hcpc health & care professions council

Visitors' report

| Name of education provider | Canterbury Christ Church University |
|---|---|
| Programme name | BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice |
| Mode of delivery | Full time |
| Relevant part of the HCPC Register | Paramedic |
| Date of visit | 29 – 30 March 2016 |

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. This recommended outcome was accepted by the Education and Training Committee (Committee) on 9 June 2016. At the Committee meeting on 25 August 2016, the programme was approved. This means that the education provider has met the conditions 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 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 reviewed 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 | Paul Bates (Paramedic) Mark Nevins (Paramedic) Sue Roff (Lay visitor) |
|---|---|
| HCPC executive officer (in attendance) | Hollie Latham |
| Proposed student numbers | 30 per cohort, 1 cohort per year |
| Proposed start date of programme approval | 1 September 2016 |
| Chair | David Grummit (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Secretary | Lauren Smyth (Canterbury Christ Church University) |
| Members of the joint panel | Matthew Catterall (External panel member) Alison Coates (Internal panel member) Sue Soan (Internal panel member) Kristina Masuwa-Morgan (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 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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 already running FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice) and BSc (Hons) 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 35 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining 23 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

**2.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of reading, writing and spoken English.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide clarity on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) requirements for this programme and how they are communicated to applicants.

**Reason:** Throughout the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate any information which outlined the IELTS requirements for this programme. At the visit the programme team stated that the IELTS requirement for this programme is 6.5 with no element below 5.5. The visitors were satisfied that this criteria was appropriate to the level and content of the programme, however, without seeing this clearly articulated in the programme documentation the visitors cannot be certain that this will be consistently applied to all applicants. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly demonstrates where the IELTS requirements for this programme are articulated within the programme documentation and how this is communicated to applicants.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarity on whether Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) or South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) will implement criminal convictions checks and demonstrate that the processes associated with the checks are appropriate and relevant.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit the visitors were unclear who was responsible for ensuring criminal convictions checks are undertaken. In a meeting with practice educators it was stated that SECAmb would hold responsibility for ensuring all applicants undergo a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check before entering onto the programme. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was stated that CCCU hold this responsibility. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify who would be responsible for ensuring criminal convictions checks are implemented for each applicant. In addition to this the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the policies and processes associated with criminal convictions checks. For example, the visitors were unable to see what would happen if an applicant declares a criminal conviction or how recent the criminal conviction check needs to be. The visitors note that due to the nature of the 'In Service' entry route for this particular programme, currency is imperative to ensuring criminal convictions checks are appropriate and relevant. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly outlines who has responsibility for implementing criminal convictions checks and that the processes associated with this are appropriate and relevant.

**2.4 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide further clarity on whether Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) or South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) will implement health checks and demonstrate that the processes associated with the checks are appropriate and relevant.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit the visitors were unclear who was responsible for ensuring health checks are undertaken. In a meeting with practice educators it was stated that SECAmb would hold responsibility for ensuring all applicants meet the health requirements of the programme. However, in a meeting with the programme team it was stated that CCCU hold this responsibility. The visitors were therefore unable to clearly identify who would be responsible for ensuring applicants meet the health requirements for the programme. In addition to this the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the policies and processes associated with health checks. For example, the visitors were unable to see what would happen if an applicant does not meet the health requirements of the programme or how recent the health check needs to be. The visitors note that due to the nature of the 'In Service' entry route for this particular programme, currency is imperative to ensuring health checks are appropriate to the content of the programme. The visitors therefore require evidence which clearly outlines who has responsibility for implementing health checks and that the processes associated with this are appropriate to the content of the programme.

### 2.5 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and / or professional entry standards.

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate appropriate academic and professional entry requirements for the programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that applicants are expected to demonstrate qualifications at level 2 as part of the entry requirements for this programme. Applicants will not be expected to demonstrate any level 3 qualifications. The programme team stated that students might complete the Associate Practitioner (AP) course designed by SECAmb which they classify as equivalent to a level 3 diploma. However, this is not a requirement. The visitors also noted that, as part of the entry criteria, applicants are expected to have a minimum of one years' experience in the ambulance service. However, there was no clarity of what kind of service was required and requirements for any skills that are expected to be met in this time. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the academic level or professional experience required before entering onto a programme, the visitors cannot see how the current academic or professional entry requirements will adequately prepare applicants for the level and content of this programme. In addition to this, in a meeting with students it was stated that those who had not been required to demonstrate level 3 qualifications at entry found the transition into the first year at level 4 particularly challenging. The visitors therefore require further evidence to demonstrate that the academic and / or professional entry standards for this programme are appropriate to the level and content of the programme.

