Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	18 – 19 March 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme. The education provider has until 5 May 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the ongoing approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

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

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Anthony Power (Physiotherapist)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	300 per cohort, one cohort per year
First approved intake	September 2014
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	September 2015
Chair	Trevor Bolton (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Libby Martin (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Bob Fellows (College of Paramedics) Paul Haddow (College of Paramedics) Kevin Armstrong (External panel member) Melanie Bird (Internal panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒
Draft Memorandum of agreement	☒	☐	☐
Guide for Paramedic Educators	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC did not review external examiners' reports for the last two years prior to the visit as the programme has not completed its first academic year.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 3 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Conditions

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

Condition: Due to the commitment to increase student numbers to 300 per year the education provider is required to demonstrate how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae of the current staff members prior to the visit. During the meeting with the programme team the current staff structure was outlined as well as a commitment to recruit further staff. The education provider currently has three senior lecturers, six clinical skills tutors and 10 hourly paid lecturers as well as other lectures from other programmes in the same faculty. The visitors were satisfied that the current staff numbers were adequate enough to teach the current number of students. However considering the planned increase in student numbers to 300 per year the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate how they plan to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to demonstrate how service users and cares are involved in the programme.

Reason: The education provider did not map any evidence for this standard in their mapping document. Therefore the visitors were unable to make a judgement about whether the programme meets this standard. During the meeting with service users and cares the visitors met with two members of staff who were part of the service user and carer group within the faculty. When asked what involvement they had with the programmes they informed us that they were partially involved with the interviewing process and open days for this programme. However it transpired that this involvement was limited and they were members of staff within the faculty. The students indicated that they had not had any involvement with services users and carers throughout the programme. Therefore considering the evidence provided, and discussions at the visit the visitors were therefore not satisfied with the involvement of service users and carers in the programme and they require the education provider to clearly outline the involvement of service users and carers in the programme.

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

Condition: Due to the commitment to increase student numbers to 300 per year the education provider is required to demonstrate how they will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors reviewed information regarding the number of appropriately qualified staff at the practice placement setting. The mapping documents stated that it was the responsibility of a collaborative development group to address the

issue that there are sufficient numbers of staff at the placement area. However, the visitors could not find any further information about who was in this group and how often the group met and what the groups' remit is. Furthermore the memorandum of agreement stated, on page 158, that "It is the responsibility of the Trust to ensure that suitable ambulance station Placements are available for the full number of students agreed for the programme in each academic year". In relation to placements other than ambulance stations the document further stated that "It is the responsibility of the institution to ensure that suitable placements other than those relation to ambulance stations ... are available for the full number of students agreed..." From this the visitors were unclear about how the education provider maintains responsibility for the number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in the ambulance trust placement settings. The visitors were also made aware that the number of students for the next academic year is yet to be confirmed, but would increase, but they received no new evidence to determine how the education provider would ensure that with this increase all students would be supervised by sufficient numbers of staff while on placement. As such the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to determine how the education provider will ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in all practice placement settings.

Mark Nevins
Anthony Power

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	PG Cert Mental Health Practice (Approved Mental Health Professional)
Mode of delivery	Part time
Type of programme	Approved mental health professional
Date of visit	17 – 18 March 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

As well as approving educational programmes for people who want to join the Register or have an annotation on their Registration record, the HCPC also approve a small number of programmes which are not linked to HCPC Registration. These programmes are for the profession of approved mental health practitioners (AMHPs) (for social workers, mental health and learning disabilities nurses, occupational therapists and practitioner psychologists).

The HCPC criteria for approving AMHP programmes set out the systems and processes an education provider is expected to have in place to deliver an AMHP programme, as well as the competencies professionals must achieve on completing the programme.

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 12 May 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome, including the conditions. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 22 June 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

When the regulation of social workers in England transferred from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to ourselves, we took responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The Health and Social Care Act (2012) gives us powers to set criteria for approving AMHP programmes. A decision was made by the Education and Training Committee to visit all existing AMHP programmes. This visit is to assess the programmes against the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Sheila Skelton (Approved mental health professional)
	Christine Stogdon (Approved mental health professional)
	Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Abdur Razzaq
Proposed student numbers	20 per cohort once a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Toby Carter (Anglia Ruskin University)
Secretary	Joanne Wood (Anglia Ruskin University)
Members of the joint panel	Charlie Nevison (Internal Panel Member)
	Philip Anthony (External Panel Member)
	Carolanne Bernard (Student Internal Panel Member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the criteria for approving AMHP programmes	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for approval the visitors must be assured that the programme meets all of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes and professionals who complete it will be able to achieve the criteria for approved mental health professionals

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

The visitors agreed that 35 of the criterion have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 15 criteria.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

Reason: In the documentation submitted prior to the visit, the visitors noted that the education provider has detailed the admission procedures and the requirements for admission to the programme. However, during the meeting with senior staff, visitors learnt that this programme is open for self-funding students. The visitors were unclear where in the documentation potential students will have information about self-funding arrangements.

