

Performance review process report

Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University, Review period 2018-2022

Executive summary

This is a report of the performance review for the Scottish Ambulance Academy and Glasgow Caledonian University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

The education provider did not use the standard HCPC portfolio template to complete their submission. We decided to not request a re-submission after consultation with the visitors who agreed they would be able to make a decision based on the information submitted. This was because of the unusual nature of the education provider, which is a partnership between the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) and Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU). It only had one programme, the DipHE Paramedic Practice. As of July 2023, this programme has closed and the SAS-GCU collaboration will therefore not be an education provider after July 2023.

We have reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.

Through this assessment, we engaged in three quality activities in the following areas.

- We explored how the education provider has involved service users in its programme. We specifically asked for further information about how the education provider adapted to the disruption in this area during caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.
 - We explored how the education provider interacted with relevant external bodies during the review period. We were unable to identify from the information within the portfolio how the education provider managed relevant partnerships.
 - We explored the education provider's approach in the area of equality, diversity and inclusivity. We were unable to identify from the information within the portfolio what principles governed the EDI approach and how its outcomes were monitored.
 - The following are areas of best practice:
 - The education provider's flexible approach to progressing learners.
-

Previous consideration Not applicable. This is the education provider's first engagement with the performance review process.

Decision The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide whether to support the visitors' recommendations about the programme during the review period. No recommendations have been made around ongoing risks or a review period as the programme has now closed. The partnership has been dissolved and the education provider will no longer exist in its current form after the 2022-23 academic year.

Next steps N / A as the only programme delivered by the partnership is coming to a close and the collaboration itself will not be renewed.

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach.....	4
The performance review process.....	4
Thematic areas reviewed.....	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this Review period 2018-2022	5
Section 2: About the education provider.....	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	9
Portfolio submission.....	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	9
Quality theme 1 – Reflection on evaluation of service user involvement.....	9
Quality theme 2 – Reflection on management of relationships with external bodies	10
Quality theme 3 – Reflection on monitoring of equality and diversity procedures and policies	11
Section 4: Findings.....	11
Overall findings on performance	11
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	11
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	15
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	16
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	17
Data and reflections	18
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	19
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	19
Assessment panel recommendation.....	19
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution	20

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which 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.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the 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 takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this Review period 2018-2022

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Sue Boardman	Lead visitor, paramedic
Lucy Myers	Lead visitor, speech and language therapist
Ann Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 1 HCPC-approved programmes across 1 profession. It is a collaboration between an ambulance service and a higher education institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2011. The Scottish Ambulance Service and Glasgow Caledonian University work together to deliver a single DipHE that is now being taught out following the changes to HCPC SET 1 that required paramedics to have a degree-level qualification before they are eligible for admission to the Register.

The last annual monitoring took place in 2019-20 and there were no significant problems highlighted.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	01/06/2011

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	200	200	2022	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources

¹ An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available [here](#)

				<p>available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners at the benchmark.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	2%	Glasgow Caledonian University 2019-20	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data was sourced from data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects</p> <p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well learners were supported through the programme.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	95%	Glasgow Caledonian University 2019-20	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's</p>

				<p>performance has been maintained.</p> <p>We do not have specific HESA data for the Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)-Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) collaboration. However GCU score well generally in this area and the SAS-GCU programme has a specific pathway to deliver registered paramedics to SAS. We explored the education provider's ability to move learners on to next steps through considering their support for learners.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>There is no data available for this data point as the partnership is not involved in the TEF. We did not establish ongoing reporting as the SAS-GCU partnership was closed as of July 2023.</p>
Learner satisfaction	74.2%	83.5%	Glasgow Caledonian University 2019-20	<p>This NSS data was sourced at the summary level. This means the data is the provider-level public data</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has broadly maintained.</p> <p>We explored this by looking at how well learners were being supported and consulted on the programme.</p>

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

We have reported on how the provider is performing on all areas, including the areas below, through the [Summary of findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – Reflection on evaluation of service user involvement

Area for further exploration: The portfolio contained minimal information about service user involvement. This included a brief narrative outlining where the service users had input into the programme. The education provider also noted that their service user involvement had been significantly disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic and that they had struggled to reintroduce it at the same level.

The portfolio did not sufficient reflections on the roles and input service users had on the programme. It did not, for example, give information about how service user involvement was evaluated, monitored and developed during the review period For example, how feedback from service users and carers or had been considered and acted upon. The visitors were therefore unable to determine the service users and carers' contribution to the quality of delivery. We sought assurance learners who had graduated from this programme had been appropriately prepared to work with service users.

