

Visitors' report

Name of education provider	University of Worcester
Programme name	FdSc Paramedic Science
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	9 – 10 June 2015

Contents

Executive summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Visit details	3
Sources of evidence	4
Recommended outcome	5
Conditions.....	6
Recommendations.....	11

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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 24 September 2015. At the Committee meeting, the ongoing approval of the programme was re-confirmed. This means that the education provider has met the condition(s) outlined in this report and 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 - 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 an HCPC only visit. The education provider and validating body did not validate or review the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their endorsement of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Bob Fellows (Paramedic) Paul Blakeman (Chiropodist / podiatrist) Ian Hughes (Lay visitor)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Amal Hussein
Proposed student numbers	60 per cohort, 1 cohort per year
Proposed start date of programme approval	1 September 2015
Chair	Robert Herbert (University of Worcester)
Secretary	Teresa Nahajski (University of Worcester)

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 (eg specialist laboratories and teaching rooms)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 47 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 11 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

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

Condition: The education provider must submit information that includes details of the module leaders for this programme.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included programme team staff CV's and descriptions of the modules. The documentation did not have accurate details of who would be the module leaders. During discussion at the visit it was highlighted recruitment for staff to the programme was on-going and the final arrangements as to the module leaders and module contributors were on-going. In order to be assured there is enough profession specific input to the programme to ensure subject areas will be taught by staff with the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge, the visitors require further evidence. The visitors therefore require details of the module leaders and where contributions made from external or associate tutors will be in order to determine how this standard can be met by the programme.

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, FD Paramedic Science Direct Route 201-15 CH, page 17 "be successful in each of the summative assessments in order to achieve registration on HCPC Professional Register". This does not clearly articulate the fact that completion of approved programmes gives students 'eligibility to apply' for HCPC registration, but students will still need to go through the application process. The visitors also noted, FD Paramedic Science Direct Route 201-15 MS, page 25 "Health Professions Council (HPC)". This should read as 'Health and Care Professions Council' or HCPC. 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

3.17 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 were sign-posted to module FDPH2001 to evidence how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Upon reviewing the evidence, the visitors were unsure how service users and carers are involved in the programme. Discussions with the programme team at the visit indicated that the dedicated service users and carers who contribute to the other health programmes at the education provider will also contribute to this programme in a similar

way. However, in discussions with the dedicated service user and carers that are involved in other health programme, it was clear that discussions to get involved in this programme has not begun. The service users and carers spoke about their future involvement with the development of the BSc (Hons) Paramedic programme but it was clear that they were not involved with this programme. The visitors recognised that the involvement of service users and carers is still at the early stages for this programme and that there is an intention to develop a bank of service users and carers to be involved in the programme in the future. However, the visitors were provided with limited information regarding how this group would be developed, and how service users and carers would be involved in the programme in the future. The visitors were therefore unable to determine from the evidence provided that a plan is in place on how service users will be involved in the programme. In order to determine that this standard is met the visitors require further evidence demonstrating the plans for service user and carer involvement in this 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 must demonstrate how the learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made very broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map onto the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcome were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes were being covered. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the module learning outcomes linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme can meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes had been determined but the programme documentation did not reflect this. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the learning outcomes that will ensure that students can meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the learning outcomes associated with all aspects of this programme and how these outcomes will ensure that students completing the programme can meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

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

Condition: Further evidence to demonstrate how students completing the programme are able to practise safely and effectively.

Reason: From the documentation submitted, the visitors noted that the programme reflected the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge articulated in the College of Paramedic (CoP) 2008 (version 2) curriculum guidance. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors heard that the education provider is currently developing

an undergraduate programme in paramedic, as a result there is no future plans to develop the curriculum for this programme and map the programme against the latest curriculum guidance produced by CoP 2015 (version 3 rev 1). From the discussions the visitors were unable to determine how, without the reflection of the most current curriculum guidance, student completing this programme are able to practise safely and effectively. The visitors therefore, require further information determine how the programme team ensure students completing the programme are safe and effective in the absence of the programme not being mapped to the most latest curriculum guidance.

5.5 The placement providers must have equality and diversity policies in relation to students, together with an indication of how these will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence of how they ensure equality and diversity policies in relation to students are in place within practice placements.

Reason: The documentation submitted prior to the visit included the procedures for approving and monitoring practice placement providers. However, the visitors were not provided with West Midlands policies around equality and diversity. From the information provided the visitors were unable to determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place in relation to students. Discussions with the programme team indicated that there is a process in place to ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place, but the visitors were unsure what these processes were and how this process formed part of the auditing and approving of all placements. In order to determine how the programme continues to meet this standard the visitors require the education provider to provide evidence to demonstrate how they ensure practice placement providers have equality and diversity policies in place.

5.6 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 demonstrate how they ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the "Mentor registers held by Trust" in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that the West Midlands Ambulance Trust hold a database of staff. Also, the visitors were told that local and regional work is currently on going to ensure that there are an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experience staff at practice placement setting via the HEI consortium, working group. The visitors acknowledge that this group is still at early development stage. However, it was unclear how the education provider would maintain responsibility for ensuring all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced and, where required, registered staff.

5.6 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 demonstrate how they ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced.

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placements have an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff. For this standard, the education provider referenced the “Mentor registers held by Trust” in their SETs mapping document, but the visitors were unclear how this statement ensured this standard was met. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are two types of mentors available to the education provider. A ‘1 day mentor’ and a ‘5 day mentors’, the visitors were told that the ‘5 day mentors’ known as Clinical team mentor (CTM) were preferably the ones to sign off student passports. The visitors were provided with a list of registered practice educators available to take on students. From the list, the visitors noted that majority of the practice educators were ‘1 day mentors’ as opposed to ‘5 day CTM mentors’ who can sign students off. In discussions with the practice educators, the visitor noted that there was some concerns raised by the CTM that with the increase in student number there might not be enough CTM mentors to sign off student passport. From the information provided, the visitors were unsure with the increase in student’s number, how the education provider will ensure all placement settings have an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced staff who can sign off student’s competencies.