The visitors also learnt during the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust's (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were satisfied with the information provided to potential applicants on the current arrangements with CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how potential students will be informed about the nature of these teaching and placement arrangements. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the admissions materials are clear and provide applicants with the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the education provider is committed to provide enough resources to deliver this programme at different partner organisations' premises.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were satisfied with the current resourcing arrangements for the programme at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure the education provider is committed to providing enough resources to deliver the programme at different partner organisations' premises. This includes how the education provider is limiting any risks or threats to deliver the programme and there is a future for the programme. Therefore, visitors will need further evidence to show their

commitment to this programme's delivery across different partner organisations and consequently, how this standard is met.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations have been finalised and agreed.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how this programme is effectively managed. In future, if the education provider agrees a partnership with a new partner organisation to deliver the theory part of the programme. For example, where an employer employs some teaching staff as well as the practice placement educators. When it happens, the education provider should inform HCPC through the major change process. Visitors will require to see the partnership agreements to be sure that there are clear procedures to deal with any problems and procedures are clearly written into partnership agreement.

The visitors also noted in the documentation provided, that there are proposed partnership arrangements between the education provider and the partner organisations articulating the responsibilities each partner has in the effective delivery of the programme. However, in the senior team meeting it was discussed that there are new partner organisations in collaborative agreements and that the education provider will update partnership agreements with its partner organisations to reflect the changes and include new partner organisations. The visitors were unsure of the current status of the agreements and were therefore unable to identify how the arrangements will ensure that this programme is effectively managed. The visitors will require further evidence to show these partnership agreements are finalised, signed and include all partner organisations, to determine how the programme meets this SET.

B.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place

Condition: The education provider must provide further information to outline the annual monitoring requirements and reports to demonstrate how the programme team evaluate the programme's effectiveness.

Reason: During the visit, visitors were given annual report for this programme. Visitors noted that the annual monitoring report mentioned this programme implicitly and was based on the whole department including other programmes. During the meeting with the programme, the visitors learnt that education provider will change the annual monitoring requirements and reports to ensure the programme team evaluate the programme's effectiveness. The programme team also mentioned that the current annual report template does not report on this programme explicitly to provide

evidence how this programme is monitored and evaluated. Therefore, the visitors will require further evidence of monitoring and evaluation systems in place for this programme to ensure this standard is met.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support students learning in all settings are effectively used at Chelmsford and Essex partner organisations.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the resources to support students learning in all settings are effectively used. The visitors were unable to determine how students will have access to resources at each partner organisation, including how resources such as buildings equipment and materials are used both in academic and placements settings. Therefore, visitors require further evidence of how resources in place at Chelmsford and Essex partner organisations will support student learning in all settings, and are effectively used.

B.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used

Condition: The education provider must submit programme documentation that has been revised to meet the conditions set as a result of this validation event.

Reason: Through discussion at the visit, and from the final conclusions of the internal validation panel it was clear revisions will be made to programme documentation to meet conditions set by the internal panel. The visitors consider programme documentation that students routinely refer to as important resources to support student learning. In particular, the conditions set referred to amendments to module descriptors, the programme specification document and the student handbook. To ensure the programme meets this standard the visitors need to review the revised documents to ensure the resources to support student learning are effectively used. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit the revised programme documentation the students routinely refer to.

B.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the monitoring mechanisms used to assess the suitability of resources at partner organisations including academic premises and placement settings.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how resources will be available and appropriate for the delivery of the programme at Chelmsford and Essex partner organisations. Also, if the education provider agrees a partnership with a new partner organisation to deliver the theory part of the programme, how the education provider will ensure there are resources available and appropriate to support student learning. Therefore, visitors require further evidence to show monitoring mechanisms used to assess the suitability of resources in partner organisations including academic premises and placement settings.

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure that IT resources are available and are appropriate at partner organisations.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the learning resources are appropriate and readily available to students and staff. The visitors also did not see any facilities at Chelmsford and Essex partner organisations during the approval visit. Therefore, visitors will need further evidence regarding the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure that resources including IT resources are available and are appropriate at partner organisations. This conditions is linked to conditions placed on B 8 and B 9.

B.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that there are mechanisms in place to ensure adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings at partner organisations.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current

arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the facilities available for student support are adequate and accessible at Chelmsford and Essex partner organisations. Furthermore, if the education provider agrees a partnership with a new partner organisation to deliver the theory part of the programme, how the education provider will ensure support facilities in place are adequate and accessible. Therefore, visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that there are mechanisms in place to ensure adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of students in all settings at partner organisations.

B.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to confirm that partner organisations will provide academic and pastoral student support.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The education provider has a 'personal tutor' system in place and visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how at Chelmsford and Essex, there will be academic and pastoral support for students. Therefore, visitors require further evidence to demonstrate that partner organisations will provide academic and pastoral student support in all settings.

B.15 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme

Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence regarding the plans for continued service user and carer involvement within the programme.

Reason: From the documentation provided, the visitors could not determine the exact nature of service users and carers' involvement in the programme. Discussion at the visit indicated there was service users and carers' involvement in this programme in a number of ways. For example, service users and carers' involvement in the admission process. However, from the discussions with the programme team it was clear that formal future plans have yet to be finalised to involve service users and carers in the programme. It was indicated by the service users and carers that there are plans for their further involvement in the programme, but the programme team provided limited detail about how this will work. The visitors were unable to determine from the discussion and the documentation provided that a plan is in place for how service users and carers will continue to be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for future service user and carer involvement.

D.2 The number, duration and range of practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that the number, duration and range of practice placements required in partner organisations will be appropriate and enable achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex from September 2015. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine the details of practice placements at Chelmsford and Essex. Also, if the education provider agrees a partnership with a new partner organisation to deliver the programme at their premises, then how the education provider will ensure practice placements are appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. Therefore, visitors will require further information about practice placements arrangements at partner organisations including the number, range and duration of these placements to ensure these are appropriate and support the achievement of programme's learning outcomes.

