

## Visitors' report

|                                      |                              |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Name of education provider</b>    | University of Greenwich      |
| <b>Programme name</b>                | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>              | Full time                    |
| <b>Relevant part of HPC Register</b> | Paramedic                    |
| <b>Date of visit</b>                 | 19 – 20 November 2014        |

## Contents

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

## Executive summary

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

The visitors' report which follows outlines the recommended outcome made by the visitors on the ongoing approval of the programme at the education provider. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 12 February 2015. At this meeting, the Committee confirmed the ongoing approval of the programme. This means that the programme meets our standards of education and training (SETs) and ensures that those who complete it meet our standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register. The programme is now granted open ended approval, subject to satisfactory monitoring.

## 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 - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was part of a joint event. The education provider 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                          | Mark Nevins (Paramedic)<br>Gordon Pollard (Paramedic)<br>Joanne Watchman (Lay visitor)                                   |
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance)                  | Amal Hussein   |
| HCPC observer   | Robert Templeton (HCPC Council member)   |
| Proposed student numbers                                | 40 per year  |
| Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from | February 2015  |
| Chair   | Martin Snowden (University of Greenwich)   |
| Secretary   | Kim Oliver (University of Greenwich)   |
| Members of the joint panel                              | Lawrence Hill (External Panel Member)<br>Simon Walker (Internal Panel Member)<br>Mandy Stevenson (Internal Panel Member) |

## Sources of evidence

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

|  | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Programme specification  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Descriptions of the modules  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SETs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Mapping document providing evidence of how the education provider has met the SOPs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Practice placement handbook  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student handbook   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Curriculum vitae for relevant staff  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| External examiners' reports from the last two years                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

|   | Yes                                 | No                       | N/A                      |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior managers of the education provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators / mentors  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Service users and carers  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Learning resources  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation<br>(eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Recommended outcome

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

The visitors agreed to recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the ongoing approval of the programme is reconfirmed.

The visitors did not set any conditions for the programme.

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 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 have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

## Recommendations

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team monitors the involvement of service users and carers within the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that service users and carers are involved in the programme and are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, during discussions with the programme team, it was indicated that there are planned future developments with service user and carer involvement in different aspects of the programme, such as developing a forum for service users and carers. However, the programme team provided limited detail about how this would be done, or how the forum will directly impact this programme. The visitors feel that the current involvement of service users and is at a threshold level, although the education provider have mentioned further plans there was no evidence of this. The visitors therefore recommend that the programme team monitor the involvement of service users and carers. 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.

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

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the number and range of placements available for the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were satisfied that the number, duration and range of practice placements would support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes enabling students to be able to meet all standards of proficiency for paramedics. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, from the documentation, the visitors noted the programme team have made a reduction in placement hours from 20 weeks in year two and three to 15 weeks to accommodate the demand of placements due to the increase in student numbers. Although, HCPC does not prescribe length of placement, the visitors would like to encourage the programme team to review and monitor the duration of placements to ensure it continues to be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Mark Nevins  
Gordon Pollard  
Joanne Watchman