### 2.6 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence of an appropriate Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning (AP(E)L) policy for the programme and clarify how this relates to the entry requirements for 'In Service' applicants.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and meetings at the visit, the visitors were unable to identify a clear AP(E)L policy for this programme. The programme team stated that AP(E)L will be applied on a case by case basis, however the visitors were

unable to see what this process looks like within the context of this programme. The visitors also note that AP(E)L may be considered as part of the entry requirements for the programme where 'In Service' applicants are asked to demonstrate a minimum of one years' service in the ambulance trust. However the visitors were unclear as to whether this was AP(E)L or in fact an entry requirement for the programme. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly outlines an appropriate AP(E)L process for this programme. In addition to this, the visitors require evidence which clearly clarifies if the one years' experience in the ambulance trust will can be accredited as AP(E)L, or, if this is an entry requirement only.

### 3.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how practice placement providers outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) are effectively managed.

**Reason:** Throughout the documentation provided the visitors noted that students would experience their placements in two types of settings, ambulance settings with SECAmb and non-ambulance settings across a range of other providers. The visitors were satisfied that placements with SECAmb are effectively managed, however the visitors were unable to see effective management of placements in the non-ambulance setting. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify a clear process for managing these placements and the lines of responsibility for those involved. The programme team stated that they attend regular meetings with non-ambulance placement settings and that there is continued communication throughout the placement process. However, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. In addition to this, there were no representatives from non-ambulance placement settings present at the practice educator meeting, the visitors were therefore unable to further ensure that there will be continued communication throughout the placement process. The visitors therefore require evidence which outlines a clear and effective management process for non-ambulance placement settings to ensure that this standard is met.

### 3.3 The programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate effective monitoring and evaluation for placements outside of South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAmb).

**Reason:** Throughout the documentation provided the visitors noted that students would experience their placements in two types of settings, ambulance settings with SECAmb and non-ambulance settings across a range of other providers. The visitors were satisfied that there were regular monitoring and evaluation systems for placements at SECAmb, however the visitors were unable to see regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for placements in the non-ambulance setting. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify a clear audit process used for non-ambulance placements and how feedback is gathered in relation to these placements. The visitors note that without seeing clear audit and feedback processes for non-ambulance placements they are unable to see that monitoring and evaluation systems are in place across all placement settings. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that there are appropriate and regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place for all placement settings.

**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 demonstrate an adequate number of staff will be in place to deliver this programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that this programme will run alongside the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science and eventually replace the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). It was also noted that staff members will work across all three programmes until the phase out of the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). However this programme intends to recruit 30 students per year in contrast to the 15 students per year currently on the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). The visitors noted to the programme team that the current staff numbers are not adequate to effectively deliver this programme alongside the BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science and the phase out of the FD Health and Social Care (Paramedic practice). The programme team stated that they were advertising for one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) member of staff to join the programme by September 2016 and another by September 2017 to counter the increase to student numbers each year. The visitors were satisfied that this would ensure an appropriate number of staff were in place, however, could not see any evidence to support this such as a job advert or a commitment to timelines for appointment. The visitors note that without seeing any documentation to support the statements made by the programme and senior teams they cannot be certain that the mentioned FTE will be recruited. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate a clear outline and process for the programme's recruitment strategy and a commitment from senior staff that this will be implemented.

**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 further evidence to demonstrate that the resources for practical teaching sessions are appropriate to support the increase to student numbers.

**Reason:** At the visit the visitors were shown a number of teaching spaces including specialist labs and tutorial rooms. The programme team stated that due to the nature of the programme and the paramedic profession students did not often use the specialist labs and would spend more time in standard teaching rooms or alternative settings within the university using specialist equipment. The visitors were satisfied that the teaching rooms and alternative settings were appropriate to support the delivery of practical teaching, however, were not provided with any further information regarding the equipment available to be used in these settings. Specifically, the visitors were unable to identify the ratio of equipment to student numbers for practical teaching sessions. In addition to this, student feedback at the visit suggested that there were not an adequate number of resources to support their learning in practical sessions. The visitors note that this programme intends to recruit 30 students per year and are therefore unable to see how the current resources for practical teaching will effectively support the learning and teaching activities of the programme with an increase to student numbers. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate that the resources to support student learning in practical teaching sessions are adequate to support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme and the increase to student numbers.

**3.12 There must be a system of academic and pastoral student support in place.**

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate an appropriate number of staff are in place to deliver academic and pastoral support.

**Reason:** With reference to the condition under SET 3.5 of this report, the visitors are unable to see that the current staff numbers are adequate to ensure that the programme's system of academic and pastoral student support will be available to students in all settings. Specifically, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider could continue to run their personal tutor system under current staff numbers alongside the increase to student numbers. The visitors note that the programme team intends to recruit one Full Time Equivalent (FTE) member of staff before September 2016 and another before September 2017. The visitors are satisfied that this change in staffing will support the programme to effectively deliver a system of academic and pastoral support, however, were not provided with any evidence to support the commitment of recruiting these staff members. The visitors therefore require evidence to demonstrate a clear outline and process for the programmes recruitment strategy and a commitment from senior staff that this will be implemented to ensure that the programme team can effectively deliver their system of academic and pastoral support.