The visitors therefore sought reflections from the education provider about the contribution of service users and carers to the delivery of the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided that a virtual meeting would be the most effective and straightforward way to explore this theme with the education provider.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider stated that, despite the disruption to their normal service user involvement by COVID-19, they had been able to maintain service user input through practice-based learning. Each learner was

required to discuss experiences with service users during their regular monitoring sessions with practice educators and programme staff. The education provider explained during the meeting that they had used practice placements creatively to ensure that learners continued to have opportunities to interact with service users and develop good communications, a respectful manner and other skills.

The visitors considered that this was a reasonable response and that it showed learners had continued to have access to service users throughout the programme. They therefore concluded that performance in this area had been satisfactory.

Quality theme 2 – Reflection on management of relationships with external bodies

Area for further exploration: The education provider's portfolio contained some information on which external bodies they had relationships. However, there was no reflection on how these relationships were maintained and developed. The visitors were therefore unable to determine how the education provider had performed in this area.

In particular the visitors decided to explore more about:

- the education provider's interaction with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education,
- the assessment of practice education providers by external bodies, and
- communication with other professional regulators / professional bodies.

Without more information around these areas, the visitors could not make a clear judgment about the education provider's performance in keeping their programme appropriately aligned with external standards and guidelines. However, they did also note that given the unique position of this education provider, the investigation would need to be proportionate.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided that a virtual meeting would be the most effective and straightforward way to explore this theme with the education provider.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider stated that they had not had an assessment under the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (UKQCHE) during the review period. This may be due to the unusual status of the programme, a collaboration between a higher education institution (HEI) and a paramedic service. They also stated that, regarding external bodies, they kept in engaged with current College of Paramedic guidance. This was done by programme staff and the responsible contacts at the Scottish Ambulance Service, who were registered active paramedics. External examiners also had oversight over the programme, and their feedback had been included in the portfolio. The education provider stated also that internal quality processes at Glasgow Caledonian University had also been followed in developing and ensuring the quality of the programme.

The visitors considered that this was an appropriate response, given the position and status of the programme. They were satisfied that during the review period there had been appropriate and timely interaction with appropriate external bodies. They were

also satisfied that there were mechanisms for updating and developing the curriculum in response to the College of Paramedics, where appropriate.

Quality theme 3 – Reflection on monitoring of equality and diversity procedures and policies

Area for further exploration: In the portfolio the education provider stated that they had equality and diversity policies. However, they did not provide clear reflections on how they had ensured the programme was meeting equality and diversity requirements. They mentioned institutional equality and diversity policies but without any reference to their specific application. The visitors considered that without this information they could not make an informed judgment about performance in this area and so they wished to explore it further through quality activity.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided that a virtual meeting would be the most effective and straightforward way to explore this theme with the education provider.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider stated that they relied on the equality and diversity policies of the Scottish Ambulance Service and Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU). During the meeting, they stated that they were bound by the monitoring requirements of GCU and that this was the main mechanism by which they sought to ensure that the programme was following appropriate procedures. These policies and procedures were available if necessary.

The visitors considered this was a reasonable response given the nature of the education provider, an SAS-GCU collaboration. They agreed it would have been disproportionate to expect the collaboration to develop specific programme-level policies when employees of the SAS and GCU – which all staff and learners were – are bound by those organisations' policies. The visitors therefore concluded that performance in this area was good and that they did not need to explore any further.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - The education provider stated in the submission the programme was a collaboration between the Scottish Ambulance Service and Glasgow Caledonian University. The aim was to enable drawing on the resources and structures from both institutions.

- The education provider's reflection of this area was limited. However, the visitors are satisfied there was sufficient information to demonstrate the programme was appropriately resourced and managed.
- The majority of learners had completed the programme by in September 2022. A "skeleton" level of staffing had been retained for a small number of learners still completing their studies. The visitors considered how the programme performed during the review period. This was set out in the introduction to the submission.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The single programme delivered by this education provider was a product of a partnership between two organisations, the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) and Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU). They explained within their submission the structure of the programme and how the two partners worked together to deliver the programme. The aim of the programme was to upskill the paramedic technician workforce to enable eligibility for HCPC registration.
 - They reflected on how well this partnership had worked and noted how they had amended the programme in response to changing workforce needs.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory. The collaboration between SAS and GCU had delivered well during the lifetime of the programme, as evidenced by external examiner feedback.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - The education provider reflected on how the programme team were primarily responsible for academic quality. There were also mechanisms for accountability at both individual institution level.
 - They reflected on how quality had been maintained during the review period, in particular relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. This was highly disruptive to the programme and required them to extend an external examiner's contract and to restructure teaching and assessment responsibilities. The education provider also reflected on how they had used the mechanisms available within the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) to maintain quality. This reflection showed they used the regular reporting sessions for practice educators to highlight any issues with learners and to ensure relevant actions were taken.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider had adapted appropriately to the difficult quality assessment conditions of the pandemic. They noted that the education provider's reflection on the challenges of this period was honest and they are satisfied with their performance in this area.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The education provider's strategy for interprofessional education was to use multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) in hospital settings. Within the portfolio, they reflected on the challenges they experienced with regards to ensuring good access for all learners to these MDTs. These problems were especially acute during the COVID-19 pandemic. They reflected on how their close relationship with hospital trust management enabled learners to continue to access MDTs.

