to the students on this programme. The visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation and ensure the terminology used is accurate, reflects the language associated with statutory regulation and avoids any potential confusion for students on this programme. 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.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further information about the student support system in place when on placement.

Reason: The visitors noted on page thirteen of the SW Hub APG approval document, that the head of department and the programme lead will act as link tutors by carrying out six and three visits to placements in year one, respectively. The visitors noted that the number of visits would decrease in years two and three. However, in discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the number of visits to placements by a link tutor would be less than stated in the documentation. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require clarity around the commitment from the link tutors regarding how often placement visits will be conducted each year of the programme and how this is communicated to practice educators and students.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how attendance is monitored, the consequences for poor attendance and how this information is communicated to students.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the attendance requirement across the programme is one hundred per cent. However, in discussion with the programme team the visitors could not determine the process in place that addresses concerns about student attendance, which falls below the attendance requirement. The visitors also could not determine 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 and the associated monitoring mechanisms 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.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to what training practice placement educators are required to undertake and how this training prepares them to act as practice placement educators for students on this programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme team, the visitors were aware that practice educators must complete mentoring training. The visitors also noted that the education provider uses a rating system for monitoring which practice educators have undertaken training. However, the visitors could not determine, from the information provided, what the training covers, how it is appropriate for practice educators supervising students on this programme and whether it is mandatory to complete this training prior to supervising student on this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the education provider communicates and ensures that the mandatory training requirements for all practice educators are met. This evidence should also articulate what this training covers to ensure that it is appropriate in preparing practice educators to supervise students on this programme in the placement setting.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the suitability of the study skills support service provided to students on this programme.

Reason: In a review of the documentation and discussions with the programmes team, the visitors noted that study skills support is made available to students on this programme. The service is based at Birmingham City University and students on this programme would be able to access this support via email, phone call and skype. As such the visitors were satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors would recommend the education provider keep under review the accessibility and appropriateness of this service for students based in Devon and Exeter.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice – Full time BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice – Full time
Approval visit date	19 - 21 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11873-P4J4Q6

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 5 of this report.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

John Donaghy	Paramedic
Penny Joyce	Operating department practitioner
Roseann Connolly	Lay
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Jane Anthony	Chair	University of Central Lancashire
Jagori Bandyopadhyay	Secretary	University of Central Lancashire
Kartina Choong	Internal panel member	University of Central Lancashire

Kevin Boles	Internal panel member	University of Central Lancashire
Andi Sambrook	External advisor	University of Surrey
Neil Larman	Visitor	College of Paramedics
Samantha McCabe-Hogan	Visitor	College of Paramedics

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Operating department practitioner
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum student cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01699

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process as changes were being made to curriculum structure, assessment strategy and programme management.

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed first intake	01 September 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01700

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time. There is an existing DipHE Paramedic Practice at the education provider.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	The paramedic programme is new so we met with learners from the existing DipHE Paramedic Practice. For the existing BSc (Hons) in Operating Department Practice we met with current learners.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice education providers and educators	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met. Unless otherwise noted, the following conditions apply to both programmes mentioned in section 2 of this report.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 46 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further

evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 17 November 2017

2.1 The admissions process 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 ensure that appropriate, clear and consistent information, that enables applicants to make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme, is available to applicants.

Reason: From their review of the programmes' documentation, the visitors considered that some of the information available to applicants was not clear or was not correct. For example, reference was made to graduates from the programmes being "eligible to register" with the HCPC rather than "eligible to apply for registration". There were also references to the 2004 edition of the HCPC standards of proficiency rather than to the most recent revision, a reference to the HPC rather than the HCPC, and a reference to there being a part-time pathway for the programmes, even though neither has a part-time pathway available. The visitors also noted that the webpages for applicants to the paramedic programme were not yet live, and therefore they were not able to determine whether the information provided on those pages was sufficient to enable applicants to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to review all relevant materials to ensure that accurate and complete information about both programmes is provided to applicants. This includes making the website available for the visitors to review.

2.7 The education provider must ensure that there are equality and diversity policies in relation to applicants and that they are implemented and monitored.

Condition: For the operating department practitioner programme, the education provider must ensure that there is equity regarding questions asked in the interview process.

Reason: During their review of programme documentation for the operating department practitioner programme, the visitors noted that in the guidance for interviewers it was stated that not all applicants needed to be asked all questions. They noted that in the "Admissions Policy Statement" provided as part of the programme documentation, the education provider states as an aim that "the procedures for the admission of students are non-discriminatory and espouse the university's commitment to equal opportunities". The visitors considered that not asking all applicants all questions created a risk that applicants would not be treated in a non-discriminatory way, or that they would not have equal opportunities to demonstrate their suitability for the programme, and that therefore relevant equality and diversity policies were not being implemented. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all applicants are considered equally in interviews.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: For the paramedic programme, the education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that sufficient practice-based learning is available for all learners.

Reason: In their review of programme documentation, the visitors were not able to see a breakdown of the practice based learning schedule showing the details of placement blocks. In particular, they were not able to see which placements were ambulance based and which were non-ambulance based, or the type of locations where learners would be based. The visitors noted that once the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice had begun, the total number of learners on paramedic programmes at the education provider would increase from 100 at present to over 150 by the 2020-21 academic year. From discussion with placement educators and the programme team, the visitors were aware that placement capacity was a concern, due to high regional demand for placements from other education providers. Under these circumstances, they considered that it might be difficult for the education provider to find enough placements for all learners given the increase in numbers across paramedic provision. They received verbal reassurances that the programme team were confident that they could find placements for all learners. However, they were unable to determine whether an effective process was in place to ensure availability and capacity, because they did not have a formal plan to ensure availability and capacity. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the HCPC standards of proficiency, and HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics, are referenced in all module descriptors and reading lists.