D.6 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the practice placement setting

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each practice placement provider.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex. Furthermore, the programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure there are adequate numbers of appropriately qualified staff at partner organisations. Therefore, visitors will require further evidence to show mechanisms will be in place to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at each practice placement provider.

D.7 Practice placement educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which will be in place to ensure that placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: During the visit and from the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors learnt that this programme is currently delivered at Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust (CPFT) premises. However, there are plans to deliver this programme with partners in Chelmsford and Essex. Furthermore, the

programme team highlighted that the number of partners may increase subject to demand for this programme. The visitors were happy with current arrangements at CPFT. However, because each partner organisation will have different teaching facilities at their premises and placement arrangements, the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider will ensure placement educators at Chelmsford and Essex have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience. Therefore, visitors will need further evidence to demonstrate mechanisms are in place to ensure that placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

D.8 Practice placement educators must undertake appropriate practice placement educator training

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms in place ensure practice placement educators receive appropriate training.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors noted that the education provider offers regular workshops for all practice educators and have an expectation about their attendance and involvement set out in the joint working agreement. However, the visitors could not find the details of these workshops including content covering specific areas for this programme. During the meeting with programme team, it was agreed that the education provider will provide further details of these workshops. Therefore, visitors need further evidence to demonstrate how mechanisms in place ensure practice placement educators receive appropriate training.

D.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to clearly articulate the mechanisms which are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all practice placement providers.

Reason: From the documentation provided prior to the visit, visitors noted the education provider's statement in the mapping document: "We provide various workshops for practice educators across our campuses and plan to extend this opportunity for AMHP practice educators. We plan to hold on-site supervisor groups and training which will allow them to feedback any comments or concerns that they have." The visitors could not determine how the education provider will plan these regular meetings between themselves and practice placement providers, and ensure they enable effective collaboration. During the programme team meeting, the visitors were assured that the programme team will provide details of the plan to organise these meetings. Therefore, visitors will need evidence to show the mechanisms which are in place to ensure that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and all practice placement providers.

<div align="right">

Christine Stogdon
Joanne Watchman
Sheila Skelton

</div>

hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Bedfordshire
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Operating department practitioner
Date of visit	25-26 March 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 19 May 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 12 June 2015 The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Joanne Thomas (Operating department practitioner) Julie Weir (Operating department practitioner) Kathleen Taylor (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	24 per cohort, per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2016
Chair	Juliet Fern
Secretary	Richard Hearing
Members of the joint panel	Alexander Kofinas (Internal panel member) Tim Gregory (Internal panel member) Hannah Abbott (External panel member) Andrea Cooke (External panel member) Angela Baker (Student representative) Philip Rodell (Student representative)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review external examiners reports prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 45 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 13 SETs.

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

The visitors did not make any recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

3.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation of the proposed student numbers for the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to page 12 of the supporting evidence documents which states "The projected student numbers are dependent on commissioning activity. We have confirmation that there are 27 places agreed for the September 2015 intake and we project that there will be a subsequent intakes following approval of this course." However, page 12 of the same document states "For the financial year 2015-16 HE EoE have committed to support 23 places…" In addition to this, in a meeting with the senior team, it was stated that in addition to the aforementioned commissioned places students could also apply to the programme on a self-funded basis, subject to placement availability. The senior team were not able to confirm a maximum student intake for the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify how many students could be on the programme at any one time. The visitors note that without clarification on student numbers they are unable to confirm if the education provider is committed to providing sufficient resources to deliver the programme, and subsequently, that there is a future for the programme. The visitors therefore require further information to clarify the maximum student intake for the programme and how this will be appropriately supported to ensure that the programmes will have a secure place in the education providers business plan.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to state the confirmed staff numbers for the programme and that this is appropriate to support student learning.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed to page seven of the supporting evidence document which states "…currently has an advertisement in press to appoint a fifth specialist lecturer to the team. It is envisaged that we will need to appoint another member of staff to the teaching team as outlined in the new course proposal form, as student numbers increase." However the visitors were not provided with any confirmation for the recruitment of the aforementioned additional staff members. In addition to this, the visitors were unclear on the proposed student numbers for this programme as stated under condition 3.1 of this report. Without clarification of both staff and student numbers the visitors were unable to make a judgement on whether the programme has an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation which confirms the staff and student numbers for this programme and how this is appropriate to support the effective delivery of the programme.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence to state the confirmed staff numbers for the programme and their individual responsibilities.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to page seven of the supporting evidence documents which states "…currently has an advertisement in press to appoint a fifth specialist lecturer to the team. It is envisaged that we will need to appoint another member of staff to the teaching team as outlined in the new course proposal form, as student numbers increase." However the visitors were not provided with any confirmation for the recruitment of the aforementioned additional staff members and were therefore unable to comment on their skills, knowledge and expertise appropriate to the delivery of this programme.

In addition to this the visitors were provided with the programmes Course and Unit Information Booklet which highlights the content for each unit alongside the individual unit co-ordinators. However, the visitors noted that not all units were currently assigned a unit co-ordinator. Specifically 'Post Anaesthetic Care' and 'Medicines Management and Pharmacology' stated the unit co-coordinator as "tbc".

