Approval process report

University of Greenwich, paramedic, 2022-23

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve paramedic programmes at University of Greenwich. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programmes against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programmes are fit to practice.

We have recommended all standards are met, and that the programmes should be approved.

The Panel should note that although we will be recording two new programmes if the visitors' recommendation is accepted, the two programmes are identical and have therefore been considered as one. They are being delivered on two different campuses belonging to the education provider.

[if observations supplied] The education provider supplied observations which [will be / were] considered in decision making.

Through this assessment, we have noted that the following are areas of best practice:
- o Programme design, and
- o Innovative use of simulation.

Additional detail about best practice can be found .

Previous consideration	Not applicable as this case did not arise from a previous case.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide whether the programmes are approved.
Next steps	The panel is asked to decide whether they agree the visitors' recommendation that the programmes be approved.

Included within this report

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 approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programmes detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programmes' approval / 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 approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:
- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)
- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

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

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

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

John Donaghy	Lead visitor, paramedic
Jason Comber	Lead visitor, paramedic
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

Executive-led assessment was appropriate for stage 1 in this case. There did not appear to be any unusual features of the proposed apprenticeship programme, and the education provider was not new or a non-traditional provider.

Paramedicine is not new provision at the education provider The proposed apprenticeship programme builds on the structures and approaches of the existing paramedic programmes.

The approval request form (ARF) supplied by the education provider suggested that the institution-level standards were likely to be met in a similar way on the proposed new apprenticeship as on the existing programmes.

Based on the information available, there were no plans to meet any institution-level standards in significantly different ways.

There was also no need to request further information to support stage 1. We had sufficient information to consider whether the stage 1 standards are met.

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 11 HCPC-approved programmes across 3 professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2007.

The University of Greenwich engaged in the approval process in the legacy model of quality assurance to deliver full and part time BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) and BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner programmes, at their campus in Greenwich, London. They also proposed to deliver the same programmes with their partner Truro and Penwith College while retaining overall responsibility for the delivery, design and award of the qualifications for all the programmes.

The university engaged in the major change process in the legacy model of quality assurance to introduce a Paramedic Degree Apprenticeship programme with both Full-Time and Part-Time modes in September 2021.

They also deliver the BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy since 2018 which is validated by Canterbury Christ Church University, which is a reciprocal arrangement where University of Greenwich validate the programme for them. They had previously delivered this as a PgDip Speech and Language Therapy with the same arrangement, which they closed through the programme closure process in 2020.

The last annual monitoring was 2018-19 in the legacy model of quality assurance.

They are also currently engaging in further approval process review for Speech and Language Therapy and Physiotherapy programmes in 2023.

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	Operating Department Practitioner	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2021
	Paramedic	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2011
	Speech and language therapist	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2007

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 programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	266	351	May 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 available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	3%	4%	2020-21	This data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests

				the provider is performing below sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because we did not consider that the small disparity here pointed to any specific issues around learner retention in the HCPC provision.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	96%	2019-20	This data was sourced from summary data. This means the data is the provider-level public data. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because it indicated good performance by the education provider in moving people on to next steps appropriately. There was nothing in the submission to raise concerns about this aspect.

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Silver	June 2017	The definition of a Silver TEF award is "Provision is of high quality, and significantly and consistently exceeds the baseline quality threshold expected of UK Higher Education." We did not explore this data point through this assessment because the strong ranking suggested good quality teaching and nothing we saw in the documentation indicated any issues in this area.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	76.1%	76.2%	2022	This data was sourced from the summary. This means the data is the provider-level public data The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because the education provider being in line with its benchmark suggests that the education provider will be able to meet the standards around learner support and involvement. The documentation confirmed this view.

				The education provider has been undertaking HCPC performance review during the 2022-23 academic year. A recommendation around review cycle length has not yet been finalised.
HCPC performance review cycle length				

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme(s) aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme(s), the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Information for applicants** –
  - Applicants will be provided with most of the same information for the proposed apprenticeship programme as on the education provider's existing undergraduate programmes. The education provider has centralised requirements for programmes to make their requirements available on a website, in the form of a template. The requirements specific to the apprenticeship will be communicated throughout the admissions process.
  - The School of Health Sciences – which is the faculty in which the new programme sits – requires that discipline-specific staff are available at Open Days to answer questions as necessary.
  - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider operates, based on the information seen in the baselining document.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health** –
  - The education provider has centralised requirements for how individual programmes assess language, character and health.
  - The approach for the proposed apprenticeship programme set out in the approval request form is closely aligned to the approach already used at the education provider. It involves an interview, a specific proficiency test for English language skills, a Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) check, and an occupational health assessment. The education provider will co-operate with the employer through the process to ensure suitability. We know that there is alignment with existing approaches based on a

comparison with the information we have already gathered through the baselining exercise.

- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)** –
  - o There is an established mechanism at the education provider for assessing what they refer to as Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL). This is governed by a policy. There are specific arrangements and thresholds set out in the policy, and these will be operative on the apprenticeship.
  - o The education provider state that "RPL claims can be made for individual modules or where a known programme has been tariffed by the school there is the potential to RPL 50% of a course."
  - o This is closely aligned with the provider's existing approach, which they have set out in the baseline document.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)** –
  - o This area is governed by an institutional policy at the university level, focused on equal opportunity for all.
  - o This approach to EDI will be applied to admissions on the proposed apprenticeship programme. The proposed approach for this programme is therefore closely aligned with the overall institutional approach.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register[1]** –
  - o There has been approved paramedic provision at the education provider for more than a decade. They have existing undergraduate programmes in this curriculum area. The proposed apprenticeship programme is closely based on this existing provision and will incorporate many of the same modules and assessments.
  - o The education provider has the staff, and the institutional infrastructure and experience, to deliver Level 6 education in physiotherapy, as required by the proposed apprenticeship programme.
- **Sustainability of provision** –
  - o All new programmes at the education provider are required to demonstrate that they are sustainable and suitable. As part of this they must complete detailed new programme proposal forms, demonstrate that they have completed market research, and return a detailed business plan. They are expected to supply learner number projections and plans for achieving and maintaining those numbers.
  - o The education provider notes through the approval request form (ARF) that as a large provider of allied health professional (AHP) education, they have access to a large pool of expertise, experience and knowledge for delivering programmes effectively.

---

[1] This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- o The arrangements for maintaining programme sustainability are appropriate. We are confident of this based on the above information.
- **Effective programme delivery** –
  - o As noted, the education provider has been delivering approved paramedic programmes at Level 6 for more than ten years. This means there is a large amount of institutional experience and expertise available, as well as the facilities to deliver physiotherapy.
  - o Additionally, there are several layers of internal quality monitoring, notably programme committees and module review mechanisms. These are within the School of Health Sciences (SHS) which has its own requirements for programmes to recruit appropriately and maintain staff expertise. All programmes are expected to make annual reports to ensure their ongoing effectiveness and viability.
  - o Considering this, we are confident that the proposed apprenticeship programme can be delivered effectively and align with existing approaches.
- **Effective staff management and development** –
  - o Development and management systems in place at the education provider will be used for the proposed new apprenticeship as well. This assessment is based on the information provided about institutional requirements of programmes set out in the approval request form (ARF).
  - o These include appraisals, a Learning & Talent Development policy, and a university-level academic workload monitoring system.
  - o Based on this information we can be confident that the mechanisms in place in this area are appropriate and will be applied on the proposed apprenticeship programme.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level** –
  - o In the approval request form (ARF) the education provider notes that there is a university-wide strategy for managing stakeholder relationships. The School of Health Sciences has strong arrangements for managing relationships with practice partners. For example, there is a Quality Lead for Practice Based Learning.
  - o All programmes at the provider are expected to work within the Practice-Based Learning Governance Framework, which sets out expectations and roles for relationships between the education provider and practice partners. All HCPC-approved programmes are required to operate within this framework.
  - o The information provided suggests that the education provider will be able to use existing arrangements appropriately on the proposed apprenticeship programme.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Academic quality** –