- The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory because the education provider had provided an honest reflection on how they adapted and addressed their challenges.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they used service users in teaching and learning activities. Service users were used to teach learners patient consultation using the “Calgary Cambridge” model, which focuses on developing good interaction techniques. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, service users were involved in programme board meetings. However, these arrangements were disrupted by COVID-19 and were not reinstated.
 - They submitted limited reflection regarding how their feedback from service users indicated a desire to more closely involved in developing learners’ professional skills. However, it was not clear to the visitors whether this was taken forward, so they decided to explore this area through [quality activity](#).
- **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider did not submit reflection on this area through the portfolio.
 - The visitors therefore considered that they would explore the education provider’s approach through quality activity. Following quality activity, they considered that performance in this area had been satisfactory because the education provider had found ways to involve service users.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The education provider did not present much reflection on future planning due to the fact the programme was in its teach-out phase. However, there was strong evidence in the portfolio they had done effective reflection on the future earlier in the review period. They had, for example, considered the programme’s future in the light of changes to the HCPC SET 1, concerning the level of qualification required for paramedic registrants. They had also considered the changes to paramedic education being undertaken by NHS Education Scotland. As noted elsewhere through this report, the education provider responded strongly to the COVID-19 pandemic. This took the form of clear, detailed planning for continued programme delivery post-pandemic. These included new pathways for learners to make up for missed learning and teaching, and more use of technology.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory. This was because they had seen a thorough and transparent account of the horizon-scanning response to COVID-19.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: The visitors considered that the education provider’s work to maintain access to interprofessional education during the COVID-19 pandemic was effective and appropriate.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider had faced significant disruption from COVID-19. This was because all their learners were qualified paramedic technicians who were still employees of the ambulance trust. As a result, they returned to working as normal to relieve the pressure on the emergency services. They reflected on how they had managed these difficulties. This included restructuring parts of the programme and making allowances for learners to submit assignments later.
 - The visitors agreed this was a helpful and transparent reflection, because it gave them a clear sense of what had happened and how it had been managed. The education provider also submitted information relating to how they had managed the downstream disruption to the programme structure. This involved moving assessment points and providing more flexibility for learners who might need to retake or delay parts of the programme.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they adapted to learners returning to work during the covid-19 pandemic. They noted the programme had been previously heavily reliant on face-to-face teaching and they had a steep learning curve in moving to more remote learning. Programme staff, for example, had needed to learn to use new technologies and digital tools, and had needed to demonstrate their ability. Learners also had to adapt to new teaching and learning activities. The education provider noted that overall, this had been a good experience and that learners had reported broad satisfaction with the changes.
 - The visitors considered the education provider had performed well in this area. Although they were starting from a low base in terms of technology-enhanced learning, they were able to roll out more remote learning as necessary. They did not reflect in the portfolio on future use of technology as the programme is teaching out and most learners had completed by the end of 2022.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - Not applicable – the nature of the education provider means that they do not have any apprenticeships and will not be running any in the future.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider did not provide any specific reflection in this area. This is partly due to the nature of the programme, which is a professionally-focused collaboration rather than a programme directly supported by a higher education institution.
 - The visitors considered that this was something they would like to explore through quality activity. [In the quality activity](#) the education provider stated that they had not an assessment under the UK Quality Code during the review period.
 - The visitors therefore considered that performance in this area was good.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - The education provider did not provide any specific reflections in this area. The unusual position of the single programme provides some explanation for this.
 - However, the visitors did consider that they would explore this area through quality activity. In the quality activity, the education provider gave reassurances that they had continued to monitor current College of Paramedic guidance on practice-based learning through programme staff and practice educators, who were all registered paramedics. External examiners also provided feedback on learners' attainment in their clinical placements.
 - In the light of the quality activity, the visitors considered that performance in this area was good. Evidence had been provided that during the review period there had been appropriate and timely oversight.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - The education provider do not participate directly in the National Student Survey. However, one of the partners in the collaboration, Glasgow Caledonian University, scored well above their benchmark in overall learner satisfaction (see data table above).
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good based on the information available to them. The portfolio gave evidence of consultation with learners, especially around mitigation of the COVID-19 impact. It was clear from the reflection provided that the education provider had ways of monitoring and responding to learner views.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - Not applicable for Scottish Higher Education institutions.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider did not submit reflection on this area in the portfolio. Based on what they had seen throughout the submission, the visitors did not have many specific concerns, but they did consider that they wished to explore this area through quality activity.
 - [In the quality activity](#), the education provider noted that they monitored College of Paramedics guidance and communications during the review period, via both programme staff and Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) staff.