Reason: In their review of programme documentation, the visitors were not able to see that the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs), and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs), were consistently referenced in reading lists and module descriptors. In discussions with educators the visitors received verbal reassurances that the SOPs and the SCPEs were threaded throughout the programme, and the learners seemed to be familiar with both sets of standards. However, the visitors considered that in order for the standard to be met the education provider needed to ensure that the SOPs and SCPEs were clearly referenced in the descriptors and reading lists of all modules. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners have access to relevant HCPC standards throughout the programme.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all learners are aware of the process for withdrawing consent when taking part as service users in clinical and practical teaching.

Reason: The visitors asked learners about their awareness of how consent policies worked in situations where they were taking part as service users in practical and clinical teaching. From these discussions, they noted that learners were not aware that they were entitled to withdraw consent if they felt uncomfortable in such situations, and that they did not know what the process was for doing so. It did not appear that they

had opportunities to reflect upon or discuss consent. As a result, the visitors were unable to determine whether the processes for obtaining appropriate consent from learners were effective. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that all learners are aware both that they can withdraw consent, and how they can do so.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators are appropriately trained.

Reason: The visitors were able to review programme documentation relating to training of practice educators, and discuss it with learners, the programme team and practice placement providers. Some of the learners reported that there had been occasions when learners were placed with mentors who had not been appropriately trained. These situations had been resolved by the programme team, but the visitors considered that there should be a robust process for ensuring that these situations did not occur, i.e. that no learner was placed with a mentor who was not appropriately trained. They were not able to determine from review of the documentation whether such a process was in place. In discussion with educators, the visitors were given verbal assurances that practice-based learning providers had processes in place to ensure that all practice educators had received appropriate training. They were able to review documentation relating to audit and monitoring of practice-based learning, but they were not able to determine how the education provider was able to ensure that all practice educators across all placement locations had received appropriate training. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators have had such training.

6.3 Assessments must provide an objective, fair and reliable measure of learners' progression and achievement.

Condition: For the paramedic programme, the education provider must demonstrate that the Practice Assessment Record ensures that assessment of competence is made at an appropriate academic level.

Reason: In the programme documentation, the visitors were able to review the Practice Assessment Record (PAR). In this document, there were marking criteria for practice based learning educators to use in their assessment of learners. Learners could be classified on a range from "fail" to "excellent". However, the visitors were not able to see guidance for educators as to how they should apply these criteria appropriately across the three years of the programme. They considered that a level of competence that could be considered "excellent" for a learner at Level 4 might not be "excellent" for a learner at Level 6, and they were therefore unable to determine whether learners' progression within the programme was being reliably assessed. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that the Practice Assessment Record guides educators appropriately to assess learners at different stages of the programme.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes. Unless otherwise noted, the following recommendations apply to both programmes mentioned in section 2 of this report.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should review its processes for communicating the outcome of monitoring and evaluation to stakeholders.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that this standard was met overall, as they had seen evidence of the audit process and had discussed its workings with learners and educators. However, from discussions, the visitors were aware that some learners and service users felt they had not been appropriately informed when their input into monitoring and evaluation processes had been acted upon. The visitors considered that if stakeholders do not feel that their participation is valued and acted upon, they may stop engaging with the process, and that therefore there could be a risk to the effectiveness of this process. The visitors therefore suggest that the education provider keep under review how action taken in response to stakeholder feedback is communicated.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Recommendation: For the operating department practitioner programme, the education provider should ensure that their equipment continues to be as accessible and up to date as possible.

Reason: The visitors were able to view some of the facilities and resources available to learners, and discuss resourcing with the programme team and senior team. They were satisfied that the standard was met. There were enough accessible resources for the proposed numbers of learners, which would enable the learners to meet the learning outcomes. However, they noted that some of the equipment available was older than the equipment with which learners would be expected to be familiar on their practice-based learning. This was also raised as a concern by some learners. In addition, a few learners reported that they did not have access to clinical skills labs as often as they would have liked. These issues did not appear to be affecting learners' ability to meet the standards of proficiency, but the visitors considered that there was a risk of this happening in the future, and so they recommend that the education provider continue to review the equipment available.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Recommendation: For the paramedic programme, the education provider should ensure that there is an appropriate quantity of equipment available.

Reason: The visitors were able to review the resources available for practical teaching on the paramedic programme, and discuss resourcing with the programme team and senior team. They were satisfied that this standard was met. There were enough accessible resources for the proposed numbers of learners, which would enable the learners to meet the learning outcomes. The education provider had used small group teaching to make efficient use of its resources. In discussion with learners on the DipHE the visitors were made aware that some learners' use of some items of equipment, such as cannulas, had been restricted. The programme team noted in discussion that they were aware of feedback from learners around this issue, and that similar restrictions would not be in place for the BSc. The visitors suggest that the education provider continues to monitor how they maintain learners' access to appropriate and effective levels of resources.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Kent
Name of programme(s)	Step Up to Social Work – Full time accelerated
	Step Up to Social Work – Full time accelerated
Approval visit date	13 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11947-G1C1X6

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

David Ward	Social worker
Graeme Currie	Social worker
Ian Hughes	Lay
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Sally Kendall	Chair	University of Kent
Louise Tollervey	Secretary	University of Kent

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Step Up to Social Work
Mode of study	Full time accelerated
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01725

Programme name	Step Up to Social Work
Mode of study	Full time accelerated
Profession	Social worker in England
First intake	01 January 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 26
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01727

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not required	This is a new programme.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers and educators	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 50 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 October 2017.