The visitors note that without confirmation of all staff members for the programme and their unit responsibilities they are unable to make a judgment on whether subject areas are taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge. The visitors therefore require further evidence which states the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge for all staff members to the programme and clarification of their unit responsibilities.

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

Condition: The education provider must revisit programme documentation to ensure consistent and accurate references to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: In a review of the programme documentation the visitors noted a number of inaccuracies. For example page 1 of the course handbook states "This course will enable you to register with the Health and Care Professions Council as a Operating Department Practitioner". This is incorrect as all students who complete an approved programme will be eligible to apply for registration with the HCPC, subject to approval. In addition to this, the visitors noted several references to our previous name, Health Professions Council (HPC). For example Page 3 of the Year 1 Skills Register Sates "…the regulatory body, Health Professions Council (HPC)."
The visitors consider this information could be misleading to students on the programme and therefore require the education provider to revisit programme documentation to ensure consistency and accuracy in line with statutory regulation and the HCPC.

3.9 The resources to support student learning in all settings must effectively support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation of the proposed student numbers for the programme in line with the appropriate resources to support student learning.

Reason: The visitors noted page 12 of the supporting evidence document states "The projected student numbers are dependent on commissioning activity. We have confirmation that there are 27 places agreed for the September 2015 intake and we project that there will be a subsequent intakes following approval of this course." However, page 12 of the same document states "For the financial year 2015-16 HE EoE have committed to support 23 places". In addition to this, in a meeting with the senior team, it was stated that in addition to the aforementioned commissioned places, students could also apply to the programme on a self-funded basis, subject to placement availability. The senior team were not able to confirm a maximum student intake for the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify how many students could be on the programme at any one time. The visitors note that without clarification on student numbers they are unable to confirm if there are adequate resources to support student learning in all settings. The visitors therefore require further information to clarify the maximum student intake for the programme and how this will be appropriately supported with resources to support student learning.

3.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Condition: The education provider must provide confirmation of the proposed student numbers for the programme in line with available learning resources.

Reason: The visitors noted page 12 of the supporting evidence documents states "The projected student numbers are dependent on commissioning activity. We have confirmation that there are 27 places agreed for the September 2015 intake and we project that there will be a subsequent intakes following approval of this course." However, page 12 of the same document states "For the financial year 2015-16 HE EoE have committed to support 23 places". In addition to this, in a meeting with the senior team, it was stated that in addition to the aforementioned commissioned places, students could also apply to the programme on a self-funded basis, subject to placement availability. The senior team were not able to confirm a maximum student intake for the programme. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify how many students could be on the programme at any one time. The visitors note that without clarification on student numbers they are unable to confirm if there are adequate learning resources that will be readily available to students and staff. The visitors therefore require further information to clarify the maximum student intake for the programme and how this will be appropriately supported with learning resources.

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 clarify the minimum number of attendance hours required for a student to successfully complete the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation the visitors were unable to locate any information which stated the minimum number of total hours students would need to attend in order to successfully graduate from the programme. The senior and programme teams were also unable to clarify this. The visitors noted that without a clear minimum total hours attendance requirement they could not be certain that students would attend enough hours on the programme to enable them to meet the standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners. The visitors therefore require clarification on the minimum number of attendance hours required of students on the programme to successfully graduate. In this way the visitors can ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to practice safely and effectively.

5.12 Learning, teaching and supervision must encourage safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the year 3 skills register in relation to practice placements.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the skills registers which are used to measure and monitor student progression and performance in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) and whilst on placement. However the visitors were only able to locate the skills registers for years one and two of the programme. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the year three skills register was not yet complete and this is why visitors were unable to review it. The visitors note that without seeing the seeing this specific document they are unable to identify which skills are taught and assessed on the year three placement. The visitors therefore require documentation to evidence the year three skills register to ensure that learning teaching and supervision encourages safe and effective practice, independent learning and professional conduct in the placement environment.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the year 3 skills register in relation to the assessment of the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the skills registers which are used to measure and monitor student progression and performance in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) and whilst on placement. However the visitors were only able to locate the skills registers for years one and two of the programme. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the year three skills register was not yet complete and this is why visitors were unable to review it. The visitors note that without seeing the seeing this specific document they are unable to identify which SOPs are assessed in the year three OSCEs and placements. The visitors therefore require documentation to evidence the year three skills register. In this way the visitors can determine if the assessment design in both OSCEs and the placement setting is appropriate to ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the year 3 skills register in relation to the assessment of professional aspects of practice.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the skills registers which are used to measure and monitor student progression and performance in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) and whilst on placement. However the visitors were only able to locate the skills registers for years one and two of the programme. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the year three skills register was not yet complete and this is why visitors were unable to review it. The visitors note that without seeing the seeing this specific document they are unable to identify how professional aspects of practice are assessed in the year three OSCEs and placements. The visitors therefore require documentation to evidence the year three skills register to ensure that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessments procedures in both OSCEs and the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the year 3 skills register in relation to the assessment of learning outcomes.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the skills registers which are used to measure and monitor student progression and performance in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) and whilst on placement. However the visitors were only able to locate the skills registers for years one and two of the programme. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the year three skills register was not yet complete and this is why visitors were unable to review it. The visitors note that without seeing the seeing this specific document they are unable to identify which skills and learning outcomes are assessed in the year three OSCEs and placements. The visitors therefore require documentation to evidence the year three skills register. In this way the visitors can determine if the assessment methods in both OSCEs and the placement setting is appropriate to measure the learning outcomes.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of the year 3 skills register in relation to students' fitness to practice.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the skills registers which are used to measure and monitor student progression and performance in Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) and whilst on placement. However the visitors were only able to locate the skills registers for years one and two of the programme. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that the year three skills register was not yet complete and this is why visitors were unable to review it. The visitors note that without seeing this specific document they are unable to identify where student performance is measured to ensure fitness to practice in the year three OSCEs and placements. Furthermore, without evidence of a document which is to be consistently applied for all students, the visitors are unable to see how the assessments will remain objective. The visitors therefore require documentation to evidence the year

three skills register to ensure that the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practise in both OSCEs and the placement setting.