- External examiners also gave feedback to the programme, which was included in the portfolio. Internal quality processes at Glasgow Caledonian University had also been used to reflect on the quality of the programme, and take action where necessary.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**
 - The education provider submitted a detailed plan for managing the teaching out and closure of the programme. This included amendments to the timetable because of COVID-19 disruption and protocols for giving extra time to those who required it. They had reflected on what support might be required for various kinds of learner, and on how they could best recover from COVID-19.
 - The visitors considered that performance was good in this area. The reflections had been thorough and transparent and had taken into account all factors which might affect how learners would be affected.
 - There was no reflection on how the curriculum might change in future as the single programme was teaching out.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - The education provider did not identify any areas where they had needed to reflect changes in professional body guidance during the review period.
 - The visitors considered that this was reasonable, given the nature of the single programme provided by the education provider.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
 - The education provider noted that at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, their learners were required to return to their full-time duties. This was disruptive to the programme because the learners' professional responsibilities had to take priority over their participation in the programme. The programme structure meant most practice-based learning took place in the learners' normal workplaces.
 - The education provider reflected on how they had managed these difficulties. This included restructuring the programme and the assessment and seeking new opportunities for learners to achieve competencies. The education provider noted that they relaxed placement hours requirements in certain areas while maintaining appropriate assessment to ensure that skills were acquired.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area had been good during the review period. This was because they had seen evidence of how the education provider had adapted to very serious challenges around capacity.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: The visitors were impressed by the comprehensive approach taken to planning the closure of the programme.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners –**
 - The education provider stated that there were both formal and informal channels for learners to give their views on the programme, and to contribute to development. They included some reflection on how learners' input had been considered in relation to the COVID-19 disruption and restructuring. This input had been gathered through learner representation on the programme and from informal contacts.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because they had seen in the portfolio examples of how learner feedback had been considered. For example, the education provider reflected in some detail on how they had helped learners cope with the reported negative effects of isolation and separation during COVID-19 mitigation measures. They took into account the strong overall satisfaction score that Glasgow Caledonian University achieved in the National Student Survey.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider stated that there were regular opportunities for practice educators to liaise with the programme staff and to have input into programme development. Due to the nature of the programme, practice educators working at the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) were closely integrated into the teaching and assessment structure. This is because learners were spending several days a week in practice-based learning and the staff from Glasgow Caledonian University generally had close professional relationships with the practice educators.
 - The visitors considered that performance was good in this area. The role of practice educators in the programme was appropriate and there was some reflection on how their feedback at the time of COVID-19 had enabled the programme team to adapt effectively.
- **External examiners –**
 - The key area for reflection here was the education provider's extension of their contract with the external examiner for the programme. This happened because the education provider realised that they would still have some learners on the programme during the whole of the 2022-23 academic year.
 - The visitors considered that performance in this area was good. Clear evidence was provided of a strong working relationship with the external examiner, for example ongoing communications with them and a responsiveness to their suggestions. It was also clear that

programme staff had considered how to manage external quality assurance during the unexpected extension of the programme.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: The education provider's realisation of the need to extend an external examiner contract was part of a culture of good forward planning.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel: The visitors considered the data as part of their decision-making. None of the data points they considered suggested issues that required further exploration.

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - We do not have programme-level data on this point for the partnership between Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU) and the Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS). However, we do have data for GCU. They score well generally in this area and are themselves being assessed through performance review in the 2022-23 cycle. We did not consider there were any issues in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - We do not have specific data for the Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)-Scottish Ambulance Service (SAS) partnership. However, GCU score well generally in this area and the SAS-GCU programme has a specific pathway to deliver registered paramedics to SAS.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - As a Scottish education provider, the partnership is not involved with the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). However, we saw evidence in the portfolio that there are processes in place by which the partnership can maintain the quality of its provision. It makes good use of the mechanisms available at both Glasgow Caledonian University and the Scottish Ambulance Service.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - Although this partnership is not included in NSS, one of the collaboration partners, Glasgow Caledonian University, scored very well. This suggests that learners were generally satisfied.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider reflected in the portfolio on how they had managed learner numbers, and how they had monitored which learners would need extra time to complete the programme, for various reasons. The visitors considered that this was good reflection and that they did not need to explore further in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that there were no risks identified for learners who have graduated from the programme provided by this education provider.

The visitors did not need to recommend a period until the next performance review. This is because the collaboration between the Scottish Ambulance Service and Glasgow Caledonian University which constitutes the education provider in this case has now come to an end.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
DipHE Paramedic Practice	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/06/2011