- o The proposed apprenticeship programme will follow all the established procedures at the education provider for monitoring and enhancing quality. They have supplied relevant regulations. This in line with their established approach.
  - o The proposed apprenticeship programme has already been approved internally using the education provider's quality assurance processes.
  - o We can be confident in the education provider approach in this area given their institutional experience and the comprehensive information supplied.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments** –
  - o Audit of employer partners will be carried out via the existing arrangements as laid out in the documentation linked to via the approval request form. There is a specific onboarding process for new placements. Subsequently the Pan London Practice Learning Group Audit is applied on a biennial basis. Practice partners are also invited to the Practice Learning Panel on termly basis which includes self-reporting for quality assurance.
  - o The education provider confirmed there will be regular reviews for learners on proposed apprenticeship programme.
  - o These arrangements are aligned with existing quality practice at the education provider.
- **Learner involvement** –
  - o Similar mechanisms will be used to gather and implement learner feedback on the new apprenticeship as on the existing HCPC-approved provision. These include internal surveys and thrice-yearly tripartite meetings between apprentices, practice educators and programme staff.
  - o The education provide note additionally that learners "are represented on all key University, Faculty & School forums via programme representatives and the student's union."
  - o We can be satisfied with the alignment of the proposed apprenticeship programme and the existing arrangements at the education provider.
- **Service user and carer involvement** –
  - o There is a Service User & Carer Strategy produced by the School of Health Sciences, which sets out in detail the expectations and requirements around programmes' use of service users and carers. The approval request form states that service users and carers have been involved with the development of the apprenticeship from the very beginning. This is in line with the requirements at the education provider.
  - o It is clear from the approval request form and the baseline document that the proposed apprenticeship programme will be aligned with the existing appropriate approaches.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Support** –

- o The approval request form sets out detailed policies and procedures in place at the education provider for supporting learners and managing their various needs. These include anti-discrimination policies, a Personal Tutoring Policy, an extenuating circumstances policy, and a Fitness to study procedure.
- o These policies are comprehensive and appropriate and cover all areas of potential learner needs. Additionally for the apprenticeship, the tripartite meetings noted above will be part of the support arrangements. Notably the education provider states that the professional body requirements around learner support are incorporated into their approach.
- o These arrangements are appropriate, and the proposed apprenticeship programme will be closely aligned with them.

- **Ongoing suitability** –
  - o The education provider have detailed policies dealing with different aspects of ongoing suitability. At the start of their programmes, all learners on health professional education must complete health and good character declarations. These are also required at the start of year 2 and upon completion of the programme.
  - o Additionally, learners on the proposed apprenticeship programme will have access to the whole suite of support at the education provider, if there are concerns about academic performance or professional suitability.
  - o These arrangements are appropriate. We can be confident from the evidence reviewed that the proposed apprenticeship programme will be appropriately aligned with them.

- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)** –
  - o The approach by the School of Health Sciences is centred on co-operation between all allied health professional (AHP) programmes. At the education provider these include nursing, midwifery, operating department practitioners and physiotherapy.
  - o It is also envisaged that learners undertake IPL in placements as part of multidisciplinary teams. There are particularly good opportunities for this on the proposed apprenticeship as the learners will be spending so much of their time in the workplace. They are also more closely integrated with a workplace because of their existing employment.
  - o The proposed approach for the proposed apprenticeship programme is aligned with the existing provision and will be able to deliver the required IPL for the apprentices.

- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –
  - o As noted above the proposed apprenticeship programme is intended to use the education provider's detailed approach to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). There are numerous policies and procedures in place covering many different aspects of the EDI area.
  - o Employers hosting apprentices on the proposed apprenticeship programme will be required to undertake EDI assessments in order to ensure that they are appropriate settings.
  - o We can therefore be confident that the proposed apprenticeship programme's alignment will enable the relevant standards to be met.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

<u>Assessment</u>

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Objectivity** –
  - o There are detailed policies in place at the education provider governing assessment. These include the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards and the Assessment & Feedback Policy. The approval request form states that these will be adhered to on the proposed apprenticeship programme.
  - o The information provided strongly suggests that the apprenticeship's alignment with current practice will be appropriate, with changes made as necessary.
- **Progression and achievement** –
  - o Similar to 'Objectivity' above, there are detailed policies in place governing fair progression and achievement. These include Academic Regulations for Taught Awards, the Assessment Misconduct Procedure and the Examination Conduct Regulations.
  - o The education provider note that because of the nature of health professional programmes, academic misconduct may be considered a professional suitability issue.
  - o The approval request form does not mention arrangements for the End Point Assessment but this can be explored through stage 2 (<u>see page 22 below</u>).
  - o The approach used for this area appears appropriate and is aligned closely with existing provision.
- **Appeals** –
  - o Learners will have access to appeals through the normal pathways governed by appropriate policies. The proposed apprenticeship programme will not use different approaches in this area and therefore we can be confident that there is alignment between the apprenticeship and the existing provision.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science Degree Apprenticeship (London)	FT (Full time)	Paramedic	20 learners. 1 cohort	11/09/2023
BSc Hons Paramedic Science Degree Apprenticeship (Medway)	FT (Full time)	Paramedic	20 learners. 1 cohort	11/09/2023

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. 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 met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the Findings section.