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

Condition: The education provider must clarify the regulations and restrictions around student resits on the programme.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the visitors were directed the university of Bedfordshire's Academic Regulations: October 2014 which states "Students who have a non-submission at level 4 resulting in grade 0/G for one or more of the elements of assessment will be permitted an attempt at a referral of an assignment or resit of an examination. For non-submission at level 5 or level 6, students will only be permitted a referral or resit attempt where the Board of Examiners confirms satisfactory engagement with the unit." Section 5a.19. The visitors were satisfied that this statement showed in which circumstances students would be able to resit, however, they could not find any evidence on restrictions to the number of times a student could resit a module. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that students are allowed a maximum of two attempts at a resit under any circumstances. However, they were unable to direct the visitors to this information within the programme documentation. Therefore the visitors were unable to see how students on the programme will be made aware of the restrictions to the number of resits available. Furthermore, without a clear statement in the assessment regulations the visitors cannot be certain that this policy will be applied consistently throughout the lifetime of the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation show where it is stated that students are restricted to a maximum of two resits, and, how this is communicated to students on the programme.

Kathleen Taylor
Joanne Thomas
Julie Weir

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Bournemouth University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	24 – 25 March 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 18 May 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 3 June 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 30 June 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Frances Ashworth (Lay Visitor) Graham Harris (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart
Proposed student numbers	35 per cohort
Proposed start date of programme approval	September 2015
Chair	Philip Ryland (Bournemouth University)
Secretary	Lianne Hutchings (Bournemouth University)
Members of the joint panel	Paul Eyre (College of Paramedics) Paul Townsend (College of Paramedics) Michael Jones (Internal panel member) Tristan Henderson (External panel member)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☒	☐	☐
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement assessment documents	☒	☐	☐

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and educators / mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☒	☐	☐
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☒	☐	☐

The HCPC met with students from the Foundation Science Degree in Paramedic Science, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 48 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 10 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a recommendation for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: Considering the planned increase in number of teaching staff the education provider is required to provide further evidence demonstrating that new staff members have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to teach the subject areas.

Reason: Prior to the visit the visitors reviewed staff curriculum vitae along with the document that outlines how staff are allocated to modules to support this standard. During the visit the education provider stated that they would be recruiting a new member of teaching staff to accommodate the increased student numbers. However the visitors could not identify, from the evidence provided, what specialist expertise and knowledge the new member of staff would need to have so that they could teach the subject areas in the curriculum. The education provider is therefore required to provide further evidence of what specialist expertise and knowledge the new member of teaching staff will have so that they can teach the subject areas in collaboration with the current members of teaching staff.

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

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

Reason: The documentation submitted by the education provider contained several instances of incorrect terminology. For example, the programme handbook, on page 6 states "…apply to register with the Health Care Professions Council". There is reference to 'The health Care professions Council'. All reference such as these must be updated to the 'HCPC' or 'Health and Care Professions Council'. Also, the "Programme specification" states "The HCPC have recommended that the minimum qualification required for registration be increased to BSc level by 2019."This is an incorrect statement as The HCPC has not made this recommendation but is a recommendation of the College of Paramedics. The visitors noted other instances such as these throughout the documentation submitted. Incorrect and inconsistent statements have the potential to mislead potential applicants and students. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to review the programme documentation, including advertising materials, and ensure that the terminology used is accurate, consistent and reflects the language associated with statutory regulation.

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

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence demonstrating how students give consent when they participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching and that they are aware that they have the right to withdraw during teaching sessions.

Reason: The visitors, in reviewing the evidence provided noted that on page 24 of the student handbook it stated that "At the start of each academic year students sign a declaration of confidentiality and consent to participate in practical classes form. During the visit the visitors were given the consent form used for the current FdSc programme but not the BSc (Hons) programme. This consent form stated that the student understood the range of practical activities and agreed to participate in practical classes and that it was the responsibility of the students to inform the programme leader or tutor if they feel unable to undertake practical teaching sessions.

The visitors agreed that although the students clearly give consent to practical teaching sessions, the opportunity to withdraw at any session is not clear. This was reflected in the meeting with the students where the students noted that they felt that they would be able to abstain from practical sessions if they felt they would be unable to do so for whatever reason, they were unaware that they were entitled to withdraw in line with the consent form. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence that demonstrates that the student has the right to withdraw form practical teaching sessions where they participate as service users for the BSc (Hons) programme.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to map the learning outcomes against the 2014 standards of proficiency (SOPs).

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had mapped the learning outcomes with the 2007 standards of proficiency. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the current standards of proficiency as published in 2014. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence, of how the learning outcomes ensure that successful graduates can meet the relevant standards of proficiency.