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

Reason: In their review of the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors noted the evidence provided for this standard, which included skill development activities, whereby learners 'undergo shadowing visits to other teams and receive input from other professionals during their workplace experience'. Learners also undertake collaborative working with other agencies and professions in other relevant professions while on placement. In assessing the evidence, the visitors recognised that there are plenty opportunities for learners to learn with, and from, professionals. However, the visitors were unclear how learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that, due to location, the programme team are unable to facilitate opportunities where learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions. However, these opportunities are crucial in developing learners' ability to communicate and work with

those outside their own profession, ultimately improving the environment and quality of care for service users. As such, the visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence to demonstrate how the programme will ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, learners in other relevant professions.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the assessment strategy will ensure that upon successful completion of the programme all students will meet the standard of proficiency (SOPs) for Social workers in England.

Reason: From the review of the programme documentation and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were content that the curriculum delivers the learning outcomes required to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for Social workers in England. However, the visitors noted that the assessment for this programme was organised around the Professional Capability Framework (PCF) without any reference how the SOPs are being assessed. As such, the visitors were unclear how the assessment organised around the PCF linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme has demonstrated that they meet the SOPs for Social workers in England. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the assessment of the learning outcomes will ensure that students meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme and how students meet and record the individual SOPs. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence to clearly define the link between the assessment of students associated with all aspects of this programme and how these assessments will ensure that students completing the programme have demonstrated that they meet all of the relevant SOPs for Social workers in England.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Liverpool John Moores University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Liverpool John Moores University, FT (Full time)
Approval visit date	13-14 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11971-Z1N4K4

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills conduct performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Manoj Mistry	Lay
Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Jasmine Pokuaa Oduro-Bonsrah	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Andrew Baker	Chair	Liverpool John Moores University
Lucy McKenzie	Event officer	Liverpool John Moores University
Seamus O'Brien	University representative	Liverpool John Moores University
Cameron Muir	Student representative	Liverpool John Moores University
Chris Moat	External panel member	Teesside University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed first intake	01 September 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 50
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01738

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	This is a new programme

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Reason(s) not met
Learners	Yes	The HCPC met with learners from the Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice programmes as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any learners enrolled on it
Senior staff	Yes	

Practice education providers and educators	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 43 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 20 November 2017.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify who will pay for the additional costs associated with the programme, and how this will be communicated to applicants.

Reason: During the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were made aware that learners on this programme will have to cover the costs associated with the criminal convictions checks and the occupational health checks. However, from the documentation provided, the visitors could not see any information about these costs for learners in the information for applicants. Furthermore, in the learners meeting, the learners were unsure about who was responsible for paying for the criminal convictions checks and occupational health checks. The visitors therefore require further evidence to ensure that applicants to this programme have all the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on this programme. As such, the education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate how they let applicants know about the costs associated with the programme, in particular the additional cost associated with criminal convictions checks and occupational health checks.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence that demonstrates the commitment and future plans for this programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine what the current and future plans are for this programme. The visitors could not determine what commitment the education provider had towards this programme and how this programme will be supported. From discussions with the senior and programme team, the visitors were informed that the education provider will be developing a 'new Masters programme and thinking about developing degree apprenticeships as a part time route, and will be keeping the DipHE programme'. The visitors could not however see how the whole paramedic provision, in particular the BSc programme, fits in to the education provider's business plan. Furthermore, the visitors could not determine what commitments, plans and support the education provider has towards this programme. The visitors therefore require further evidence, which documents the education providers' commitment to this programme, what the plans are for the paramedic provision, and how this programme fits into the overall business plan, in order to determine the viability and sustainability of the programme.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support learning is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors noted various instances of inaccurate and out-of-date information. In the Programme Document, for example, the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and Guidance on conduct and ethics for students referenced were the 2009 versions. However, there are more recent versions of these publications, published in 2016. Furthermore, the visitors noted that the programme guide states "On successful completion of the programme, you will be eligible to register with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC)". These statements could be misleading to learners, as learners are only eligible to apply for HCPC registration. The visitors were not sure how the education provider ensures that the learners have the accurate up-to date information they require in order to support their learning. . The education provider must therefore revise the programme documentation to ensure that the resources to support learning is accurate and appropriate to deliver an effective programme.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they will make learners and educators aware of the exit awards, and that they will not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the Website Factfile and the SETS Descriptor document. In the documentation, the visitors noted that the exit awards for this programme are the Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE) and the Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE). Firstly, the visitors were unsure what the names of these exit awards were as there were no programme titles attached to the award. The visitors were aware that the education provider had an approved Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic practice programme. The visitors were therefore unsure

whether the DipHE exit award for the proposed programme will lead to the Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic practice qualification. During the programme team meeting the visitors were informed that the names of the exit awards had not yet been finalised but will not include the title of the approved and proposed programmes. However, the visitors did not see any evidence of what the exit awards for this programme would be, how they will be communicated to learners and educators and how these learners and educators will be made aware that these exit awards will not lead to eligibility to apply for admission to the Register. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence about what the exit awards will be for this programme, how they will be communicated to learners and educators, and that they do not lead to eligibility to apply for registration with the HCPC.