Quality theme 1 – Support for learners in clinical settings

Area for further exploration: The education provider submitted a Draft Year Planner. This set out how they intended to manage capacity in practice-based learning for all learners across the year. They stated that they intended to seek twenty learners per cohort in partnership with local ambulance Trusts. The learners on the programme would be employees of these Trusts who wished to become registered paramedics.

The Draft Year Planner helped the visitors understand the planning for the programme. However, the education provider did not submit information showing how they would ensure that all learners were appropriately supported. The visitors therefore determined that they would like to explore this area through quality activity. Specifically, they wanted to explore whether there was a defined structure in place to ensure that all learners were supported during their clinical learning. They

considered that this was especially important because the learners would be spending large amounts of time in the clinical settings, because of the nature of the programme.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: To further explore this area, we requested email clarification. We considered this the most effective way for us to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider submitted a narrative explaining how they intend to support learners in clinical settings. In this narrative they noted that before any learner begins the programme, their individual needs are discussed by the programme lead, the employer, and the university apprenticeship manager. The education provider also stated that availability of appropriate ongoing support is a key part of these discussions. All parties sign a commitment statement which outlines the outcome of the discussions. They are required to abide by the arrangements agreed.

The education provider's response also sets out the frequent opportunities for issues to be raised by themselves, employers or learners, during the course of the programme. These include regular tripartite meetings and programme committee meetings.

The visitors considered that this additional evidence demonstrated that there were defined pathways of support for learners on the programme. Before and during the programme, learners would have access to different forms of individualised support, which were recorded in writing and regularly revisited and referred to. They therefore considered that the relevant standards were met.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
    - The education provider set out their admissions requirements in the mapping exercise, referring to the more detailed information available in the programme specification document.
    - They stated that "academic and professional references" would be sought to ensure that learners were suited to the programme. Applicants would be required to have maths and English qualifications in line with the requirements of the Institute of Apprenticeships. Applicants would need 112 UCAS points or equivalent, and would need to be an eligible employee of a healthcare provider, with the support of an employer.
    - The visitors sought to clarify exactly was meant by "academic and professional references". The education provider response set out their expectation that applicants would have a strong healthcare background, and employers would set out in detail their reasons for thinking that applicants were suitable for the programme. They gave examples of the two pathways on to the programme. The first is for learners who had non-ambulance healthcare experience, who will take four years to complete the programme. The second is for learners with experience of working in emergency medicine who can demonstrate that they meet the year one standards of proficiency. These candidates will take three years to complete the programme – they are using Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning (AP(E)L) to go straight into year two of the programme.
    - The visitors considered that the relevant standard was met, as the education provider was applying appropriate academic and professional entry standards. This should enable those admitted to the programme to have as good a chance of completing the programme.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
    - The education provider set out their approach to this SET in their mapping document and supporting evidence. In support of the standards requiring effective collaboration with practice education providers, the education provider noted their university-level Practice Based Learning Governance Framework (PBLGF). Under this framework, practice partners will attend termly Practice Learning Panels (PLPs). They also stated that there will be regular meetings between Partner Relationship Managers and link staff at the relevant employers. These link staff will also attend regular tripartite meetings of learners, programme staff and employer representatives, to stay in touch with operational concerns. These mechanisms will be used to maintain relationships and to maintain capacity.