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

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how they ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

Reason: From the initial documentation and information provided regarding the approval and monitoring of placements, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme. In scrutinising evidence, and in discussions with the programme team and the practice placement provider, the visitors learnt that a mentorship programme has been developed by West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust (WMAS) in partnership with the education provider. The visitors learnt that all placement educators will be expected to undergo the mentorship programme prior to supervising a student undertaking this programme. The visitors were also aware that there is on offer a variety of training courses for placement educators once they have undertaken this initial mentorship training. However the visitors were informed that the mentorship programme will be delivered locally and as such they were unclear as to how the education provider, University of Worcester, would play a role in this local delivery to ensure that the delivery of this programme would ensure that practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience having undergone the programme. The visitors were also made aware that the education provider will not hold a register of practice placement educators and the training that they have undertaken, this will be held instead by the employer, WMAS The visitors therefore had insufficient evidence to

make a judgment about whether this standard is met, and require further information to demonstrate how the education provider will ensure all practice placement educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise students from this programme.

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

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

Reason: From the initial documentation provided, the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training. During discussions with the programme team, the visitors learnt that there are practice educators training options that are offered to practice educators including a general update review and a 5 day mentorship programme. The visitors acknowledged that there are training opportunities and workshops provided by the education provider for practice placement educators but were unable to see how each individual placement educator's training is monitored, or how the requirements for training feeds into partnership agreements with the providers. The visitors were also unclear about the steps taken by the education provider to ensure that suitably trained placement educators were in place for students. The education provider tabled documentation on the second day of the visit with information about practice placement educators, but the visitors were unable to review this documentation due to time constraints. To ensure this standard is met, the visitors require the education provider to clearly articulate the training requirements for placement educators and the processes in place for ensuring these requirements are met and monitored in practice placement setting.

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 demonstrate how the assessments of learning outcomes ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

Reason: The documentation provided prior to the visit included module descriptors, together with a mapping document giving information about how the assessment procedures for the programme will ensure that students who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs. However, the SOPs mapping made broad references, rather than specific references to the modules and did not map on to the learning outcomes. In addition, the visitors noted that 14 of the learning outcomes were not mapped against a module or indicated where in the curriculum these learning outcomes were being covered or assessed. Therefore, the visitors were unclear how each of the assessment of modules and the associated learning outcomes were linked to each of the SOPs, to ensure that a student completing the programme has demonstrated that they meet the SOPs for paramedics. From discussions with the programme team the visitors heard that the necessary learning outcomes and associated assessments were in place but were yet to be finalised throughout the documentation. Therefore, the visitors did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this standard was met. The

visitors therefore require further documentation to clearly evidence how the assessment of the learning outcomes that will ensure that students meet the relevant SOPs on successful completion of the programme. The visitors therefore require the education provider to submit further evidence, such as revised documentation, to clearly define the link between the assessment of students associated with all aspects of this programme and how these assessments will ensure that students completing the programme have demonstrated that they have meet all of the relevant SOPs for paramedics.

6.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register.

Condition: The programme team must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that aegrotat awards do not lead to registration with the HCPC.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors could not determine where in the assessment regulations there was a clear statement regarding aegrotat awards. This standard requires that the programme documentation clearly states that an aegrotat award will not provide eligibility for admission to the HCPC Register to avoid any confusion. The visitors could not determine from the documentation how the programme team ensured that students understood that aegrotat awards would not enable them to be eligible to apply to the Register. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to be updated to clearly specify that an aegrotat award would not provide eligibility for admission to the Register. This is to provide clarity for students and to ensure that this standard is met.

Recommendations

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.

Recommendation: The visitors recommend the education provider ensure the information provided through the admissions procedures is consistent.

Reason: Documentation and discussion at the visit highlighted information was provided to potential applicants to the programme through different ways. The visitors were satisfied applicants to the programme had the information they require to make an informed decision about the programme. The visitors noted the information presented at the open day and recruitment day was not included in the online materials. The visitors recommend the programme time should consider updating their website material to ensure the information presented to potential applicant is consistent across all channels.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Reason: From assessing the documentation and the discussions with programme team and senior team, the visitors noted that there is an appropriate number of qualified and experience staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors are satisfied this standard is being met. However, the visitor would encourage the programme team to keep the staff numbers within the programme team under review to ensure that there continues to be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme as student numbers increase in the coming years.

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

Recommendation: The education provider should consider reviewing the role play consent form so that the information provided is clear and easy to understand.

Reason: The visitors were provided with the role play consent form, which allows students to give their consent to participate as service users in practical and clinical teaching. The visitors were therefore satisfied that this standard has been met. However, the visitors suggest that the programme team considers reviewing how they communicate the requirements around signing the consent form and what it entails. This will contribute to a greater understanding from students as to what they are signing for and why.

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.

Condition: The visitors recommend the programme team continue to review and monitor the range of placements available for students on this programme.

Reason: The visitors noted in the programme documentation and in discussion with the programme team that students had the opportunity to experience a suitable number and range of placements. The visitors were therefore content this standard was met. In the meeting with the students, it was highlighted that not all students had the same opportunity to experience as much variation in their placements between urban and rural areas. The visitors therefore recommended the programme team continues to develop further the variety of placements available to students so that all students experience a wide range of different placement settings.

Bob Fellows
Paul Blakeman
Ian Hughes