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

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

4.9 The programme must ensure that learners are able to learn with, and from, professionals and learners in other relevant professions.

Condition: The education provider must articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the SETS Descriptor and Programme Document. The Programme Document states "At each level particular modules have periods when interprofessional learning and engagement is possible…the paramedic and midwifery team will blend their programmes giving an opportunity for learner midwives to work collaboratively with learner paramedics during a series of workshops and scenario based exercises". From the information provided the visitors could not determine what these interprofessional sessions consisted of. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that there will be 'opportunities for interprofessional learning' including shared teaching with the midwifery learners and some lectures will be delivered by midwifery lecturers. Furthermore, the programme team informed the visitors that as part of the DipHE programme they run a patient journey session from the pick up call to the rehab process for a cerebrovascular

event. However, from the visitors understanding, this session was a one-day extracurricular activity as opposed to required learning. Additionally the visitors could not determine how paramedic learners learning from midwifery lecturers and having shared teaching sessions with midwifery learners constituted paramedic learners learning with and from professionals and learners in other relevant professions. The education provider is therefore required to articulate what interprofessional learning there will be on the programme, and how they will ensure that learners on this programme will learn with, and from professionals in other relevant professions.

5.1 Practice-based learning must be integral to the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what formal arrangements there are in place to secure practice-based learning for all learners.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the Programme Document, Practice placement Handbook, Programme specification and SETS Descriptor document. The visitors were also shown the 'Placement Learning Support System'. The placement management system for the health care learners at the institution. However, the visitors could not see in the documentation provided whether there were any formal arrangements in place to secure placements for all learners on this proposed programme. During the programme and practice education provider meeting the visitors were informed that there will a similar arrangement in place for the proposed BSc programme as there is for the currently approved DipHE programme. The visitors were shown a Health Education England 'Schedule 8' document, which highlights the placement provision places for the DipHE paramedic learners for the 2017-18 academic year. The programme team informed the visitors that they were unsure about whether these commissioned places will remain for the BSc programme and cannot currently determine what the funding model will be. In the placement education provider meeting the visitors were informed that they anticipate that there will be a transition in contracts the formal arrangements they currently have will follow the same format as highlighted in the learning development agreement. The visitors however did not see any formal agreements in place to secure placements for all learners on the programme. The education provider must therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate what formal arrangements there are in place to secure practice-based learning for all learners.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure practice educators undertake appropriate regular training.

Reason: From the documentation provided and at the visit, the visitors noted that new practice educators must have a level five mentorship before supervising learners. The education provider informed the visitors that they have not planned to have regular training sessions for practice educators. Therefore, the visitors could not determine how the programme team ensure that practice placement educators keep up-to-date with developments on the programme. In particular, the visitors could not determine how the practice educators would be aware of changes to the programme such as changes to the Practice Learning Assessment Document (PLAD). The education provider must therefore provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice educators

undertake appropriate regular training, in order to sufficiently support the learners' needs and to ensure that they are kept up-to-date with the expectations of their role.

6.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must communicate any changes to the assessment strategy and design, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Reason: In reviewing the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors were made aware of the assessment strategy and design for the programme, which is designed to ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, during the meeting with the programme team and the informal feedback meeting at the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to make some changes to parts of the assessment strategy and design, in particular, the assessment of the research and dissertation modules. As such, the visitors have not had the evidence of the final, confirmed, assessment strategy and design for the programme. Therefore, they cannot determine how the final, confirmed, learning assessment strategy will ensure that successful graduates can meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors will therefore require the education provider to provide additional evidence, which will communicate any changes to the assessment strategy and design, so they can make determinations about how the programme can meet this standard.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Recommendation: The education provider should consider how best communicate to learners what happens to their videos once they complete their assessments and marks have been finalised.

Reason: From the documentation provided and discussions at the visit, the visitors learnt that there was a video/photo/audio consent form used to obtain consent from service users and learners, and used as a learning and assessment tool. The visitors reviewed the appropriateness of the form and agreed it was adequate to obtain consent from learners and service users and were therefore satisfied that this standard was met. However, the learners mentioned that they 'had not really thought about what happens to the video recordings after their assessment'. The programme team informed the visitors that these video recordings were deleted after the assessment marks had been ratified and finalised. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider considers clearly communicating to learners what happens to their videos once they complete their assessments and the marks have been finalised.

hcpc health & care professions council

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Name of programme(s)	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice – Full time Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice – Full time
Approval visit date	12 – 13 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11935-W1R0B0

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Clare Bates	Lay
Simon Walker	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Beverley Ball	Radiographer - Therapeutic radiographer
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive
Jamie Hunt	HCPC executive (observer)

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Lisa Reidy	Chair	Sheffield Hallam University
Sandra Clark	Secretary	Sheffield Hallam University

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
Proposed first intake	01 January 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01735

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Programme name	Pg Dip Radiotherapy and Oncology in Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Radiographer
Modality	Therapeutic radiographer
First intake	01 September 2003
Maximum student cohort	Up to 18
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01843

We undertook this assessment via the approval process, which involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards. We decided to assess the programme via the approval process as we were visiting the education provider to give initial approval to the MSc which will replace it, and re-approving the programme in this way would remove the need for the programme to submit annual monitoring during its final two years. The programme has now admitted its final cohort and will be closed when these learners have completed.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Programme specification	Yes
Module descriptor(s)	Yes
Handbook for learners	Yes
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Yes

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes – from the existing PG Dip programme
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers and educators	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 47 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 30 October 2017.