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider is required to demonstrate how the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had mapped the learning outcomes with the 2007 standards of proficiency. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance. Therefore the education provider is required to demonstrate that the programme reflects the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

5.11 Students, practice placement providers and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about an understanding of:
- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**

- **the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence as to how students are made aware of the learning outcomes for non-ambulance practice placements.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation outlining how students were made aware of the learning outcomes for practice placements prior to the visit, this evidence was demonstrated in the 'Practice Assessment Documents' (PADs) and the 'Practice Placement Handbook' where the learning outcomes are clearly identified as well as the assessment methods. However it was noted in discussion with the programme team that the PADs were specifically designed for the ambulance placements. The visitors noted that there was no document which identified the learning outcomes for the non-ambulance placements, such as those based in a hospital setting such as accident and emergency. The students informed the panel that during these non-ambulance placements it was the students who decide the learning outcomes for when they are in the non-ambulance placement setting. As such the visitors noted that a student or a practice placement educator could potentially be in the placement setting without a clear understanding of the learning outcomes that need to be met in order for a student to successfully complete the placement. The education provider should therefore provide further evidence to demonstrate how they prepare students, and practice placement educators, to undertake placements in the non-ambulance setting. In particular they should provide further evidence as to how learning outcomes for these placements are identified.

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

Condition: The education provider is required to demonstrate how the assessment strategy and design ensures that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the 2014 standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had mapped the learning outcomes with the 2007 standards of proficiency. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme ensures that those who successfully complete the programme met the current standards of proficiency as published in 2014. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence of how the assessment strategy and design ensures that the student who successfully completes the programme has met the current standards of proficiency as published in 2014.

6.2 All assessments must provide a rigorous and effective process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide further evidence demonstrating how the assessment process by which compliance with external-reference frameworks can be measured.

Reason: From the evidence submitted regarding this standard the visitors could not fully establish how the assessment procedures meet any relevant external-reference frameworks. The visitors were directed to the 'University's Academic Procedures documentation', however the visitors could not find any information regarding external-reference frameworks such as the QAA Paramedic Science Benchmark or College of Paramedics Paramedic Curriculum Guidance specifically in relation to assessment. The visitors noted that the education provider has made reference to the QAA Paramedic Science Benchmark and College of Paramedics Paramedic Curriculum Guidance in appendix 5 where the HCPC Standards of Proficiency (SOPs), QAA Paramedic Science Benchmark and College of Paramedics Paramedic Curriculum Guidance are mapped against the modules. However the mapping included the 2007 HCPC SOPs which need to be updated, therefore based on this mapping the visitors are unsure as to how the assessment procedures will meet the referenced external frameworks. Moreover the visitors were not presented with the assessment procedures and learning outcomes for the non-ambulance specific placements, therefore they are unable to understand how the external-reference frameworks assessment procedures are measured in assessment in all settings including practice placements.

6.3 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting.

Condition: The education provider is required to demonstrate that Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting as outlined in the current standards of proficiency.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider had mapped the learning outcomes with the 2007 standards of proficiency. As such the visitors could not determine how the programme ensures that professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting. Therefore the education provider is required to provide further evidence, of how the programme ensures that Professional aspects of practice are integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement setting as outlined in the current standards of proficiency.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider is required to provide evidence to demonstrate that the external examiner is appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The education provider submitted the external examiner reports from the previous two academic years, not for this programme, but for the FdSc paramedic programme. During the visit it became apparent that the education provider had appointed a new external examiner for this programme, but information about this appointment was not provided at the visit. The visitors also could not identify, from the evidence provided, how any regulations in place ensured that this new external examiner is appropriately experienced, qualified and from the relevant part of the Register. Therefore the education provider is required to provide evidence of the requirements in place that ensures any external examiners appointed to the programme

are appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Recommendations

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

Recommendation: It is recommended that the education provider develop the involvement of service users and carers on the programme.

Reason: The visitors were satisfied that the service users and carers are involved in the programme and so determined that this standard is met. During discussions with the service users and carers, it was indicated that they would like to enhance their involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as involvement with the selection process. The visitors recommend that the programme team consider developing service user and carer involvement and looking into new ways for involvement. The visitors suggest that a more robust service user and carer involvement will allow a greater depth to students' learning and other aspects of the programme.

Frances Ashworth
Graham Harris
Mark Nevins

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science
Programme name	Certificate of Competence by Equivalence
Mode of delivery	Flexible
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Biomedical scientist
Date of visit	15 – 16 April 2015

Contents

Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the approval of the programme. The education provider has until 8 June 2015 to provide observations on this report. This is independent of meeting any conditions. The report and any observations received will be considered by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 4 June 2015. At this meeting, the Committee will accept, reject or vary the visitors' recommended outcome. If necessary, the Committee may decide to vary the conditions.

The education provider is due to redraft and resubmit documentary evidence in response to the conditions outlined in this report by 1 August 2015. The visitors will consider this response and make a separate recommendation to the Committee on the approval of the programme. It is anticipated that this recommendation will be made to the Committee on 27 August 2015.

