

## HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Swansea University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science, Full time
Approval visit date	25 March 2020
Case reference	CAS-15342-Q4C7Q8

### Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach .....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4
Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation.....	5

### Executive Summary

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as ‘our standards’). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Frances Ashworth	Lay
Glyn Harding	Paramedic
Timothy Hayes	Paramedic
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

### Other groups involved in the virtual approval visit

There were other groups involved with the approval process as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Michelle Lee	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Swansea University
Nicola Rees	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Swansea University

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
Proposed first intake	07 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 55
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP02174

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involved consideration of documentary evidence and a virtual approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

## Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we ask for certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Type of evidence	Submitted
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes
Information about the programme, including relevant policies and procedures, and contractual agreements	Yes
Descriptions of how the programme delivers and assesses learning	Yes
Proficiency standards mapping	Yes
Information provided to applicants and learners	Yes
Information for those involved with practice-based learning	Yes
Information that shows how staff resources are sufficient for the delivery of the programme	Yes
Internal quality monitoring documentation	Yes

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the education provider decided to move this event to a virtual (or remote) approval visit. In the table below, we have noted the meeting held, along with reasons for not meeting certain groups (where applicable):

Group	Met	Comments
Learners	Not Required	We determined that a learners' meeting was not necessary. Before the visit, based on their documentary review, the HCPC panel determined that they were satisfied with the learner involvement, and that other questions which would normally be

		discussed with learners could be raised with the programme team or practice educators.
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Not Required	We determined that a service users and carers meeting was not necessary. Before the visit, based on their documentary review, the HCPC panel determined that they were satisfied with the service user and carer involvement, and that other questions which would normally be discussed with service users and carers could be raised with the programme team or practice educators.
Facilities and resources	Not Required	A virtual tour of facilities and discussion of available resources took place in the programme team meeting.
Senior staff	Yes	
Practice educators	Yes	
Programme team	Yes	

## Section 4: Outcome from first review

### Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the virtual approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

### Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 22 May 2020.

### **5.6 Practice educators must have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, must be on the relevant part of the Register.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that Level 6 practice educators will have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise learners appropriately at that stage of the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation and from discussions at the visit, the visitors were aware that the education provider was planning to ensure that all practice educators supporting the programme would have relevant knowledge, skills and experience to supervise the learners at all stages of the programme. They were satisfied that the plans in place for preparing practice educators for supervision at Levels 4 and 5 were

appropriate. However, the evidence for how the education provider would ensure the suitability of practice educators at Level 6 was not yet available, and so the visitors could not be sure the standard was met. They understood that as it was a new programme, due to start in September 2020, practice educators would not be needed to support students at Level 6 until 2022, but they considered that they needed to understand the plans that the education provider has in place to prepare for this. They therefore require further evidence of how the education provider will ensure that Level 6 learners can be appropriately supervised in placement, by staff with relevant knowledge, skills and experience to support safe and effective learning.

### **Recommendations**

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. Recommendations do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

#### **2.1 The admissions process 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 education provider should consider reviewing at which stage of the admissions process they supply information about additional costs associated with the programme.

**Reason:** The visitors were aware that there were potentially some significant additional costs for learners, mainly because placements might be anywhere in Wales, even though the programme was based in South Wales. Information about these costs was provided at an interview and at Open Days for interested potential learners. The visitors considered that the standard was met at threshold, because applicants would have full information before they made a choice about to take up an offer. However, they noted that in materials provided to potential applicants before the interview stage, these extra costs were not laid out. There was therefore a risk that in future some applicants might not have appropriate information with which to make an informed choice. The visitors therefore suggested that it might be appropriate for the education provider to review whether they were supplying information at the most useful point.

### **Section 5: Visitors' recommendation**

Considering the education provider's response to the conditions set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that the conditions are met and recommend that the programme(s) are approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 02 July 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).