2.1 The admissions process 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 ensure that information about all costs associated with the programme is fully available to applicants.

Reason: The visitors were able to view information made available to applicants regarding programme costs. They noted that there was clear information about programme fees. However, they were not able to see where applicants could find information about other costs associated with the programme. In particular, it was not clear to the visitors where applicants could find out that the education provider pays for the Disclosure and Barring Service checks, or where they could get an indication of the costs associated with practice-based learning. Based on their review of documentation and discussions with learners, the visitors considered that these costs could be significant for some learners, depending on placement location, and so it was important for applicants to have as full information as possible in order to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure the availability of the relevant information.

2.3 The admissions process must ensure that applicants have a good command of English.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that information about IELTS requirements is clear, accurate and consistent across all materials.

Reason: The visitors were able to view information about the IELTS entry requirements of the programme. They noted, however, that different parts of the programme documentation gave different figures for the IELTS requirements for the programme. In the submission document (page 26), the education provider states that "should [international] students wish to register with the HCPC, they will need to take an IELTS test prior to registration". The visitors were unclear what the education provider meant by this statement. The HCPC does not administer such tests, and does not impose additional requirements for eligibility for registration for international applicants besides having completed an approved programme. The HCPC ensures that registrant radiographers have an appropriate proficiency in English via the requirement that learners on approved programmes meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for the profession. In their SOPs mapping document, under SOP 8.3 (be able to communicate in English to the standard equivalent to level 7 of the International English Language Testing System, with no element below 6.5), the education provider noted that this SOP was met by the entry requirements. Given these considerations, the visitors were not clear how the admissions process ensured that applicants had a good command of spoken English, or that applicants would understand HCPC requirements. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure consistency and accuracy across all documentation for applicants concerning English language requirements. In this way the visitors can be satisfied that the standard is met.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: From review of programme documentation and discussions with current learners, the visitors were not able to see an effective process which enables learners to highlight concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. They were aware that there was a formal policy in place, "Guidance for Students Responding to Concerns and Complaints on Placement", but learners did not seem to be familiar with it. The learners suggested that they had tended to rely on informal pathways by which concerns could be raised, but the visitors considered that this was insufficient for the standard to be met, as it appeared to be dependent on good relationships between particular learners and educators. The visitors considered that the lack of awareness of a formal policy would make it harder for all learners to understand what constituted acceptable behaviour across different contexts and in different practice-based learning settings. They also considered that it would be difficult for learners to know what to do if a concern involved the person to whom they would normally report concerns on an informal basis, and that the lack of awareness of a formal process might mean a lack of equity or consistency in how concerns were dealt with. They therefore require the education provider to demonstrate how they will ensure that learners and educators are aware of the formal process for raising concerns. In this way they can be satisfied that it is an effective process.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have a process in place for obtaining consent from learners where appropriate.

Reason: From their review of programme documentation, and discussions with current learners and the programme team, the visitors were not clear that processes for obtaining consent from learners were in place. There was a policy on confidentiality and consent relating to service users included in the documentation, which was referenced in the education provider's mapping for this standard. The learners did not appear to be aware of the policy, and could not recall having given formal consent at any point during their time on the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to demonstrate that they have an effective process in place for obtaining formal consent from learners where appropriate, and for ensuring that learners understand what it is that they are consenting to. This includes ensuring that learners understand the nature of ongoing consent, and that factors such as cultural differences and disability are taken into account.

4.11 The education provider must identify and communicate to learners the parts of the programme where attendance is mandatory, and must have associated monitoring processes in place.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that their attendance policy is clear and consistent in programme documentation, and ensure that learners are aware of which parts of the programme are mandatory.

Reason: From reviewing programme documentation relating to attendance, and discussions with the programme team and learners, the visitors were not clear about the programme policy on attendance. Some documents gave the minimum attendance figure as 80 per cent and others said that 100 per cent attendance was "normally expected". In discussion with the programme team, educators stated that the policy was that 100 per cent attendance was expected, but that 80 per cent was the threshold below which "sanctions" would be taken. However, the visitors could not see how this was clearly communicated to learners. They were also unable to determine how the 80 per cent attendance expectation would be spread across theory and practical parts of the programme, and could not see where the education provider has specified which parts of the programme were mandatory. In addition, they noted that the programme documentation mentions that 80 per cent attendance has been set by the "regulating bodies", when this is not in fact the case. The visitors therefore require the education provider to clarify their attendance policy, to demonstrate how they will identify to learners which programme components are mandatory, and to remove any references to specific HCPC attendance requirements.

Recommendations
We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Recommendation: The education provider should review the reading lists of modules to ensure that HCPC documents regarding professional behaviour are included wherever appropriate.

Reason: From their review of descriptors of modules that included learning outcomes about professional behaviour, the visitors noted that HCPC documents regarding expectations of professional behaviour were not referenced in the reading lists. They were satisfied that the standard is met as they saw other evidence in the documentation that learners will be able to understand and meet expectations of professional behaviour. However, the visitors noted that learners would benefit from relevant HCPC documents, such as the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, and the Guidance on conduct and ethics for students being more thoroughly embedded in the modules. They therefore suggest that the education provider revisits module reading lists to ensure that learners are appropriately signposted to these documents.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 23 November 2017 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available on our website.