Introduction

The HCPC visited the programme at the education provider as it was a new programme which was seeking HCPC approval for the first time. This visit assessed the programme against the standards of education and training (SETs) and considered whether those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

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

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	William Gilmore (Biomedical scientist) David Houliston (Biomedical scientist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officers (in attendance)	Alex Urquhart Jamie Hunt
Proposed student numbers	100 applications a year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Sarah Pitt (University of Brighton)
Secretary	Marie-Helen Jean (Institute of Biomedical Science)

Sources of evidence

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

	Yes	No	N/A
Programme specification	☒	☐	☐
Descriptions of the modules	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs	☒	☐	☐
Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs	☒	☐	☐
Practice placement handbook	☐	☐	☒
Student handbook	☒	☐	☐
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	☒	☐	☐
External examiners' reports from the last two years	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC did not review the Practice placement handbook prior to the visit as the documentation does not exist.

The HCPC did not review the external examiners' reports from the last two years prior to the visit as there is currently no external examiner as the programme is new.

During the visit the HCPC saw the following groups or facilities:

	Yes	No	N/A
Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme	☒	☐	☐
Programme team	☒	☐	☐
Placements providers and mentors	☒	☐	☐
Students	☒	☐	☐
Service users and carers	☒	☐	☐
Learning resources	☐	☐	☒
Specialist teaching accommodation (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	☐	☐	☒

The HCPC met with students who have completed the Registration Training Portfolio for the Certificate of competence, as the programme seeking approval currently does not have any students enrolled on it. The HCPC also met with some potential students for the proposed programme.

The HCPC did not see the learning resources and specialist teaching accommodation as the nature of the programme does not require learning resources or any specialist teaching or laboratories at the education provider.

Recommended outcome

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

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

The visitors agreed that 52 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 6 SETs.

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

The visitors have also made a number of recommendations for the programme.

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

Conditions

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

Condition: The education provider must revise the documentation available to applicants so that it clearly indicates what learning resources are available throughout the programme, specifically the learning resources that are dependent on Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) membership.

Reason: The visitors reviewed the documentation which will be made available to applicants. These documents include the programme specification and the programme handbook. In this documentation it was clear that the students have access to the learning resources at the Institute of Biomedical Science (IBMS) approved laboratory they are currently employed at as well as some online learning resources provided by the IBMS. However during discussions with the programme team it was made clear that some of the learning resources listed as available to students are dependent on students being IBMS members. The visitors noted that some students who do not have current IBMS membership will not be able to have access to some of the learning resources. The visitors noted that this was not made clear in the documentation which will be made available to applicants for the programme. Therefore the visitors noted that this could be misleading to applicants who require this information to take up or a place on the programme. The education provider is therefore required to revise the documentation available to applicants so that it clearly indicates what learning resources are available throughout the programme, specifically the learning resources that are dependent on IBMS membership.

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 documentation that will be made available to applicants so that the academic entry criteria are clear.

Reason: Throughout the documentation which will be made available to applicants the visitors noted that there were discrepancies in the entry criteria including academic requirements. For example page 1 of the programme specification states that a "Minimum of an honours degree" as the academic entry requirement. On the other hand the 'Guide for Applicants 2015-16' stated on page 3 that applicants must have a "minimum of a science degree with honours". The visitors noted that both examples are different enough to potentially cause confusion as to exactly what the academic entry criteria is for the programme. During the meeting with the programme team it was clarified that the academic entry requirement was an honours degree from any discipline. The visitors noted that this discrepancy could be misleading to applicants, therefore the education provider is required to revise the documentation to ensure that the academic entry requirements are clear across all the documentation available to applicants.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence demonstrating the criteria, including the professional and academic qualifications, required to successfully apply and be appointed as one of the portfolio verifiers.

Reason: The education provider identified the staff in place to deliver the programme as the members of the assessment panel, known as portfolio verifiers, who make a recommendation about whether or not the student's portfolio demonstrates that they have meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for biomedical scientists. Throughout the visit in discussion with the programme team it was established that the assessment panel is made up of three portfolio verifiers and that panel members are selected from a pool of portfolio verifiers. An assessment panel consists of three members; one HCPC registered biomedical scientist or clinical scientist, a biomedical scientist academic and a lay representative. During the visit the visitors were presented with the role description of the lay representative, however this document did not include information about the specific criteria and professional/academic qualifications to be the lay representative portfolio verifier. From the documentation made available to the visitors the criteria for the HCPC registrant was stated in the Application Form to become A Registrant Portfolio Verifier, this document stated the criteria to become the registrant portfolio verifier. However from the documentation made available the visitors were unsure as to the criteria for the remaining two portfolio verifiers, including the academic and the lay representative. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence demonstrating the criteria, including the professional and academic qualifications required to apply and be appointed as one of the portfolio verifiers on the programme.

3.16 There must be a process in place throughout the programme for dealing with concerns about students' profession-related conduct.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the process by which any concerns about a students' profession related conduct is communicated to the IBMS as the education provider.

Reason: For this standard the education provider stated that it was the responsibility of the practice placement provider to raise concerns about a student's profession related conduct throughout the programme. During the meeting with the programme team it was explained that because the students would be employed by the practice placement provider during the programme, any concerns would be raised and dealt with by the individual laboratory following their employment policies. It was further stated that the students practice placement educator has the contact details of the Executive Head of Education at the IBMS for the discussion of any concerns. From the evidence provided the visitors were unclear of the procedure outlining a process in place for dealing with any concerns as and when they arrive, and how these concerns would be reported to the IBMS as the education provider. The visitors noted that any issues about a student's profession related conduct would need to be dealt with by the IBMS as the education provider. The visitors further noted that if issues about a student's profession related conduct were dealt with by the individual practice placement provider, there was potential that they would not be dealt with in a clear and consistent basis across the whole programme. Therefore all issues raised would need to be dealt with by the IBMS on a clear and consistent basis. The visitors stated that any issue or concern about a students' profession related conduct should be reported to the IBMS as the education

provider and were therefore unclear as to the process on this programme. The visitors therefore noted that there was a potential risk that an issue of concern about a students' profession related conduct could not be reported to the IBMS, which may impact the student's future registration with the HCPC. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence which demonstrates the process by which any concerns about a students' profession related conduct is communicated to the IBMS as the education provider and how any concerns are dealt with on a clear and consistent basis.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence demonstrating that the system for approving and monitoring all placements, allows placements to be monitored throughout the duration of the individual placement.