- o The education provider noted that they have access to specialists from other relevant fields, such as physiotherapy and occupational therapy. Staff CVs were submitted to demonstrate the relevant expertise and knowledge of the available educators. They explained they support which will be provided to learners and practice educators. They explored the specifics of how learners would be supported in practice through quality activity 1.
  - o Regarding support for practice educators, the visitors asked the education provider to clarify how they would ensure practice educators had access to programme materials. The education provider noted that they provide regular practice educator study days where practice educators can access appropriate materials. They also referred to the practice assessment documents (PADs), which contain extensive guidance and information for practice educators.
  - o There was sufficient evidence to satisfy the visitors that all standards within this SET area have been met
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery** –
  - o The education provider submitted a programme specification and a standards of proficiency (SOPs) mapping document. These documents support the standards requiring alignment between learning outcomes and SOPs, and between learning outcomes and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs).
  - o The programme specification document also contained information about how the education provider has used the most to date guidance on curriculum design from the College of Paramedics (COP). Similarly, they also demonstrated alignment with the Standards of Apprenticeship for Paramedics.
  - o The education provider referred to the programme specification to demonstrate that their curriculum was designed to be flexible so that they could remain relevant to current practice. They also noted that they intend to use specific opportunities offered by an apprenticeship format to keep the programme up to date. For example, learners will be spending a lot of time in clinical settings so they will be well-placed to note and discuss current practice.
  - o The education provider cited the programme specification to demonstrate that the programme had appropriate learning and teaching methods, and that it would develop autonomous, evidence-based practice. The programme specification set out a wide range of teaching methods. It also included clear requirements within the modules for learners to understand the evidence underpinning their practice, and to develop professional self-reliance.
  - o There was sufficient evidence to satisfy the visitors that all standards within this SET area have been met
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning** –
  - o The education provider demonstrated that practice-based learning was integral to the programme by citing the detail of the structure in the programme specification and the module descriptors.

- o They used some of the same evidence to demonstrate that the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning was appropriate. Additionally, they referred to the practice assessment documents (PADs) to show that the clinical learning would be integrated with academic learning appropriately. They also used PADs to show that learners would be required to spend sufficient time mastering the required range of specific competencies.
  - o The education provider stated they would liaise closely with local stakeholders to ensure recruitment matched availability. All practice educators would be required to hold at least a Unit 1 on the Certificate in Practice Education. The education provider confirmed that there were several channels through which the real-time information could drive action as necessary. These include the managers overseeing the tripartite meetings between employer, learner and education provider, programme committee meetings, and – at the strategic level – the Partnership Board. They stressed that they were keeping numbers relatively low to ensure that these processes were not overwhelmed.
  - o There was sufficient evidence to demonstrate to the visitors that all standards within this SET area are met. This was because the education provider had clear mechanisms to ensure that practice-based learning was fit for purpose, integrated with the other parts of the programme, and overseen by appropriate practice educators.
- **SET 6: Assessment** –
  - o The programme specification and the module descriptors showed how the assessment strategy and design would effectively test whether learners had met the standards of proficiency (SOPs). A wide range of summative and formative assessment methods were planned, giving learners the opportunity to show they could meet the SOPs.
  - o Similarly, the practice assessment document (PAD) and programme handbook were cited to demonstrate that assessment would ensure the learners met the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs). These documents showed that the education provider had a coherent approach to ensuring learners' knowledge of the SCPEs was assessed.
  - o The visitors reviewed the Year 3 PAD to ensure they had complete understanding of the assessment approach. They wanted to understand more about how assessment at that stage of the programme was preparing learners to practise independently.
  - o Module descriptors and the programme specification showed how assessment methods were effective in measuring the learning outcomes. There was close alignment in these documents between assessment methods and learning outcomes.
  - o The education provider submitted information relating to the End Point Assessment (EPA). This had not been mentioned in stage 1 and we considered that it could be reviewed through stage 2. The visitors considered that the EPA was appropriately integrated with the rest of the assessment.

- o The visitors were satisfied that the education provider had adequately demonstrated that all standards within this SET area have been met. This was because they had seen evidence of a good range of planned assessment methods, which had been designed to ensure that learners' knowledge, professionalism and skills were appropriately assessed at the relevant points in the programme.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:
- The visitors considered that the programme as a whole was well designed and well-considered, and placed the learner "at the heart".
- They also wished to commend the education provider on a thorough and thoughtful response to the quality activity and to their various requests for clarification.
- They were impressed by the education provider's commitment to oversee placement quality.
- They commended the embedding of simulation in the programme's strategy and the education provider's commitment to use of innovative outdoor simulation.

Section 5: Referrals

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

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

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. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that all standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the programmes are approved.

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitors' recommendation that the provider and its proposed programme have demonstrated they meet our standards and should receive approval.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Degree Apprenticeship) (Truro & Penwith College)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practitioner (Truro & Penwith College)	PT (Part time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/01/2011
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (London)	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2012
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			04/09/2023
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy Degree Apprenticeship	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			04/09/2023
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			01/09/2018
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and language therapist			04/09/2023