HCPC approval process report

Table 1 (front page)

Education provider	University of Portsmouth
Name of programme(s)	Postgraduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice – Full time
	Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology – Full time
Approval visit date	5 – 6 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11974-J8D3P4

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Roseann Connolly	Lay
Jacqueline Bates-Gaston	Practitioner psychologist - Forensic psychologist
David Packwood	Practitioner psychologist - Counselling psychologist
Amal Hussein	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Mike Berry	Accreditation visitor	British Psychological Society
Jacqueline Wheatcroft	Accreditation visitor	British Psychological Society
Susan Quinn	Accreditation officer	British Psychological Society

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Postgraduate Diploma in Forensic Psychology Practice
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 February 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01739

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Programme name	Professional Doctorate in Forensic Psychology
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Practitioner psychologist
Modality	Forensic psychologist
First intake	01 Febuary 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 5
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01740

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	

Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	This is a new programme

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers and educators	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 45 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 16 October 2017.

3.12 **The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.**

Condition: The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised in line with any changes made to meet the conditions set as a result of this approval visit.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the external visiting panel from the British Psychological Society (BPS), it was clear that revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the external panel. The visitors consider the programme documentation that learner routinely refer to as an

important resource to support learners. In particular, the conditions set by internal panel referred to amendments to module descriptors, the programme specification document and the learner handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review revised documentation to ensure the resources to support learners are effectively used. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the learners routinely refer to.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The programme team must provide evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching and for managing situations when learners decline from participating.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors noted that the SETs mapping document (SET 4.10) submitted by the education provider stated that the process for obtaining appropriate consent from learners was contained in the placement handbook. In review of this documentation, the visitors were unable to locate the information relating to this standard in relation to learners. As such, the visitors did not see evidence of the formal protocols to obtain consent from learners when they participate as service users, or for managing situations when learners decline from participating as service users in practical sessions. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require evidence of the formal protocols for obtaining consent from learners before they participate as a service user in practical and clinical teaching. They also require evidence that demonstrates how learners are informed about the requirement for them to participate, and how records are maintained to indicate consent had been obtained. In particular, the visitors require evidence to show what alternative learning arrangements will be put in place so there would be no impact on their learning where learners decline participation.

5.7 Practice educators must undertake regular training which is appropriate to their role, learners' needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must demonstrate how they ensure that practice educators have undertaken the appropriate placement educator training.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice educators undertake regular training appropriate to their role, learner's needs and the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme. During programme team meeting, the visitors learnt that there are practice educator training options that are offered to practice educators including 'a three hour training session'. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities provided by the education provider for practice educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for learners. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Sunderland
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) in Paramedic Science and Out of Hospital Care, Full time
Approval visit date	12-13 September 2017
Case reference	CAS-11894-P4F3C8

Contents

Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

Section 1: Our regulatory approach

Our standards
We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally approved on an open-ended basis, subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed on our website.

How we make our decisions
We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint partner visitors to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view on our website.

HCPC panel
We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Susanne Roff	Lay
Vincent Clarke	Paramedic
John Donaghy	Paramedic
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit
There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Matthew Watson	Chair	University of Sunderland – Principal lecturer
Margaret Young	Secretary	University of Sunderland – Senior quality assurance and enhancement officer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) in Paramedic Science and Out of Hospital Care
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed First intake	01 April 2018
Maximum student cohort	Up to 80
Intakes per year	2
Assessment reference	APP01706

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meets our standards for the first time.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	These documents do not exist, as the programme is yet to run

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Yes	As the programme is not currently approved, there are no learners enrolled. Therefore, the visitors met learners from the education provider's HCPC-approved Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice programme
Senior staff	Yes	

Practice education providers and educators	Yes	
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	
Facilities and resources	Yes	

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors
In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions
Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that 37 of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 08 November 2017

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the programme documentation, including advertising materials, to ensure information about the programme and any associated requirements is provided to potential applicants, allowing them to make an informed decision about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: After scrutinising the evidence provided prior to the visit, the visitors understood that some of the pertinent admissions information about the programme was not contained in the documentation. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the criminal convictions checks and occupational health assessments are paid for by the education provider. However, they could not see information about what the occupational health check entails and how potential applicants would know what to expect prior to applying to the programme. Additionally, a screenshot of a different programme's website was tabled at the visit as a template that would be used for this programme. However, the visitors could not see the relevant information prospective applicants would need to see so that they can make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme. As such, the visitors could not see how prospective learners would be made aware of certain requirements and costs prior to application. In a review of the documentation, the visitors could not determine how the education provider communicates the following information to prospective applicants:

- the requirement for and process associated with the assessments;
- the requirement for and process associated with criminal convictions checks;
- any additional costs learners may incur over and above the usual programme fee;
- the expectation that learners will travel to placements at their own expense and that this is an additional cost for the learner;
- the elements of the programme to which accreditation of prior (experiential) learning could be applied, and how it would be applied;
- where placements may take place geographically;
- that exit awards on this programme do not confer eligibility to apply for HCPC registration and as such the named awards do not contain the protected title 'Paramedic'.

In discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that the education provider intends to provide information about the entry requirements, admissions processes and additional costs on the programme website. However, because the visitors did not have sight of this, they could not determine how this information would be appropriately communicated to prospective applicants. The visitors therefore require further information showing how prospective applicants are provided with the information they need to make an informed choice about whether to apply for a place on the programme.

2.5 The admissions process must ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with any health requirements.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their admissions processes ensure that applicants are aware of and comply with the health requirements for the programme.