Reason: For this standard the education provider directed the visitors to the process by which a placement is approved. For a student to undertake this programme they must be working in an IBMS approved laboratory. If the student is not working in an approved laboratory then the laboratory must go through the IBMS laboratory approval process before the student can apply to the programme. The visitors were satisfied that this system of approving the placements was sufficient to ensure that all placements were suitable for the programme due to the criteria that a laboratory has to meet to be IBMS approved. The monitoring of the placements involved the 'student's feedback form' which was completed at the end of the placement when the student submits the portfolio. The visitors noted that there was no point whereby placements were monitored between the student being accepted onto the programme and before the student completes the portfolio. Therefore there is no opportunity for the student or the placement provider to highlight any potential problems. Therefore the education provider must provide further evidence demonstrating that the system for approving and monitoring all placements, allows placements to be monitored throughout the duration of the individual placement and how any issues which arise are dealt with.

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

Condition: The education provider must provider further evidence clarifying the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors are directed to the 'Assessor Guidance 2015-2016' and the 'Guide for Applicants [students] 2015-2016'. In the 'Guide for Applicants [Students] 2015-2016' the visitors looked at stage 3 of the programme which is titled 'The Equivalence Assessment Process'. In this section the requirements for student progression is outlined. From the documentation the visitors could clearly identify the 'levels' of student progression within the process, starting with the declaration by the practice placement educator allowing the student to submit the portfolio to the IBMS and finishing with the three outcomes recommended by the assessment panel. However during discussion with the programme team it became apparent that there were additional stages in the process which impact student progression. For example once the student has submitted their portfolio, the panel has the opportunity to communicate with the student for purposes of clarification and request further documentation before the reports are collated by the chair and sent to the IBMS. The visitors noted that this was not clear in the documentation available and the process

may not be clear to students as the requirements for student progression and achievement were not clear to the visitors. The visitors also noted that there was the potential for the assessors becoming too involved in developing and improving the student portfolio. The visitors could not determine how the functions of the assessment panel as set out in its regulations extends to this type of involvement and development of student portfolios. Therefore some students may be at a disadvantage as other students may have more opportunities to submit further documentation at different stages within the process. Therefore the education provider must revise assessment regulations clearly specifying the requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme.

6.11 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further documentation outlining the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: For this standard the education provider directed visitors to the 'Assessor Guidance', from this documentation it was unclear whether an external examiner was to be appointed for the programme. During discussion with the senior team it was stated that an external examiner was going to be appointed for this programme. However it was unclear whether the role of the external examiner was as an external verifier of the programme as a process or as a moderator for the decisions made by the assessment panel. Therefore the education provider is required to provider further evidence which outlines the requirement for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from the relevant part of the Register. The education provider also needs to provider further evidence that clearly outlines the exact role of the external examiner in this requirement so that this is clear to both the external examiner and the education provider.

Recommendations

2.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider consider a process which gives the applicant the opportunity to declare that they do or do not have a criminal conviction overseas.

Reason: As part of the application process the student must provide a valid Disclosure and Barring Services (DBS) Check. For this reason the visitors were satisfied that the standard had been met. However the visitors noted that the DBS does not check any criminal convictions from overseas and that the education provider had not put in place any mechanisms which gives the student the opportunity to declare any overseas convictions. The education provider stated that from their perspective the responsibility of checking for criminal convictions from overseas fell upon the UK Border Control. However the visitors noted that there was a possibility for someone to apply with a criminal conviction from overseas which may impair on the professional conduct as a student on the programme and as a perspective HCPC registrant and IBMS member, and for this to go unchecked. Therefore the visitors recommend that the education provider considers putting in place a process whereby a student may declare that they do not have any overseas criminal convictions.

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

Recommendation: The visitors recommend that the education provider broaden the involvement of service users and carers to include and represent the patient voice in the development of the programme.

Reason: In meeting this standard the education provider has defined services users and carers as the health professionals and medical staff who use the services of biomedical scientists. The visitors met with these representatives in the meeting with service users and cares who said that they have been involved with the design and the development of the programme. Specifically these groups have been involved in the requirement for the student to reflect on the contribution of service users in their development in their portfolio under module 5, professional relationships in relation to SOP 9.3. Therefore the visitors were satisfied that the standard has been met. However the visitors noted that with the involvement there was an opportunity for the patient voice to be further represented in the involvement and development of the programme in the future. This is due to the fact that the role of the biomedical scientist may involve interaction with any patient of one of the health professionals or medical staff who use the services of biomedical scientists. For this reason it is recommended that the education provider consider broadening the involvement of service users and cares to include the patient voice in the development of the programme.

William Gilmore
Ian Hughes
David Houliston