

Education and Training Committee

Decision on approval – Non-approval (conditions not met)

Education provider	Medipro Limited
Programme name	Level 6 in Paramedic Science (validated by Future (Awards & Qualifications) Ltd)
Mode of study	Part time
Date of decision	6 November 2024

Committee: Helen Gough (Chair)
Rebekah Eglinton
Penny Joyce
Katie Thirlaway

Decision
That the programme, which was previously recommended for approval subject to conditions, has not met all the conditions and approval is refused.
Reasons
<p>The Committee was of the opinion, taking account of the visitors' report, visitors' recommendations and the observations received from Medipro Limited relating to the Committee's previous decision recommending non-approval of this programme in August 2024, that standards 1.1, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.8, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1 and 6.5 of the Standards of education and training (SETs) had not been met.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that the repeated and additional information provided by the education provider within their observations did not constitute evidence that the conditions were met. The Committee therefore maintained their view that the programme should not be approved.</p> <p>The reasons for this decision are set out below, linked to each of the outstanding conditions:</p> <p>SET 1.1: The education provider had not demonstrated how the proposed programme would meet the academic qualification level for a Bachelor degree with honours, as set out in section 4.5 of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies. This would include the education provider clearly defining its own philosophical and pedagogical approach to designing the programme and curriculum in line with the QAA Framework and how the learning outcomes would be delivered at the required academic qualification level.</p>

SETs 3.9 and 3.10: The education provider had not demonstrated how it would ensure that there would be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to deliver and assess learning outcomes at a Bachelor degree with honours level. While the Committee recognised the experience of the academic staff delivering the programme, they did not have the appropriate teaching qualifications to deliver and assess at the level required for a Bachelor degree with honours. This included delivery of the level 5 modules from the start of the proposed programme and a clear requirement to achieve the appropriate teaching qualifications during the course of the programme. The appointment of former employees who had been associated with delivery of the proposed programme, with other education providers was not considered to be relevant evidence to alter the Committee's previous decision.

SETs 4.1, 6.1 and 6.5: The education provider had not demonstrated that the learning outcomes would be appropriately set, and assessed, to enable learners to achieve the SOPs for paramedics. This was due to the lack of clarity about how learner knowledge and understanding would be developed through the programme as part of the spiral curriculum, how the assessment criteria were linked to the academic level of relevant modules and what needed to be achieved in terms of learner competence each module or at each level for both learners and those assessing them. This level of detail had not been defined on conclusion of the approval assessment when it would be expected to be in place in order for these standards to be evidenced as met.

SET 4.8: The education provider had not demonstrated that evidence-based practice would be delivered and assessed at the academic level required to deliver the SOPs for paramedics. The reasons had been outlined in relation to SETs 3.9. and 3.10 and SETs 4.1, 6.1 and 6.5 above and focused on the delivery of learning outcomes and how these would be assessed.

SETs 5.5 and 5.6: The education provider had not demonstrated how they would ensure there were an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff to support the delivery of practice-based learning, including delivery of the learning outcomes. The Committee acknowledged that the education provider had established relationships with ambulance and acute trusts from the delivery of previous paramedic programmes. However, in order to meet the standards, this would need to be demonstrated for the specific proposed programme, which was different to previous programmes offered by the education provider.



Signed:.....**Committee Chair**