Reason: In review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see what information is provided to applicants regarding the health requirements they must comply with to gain entry to the programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that information about the health requirements and processes would be communicated with applicants. However, the visitors could not ascertain how applicants would know what the health requirements are and the process they need to engage in to determine whether they comply with the requirements for the programme, prior to applying. As such, the visitors require further information about what the health requirements are for this programme, the process for ensuring applicants comply with those requirements, and how this is communicated to potential applicants. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the commitment to provide resources made by partner organisations to demonstrate that there are adequate partnerships in place and that the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: In a review of the documentation the visitors could not see information pertaining to the partnerships in place to deliver ambulance and non-ambulance practice-based learning. In discussions with the programme team and the practice providers, the visitors ascertained that there are a number of practice-based learning providers who will be involved in delivering practice based learning for this programme.

The visitors also heard that North East Ambulance Service (NEAS) has agreed and signed a service level agreement which arrived on day one of the visit. However, the visitors did not have sight of the agreement, as such they could not determine the details of the partnership arrangements between NEAS and the education provider. The visitors also heard, in the senior team meeting, that the education provider would extend the service level agreements that are currently in place for their HCPC-approved Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice programme. The education provider anticipates that this would provide assurances around the number of placements to be provided and the expectations of each party. In discussions with the practice educators, the visitors heard that some practice placement facilitators in the area meet to discuss the requirements of programmes in the area. However, providers are still in the initial stages of mapping placement provision in the area. The visitors also heard that NEAS could provide practice based learning to ten students on a rotation. As such, the visitors could not fully determine what each practice provider has agreed to provide as part of the partnership arrangements. The visitors were unable to see whether there are adequate partnerships in place to ensure that the practice providers can provide sufficient practice-based learning opportunities and commit sufficient staff resources to support the delivery of the programme. As such the visitors require further information to determine whether this standard is met.

3.1 The programme must be sustainable and fit for purpose.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the timeline for delivery across the full three years of the programme, including where practice based learning takes place and how this is resourced to demonstrate that the programme is sustainable and fit for purpose.

Reason: On reading the documentation prior to the visit, the visitors understood that the programme would have one cohort of 80 learners per year and learners would complete the programme after three years. However in discussions at the visit, the education provider confirmed that they are seeking approval for two cohorts of 80 learners per year. The documentation did not reflect this, so considering the proposed learner numbers and the staggering of two cohorts, the visitors could not see:
- the timeline for delivery;
- where placements would take place within the programme timeline; and
- how the programme would be resourced.

As such, the visitors require further information regarding the timeline for delivery of the programme and how the programme will be resourced for the number of learners on this programme across three years, considering the staggering of two cohorts. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.6 There must be an effective process in place to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning for all learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the process in place to ensure the availability of practice-based learning for all learners on the programme is effective.

Reason: This condition relates to the above condition. In a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that learners will undertake ambulance and non-ambulance practice based learning. However, the visitors could not see the process the

education provider uses to ensure that all practice providers have availability and capacity to provide placements for the number of learners on this programme. In discussion with the senior team, the visitors noted that the education provider is in the process of agreeing service levels with the practice providers. However, the visitors did not have sight of these agreements so they could not determine what arrangements are in place. In discussion with the practice educators, the visitors heard that practice placement facilitators meet to map the requirements for programmes in the area who require practice based learning opportunities, and then divide the placement opportunities between programmes. However, the visitors were unable to determine the clear and effective process in place to ensure that all practice based learning providers associated with this programme have availability and capacity to deliver practice-based learning for all learners. As such, the visitors required further information regarding the process the education provider uses to ensure there are sufficient practice based learning opportunities for all learners, across the three years, including the agreements in place between the education provider and the practice providers. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that they have adequate paramedic profession-specific equipment which is effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme and the number of learners on the programme.

Reason: On the tour of facilities, the visitors could not see the paramedic profession-specific equipment used to support the delivery of the programme. In discussion with the senior team, the visitors heard that a list of equipment specific to the paramedic profession was ordered and was yet to arrive. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider had a list of equipment they wished to purchase, however they were unable to purchase it. As such, the visitors could not determine how learners and educators would have access to the resources required to support learning on the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further details regarding what paramedic profession-specific equipment is available to learners and educators on this programme. This information should demonstrate that the resources to support learning at the education provider, is effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme and is accessible to all learners and educators. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

3.12 The resources to support learning in all settings must be effective and appropriate to the delivery of the programme, and must be accessible to all learners and educators.

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 review of the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted a number of inaccurate references to the HCPC. For instance, there were references made to the HCPC's former name, the "Health Professions Council", within the documentation. In addition, the visitors noted that the mentor handbook inaccurately refers to the 'Health and Care Professionals Council'. 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 determine whether the documentary resources available to support learning are being are effective and appropriate to ensure that this standard is met.

3.18 The education provider must ensure learners, educators and others are aware that only successful completion of an approved programme leads to eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide revised documentation to ensure that exit awards from the programme do not contain an HCPC protected title.

Reason: In their reading of the documentation provided, the visitors noted that exit awards for this programme include a Cert HE and Dip HE in paramedic practice. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors established that neither exit award would confer eligibility for the learner to apply to register with the HCPC. However, programmes which do not provide eligibility for students to apply for HCPC registration must not contain any reference to the HCPC protected title, 'paramedic', in the programme title. As such, the visitors require the education provider to amend the documentation and the exit award programme titles so that they do not contain reference to a protected title and will not lead to misinterpretation. In this way the visitors can establish whether this standard is met.

4.10 The programme must include effective processes for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the process learners use to obtain appropriate consent from service users is effective, and how learners are made aware of this process.

Reason: In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that the learners from the HCPC-approved Diploma in Higher Education Paramedic Practice programme no longer introduce themselves as trainee paramedics to service users (where this would be possible). In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the learners are taught to inform service users of their trainee paramedic status and request their consent to work with them every time they work with a service user. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require further information regarding the process used by learners to obtain appropriate consent from the service users, and assurances that this process is properly applied by learners in practice. Additionally, the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates how the education provider ensures the process is effective, to ascertain whether this standard is met.

5.2 The structure, duration and range of practice-based learning must support the achievement of the learning outcomes and the standards of proficiency.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide clarity about the range, duration and structure of practice based learning, to demonstrate that it supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for paramedics.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to see information regarding the structure, duration and range of placements for this programme. As such they were unable to determine how the two cohorts of 80 learners each year would have access to practice-based learning which supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics. In discussions with the senior team, programme team, and practice educators, the visitors understood that the education provider intends to ensure that there are practice-based learning opportunities in a variety of settings. However, the visitors were unable to establish what arrangements are in place between the education provider and the practice providers regarding delivery of practice based learning for this programme. The visitors were also unable to see when, where, and for how long the practice-based learning opportunities would take place, or how their approach will support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for paramedics. As such, the visitors require further evidence of the structure, duration and range of practice based learning for learners on this programme, and how it is appropriate to support the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs for paramedics. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.

5.3 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and ensuring the quality of practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the system used to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning is thorough and effective.

Reason: In a review of the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine the system used to approve and ensure the quality of practice-based learning for this programme. In discussion with the practice providers, the visitors heard that the practice placement facilitators (PPFs) conduct annual education audits of practice-based learning within the ambulance service through self-assessments. The visitors also heard that the clinical link tutor sits in on the education provider's audits. However, the visitors could not see evidence of the clear, thorough and effective system used by the education provider which demonstrates how the quality assurance systems mentioned are applied consistently to all practice-based learning environments. For instance, the visitors were unable to see how non-ambulance practice-based learning environments are approved and quality assured in a thorough and effective manner. As such the visitors require further clarity around the system used to approve and ensure the quality of all practice-based learning and how the education provider ensures it is thorough and effective, to determine whether that this standard is met.

5.4 Practice-based learning must take place in an environment that is safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that practice-based learning environments are safe and supportive for learners and service users.

Reason: This condition relates the above condition. In a review of the documentation, the visitors could not see the information to show how the education provider ensures that the practice based learning environments are safe and supportive for learners and service users. In discussion with the practice providers, the visitors heard that the practice placement facilitators (PPFs) conduct annual education audits of practice-based learning within the ambulance service through self-assessments. The visitors also heard that the clinical link tutor sits in on the education provider's audits. However,

the visitors could not see evidence of the process used by the education provider which ensures that all practice-based learning environments are safe and supportive for learners and service users. As such the visitors require further clarity around the process used to ensure that practice-based learning environments are safe and supportive to determine whether this standard is met.

5.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for the number of learners on the programme.

Reason: This condition relates to the other conditions regarding quality assurance of practice-based learning. The visitors read the documentation prior to the visit but were unable to establish how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. In discussion with the practice providers, the visitors noted that there are no formal arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice providers regarding the provision of practice-based learning. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence which articulates the arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice educators. Additionally, the visitors require evidence which clearly outlines the process used by the education provider to ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified and experienced staff involved in practice-based learning for this programme.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners on this programme.

Reason: This condition relates to the other conditions regarding quality assurance of practice-based learning. The visitors read the documentation prior to the visit but were unable to establish how the education provider ensures practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. In discussion with the practice providers, the visitors noted that there are no formal arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice providers, regarding the provision of practice-based learning. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence which articulates the arrangements in place between the education provider and the practice educators. Additionally, the visitors require evidence which clearly outlines the process used by the education provider to ensure that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to show how they ensure that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were unclear about how the education provider ensures that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support learners. The visitors heard that for 60 per cent of the time learners are supervised by practice placement educators (PPEds), however the visitors could not see the agreements in place that reflect this service level to be provided by the education providers. Consequently, the visitors were also unable to see how the education provider ensures that practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to show what arrangements have been agreed regarding the provision of practice educators on this programme and how the education provider ensures that those practice educators have the appropriate knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

5.8 Learners and practice educators must have the information they need in a timely manner in order to be prepared for practice‑based learning.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they provide learners and practice educators with the necessary information for them to be prepared for placement in a timely manner.

Reason: In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that learners are informed about where their practice-based learning will take place six weeks prior to its commencement. However, in discussion with the learners, the visitors heard that that learners had not been informed about where the following week's practice-based learning would take place. Due to the disparity in the information provided, the visitors require further information about how the education provider ensures that learners and practice educators receive the information they need in a timely manner. As such, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate how the education provider ensures that learners and practice educators receive the information they need in a timely manner.

6.4 Assessment policies must clearly specify requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the assessments polices clearly specify the requirements for progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: This condition relates to the condition for SET 5.2. The visitors reviewed the documentation and could not determine which learning outcomes are be linked to practice-based learning. As such they could not determine how practice-based learning supports the achievement of the learning outcomes and standards of proficiency for paramedics. Without having a clear understanding of what learning outcomes can be

achieved through the successful completion of practice based learning, the visitors could not determine how a learner would gain a clear understanding of the requirements for their progression and achievement within the programme. As such, the visitors require further evidence clearly articulating what learning outcomes are associated with practice-based learning and what the requirements are for learners to progress and achieve within the programme. In this way, the visitors can determine whether this standard is met.