**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 communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for paramedics.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the level at which learning outcomes should be delivered the visitors noted that there could be significant changes to the learning outcomes as a result of the internal panel requirements. Without seeing the changes to learning outcomes the visitors cannot make a judgement on how they enable students to meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

**4.5 The curriculum must make sure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct, performance and ethics.**

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that students understand the implications of the HCPC's standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs).

**Reason:** The visitors noted that there was disparity in the views of teaching staff and students regarding the teaching of the SCPEs. In the documentation provided the visitors were advised that the SCPEs are delivered throughout the programme. The

programme team also stated that the SCPEs would be covered in year one of the programme alongside teaching of the role of the HCPC. However, the students that the visitors met with did not know what the SCPEs were and had no recollection of these being taught. In addition to this the students were not aware of the role and remit of the HCPC. Although the students that the visitors met with were not on this programme the visitors were concerned that this issue could be transferred to this programme. The visitors note that, whilst it is clearly the intention of the programme team to deliver teaching on the SCPEs, this may not currently be effective in ensuring that students understand the implications of the SCPEs. The visitors therefore require further evidence to clearly outline where students are taught about the SCPEs and how the programme team ensure that these are understood by students.

### 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 education provider must provide clarification on which placement settings will be offered to students outside South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) and the learning outcomes associated with them.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that students would experience some time in placement settings outside of the SECAmb ambulance setting. However the visitors were not provided with any information regarding the locations of these alternative settings or the learning outcomes associated with them. At the visit the visitors were provided with additional documentation which outlined a placement timetable and made reference to a number of non-ambulance placement settings, however no further detail was provided on these non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that without clarification of which placement settings will be offered outside of the SECAmb ambulance setting they cannot be certain that the current range of practice placements is appropriate to support the delivery of the programme. In addition to this the visitors note that without clarification of the learning outcomes associated with non-ambulance placements they cannot be certain that the range of practice placements support the achievement of the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require further evidence which clearly outlines each of the non-ambulance placement settings and the learning outcomes associated with them to ensure that this standard is met.

### 5.3 The practice placement settings must provide a safe and supportive environment.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECamb) to ensure a safe and supportive environment.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and

managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure they provide a safe and supportive environment. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) to ensure an effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately approved and monitored. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

**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 demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) to ensure equality and diversity policies in relation to students will be implemented and monitored.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that equality and diversity policies are in place in relation to students. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) to ensure there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) to ensure that practice educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure practice placement educators have relevant knowledge, skills and experience. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that all practice educators have the relevant knowledge, skills and experience required to mentor students on this programme.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the practice educators mentoring students are not registered paramedics. Some of the mentors are ambulance technicians. The programme team stated that this programme would not accept any mentors that were not registered paramedics and that the information provided was for other programmes currently run by the university. However, practice educators stated that ambulance technicians could mentor students but this would be limited to students in year one of the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear on the requirements of knowledge, skills and experience for practice educators and mentors on this programme. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate the level at which practice educators must be qualified, the visitors were unable to see how ambulance technicians, acting as practice mentors, would be able to support students and provide a safe environment for effective learning. The visitors therefore require clarification on the knowledge, skills and experience required to be a practice mentor on this programme. In addition to this, if ambulance technicians are acting as practice mentors, the visitors require a clear rationale which outlines their knowledge skills and experience and subsequently their ability to mentor students at this level.

### 5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that an effective and consistent audit system is in place for placement settings outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb) to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other agreements are agreed.

**Reason:** The visitors were provided with a clear audit system for all placements associated with SECAmb and are therefore satisfied that all SECAmb placements are appropriately audited. However the visitors were unable to locate an audit system for placements offered outside of SECAmb in a non-ambulance setting. The programme team stated that the audit would vary from placement to placement with some placement settings providing details of their own internal audits and some undergoing an audit from Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU). The visitors were therefore unable to identify a clear and consistent audit process that was implemented and managed by CCCU across all non-ambulance placement settings. The visitors note that, as the education provider, it is the responsibility of CCCU to ensure that all placement settings are appropriately audited to ensure that practice placement educators are appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed. The visitors therefore require further documentation which outlines a clear and effective process, managed by CCCU, for auditing and monitoring placement settings outside of SECAmb.

### 5.9 Practice placement educators must be appropriately registered, unless other arrangements are agreed.

**Condition:** The education provider must demonstrate that the mentors for this programme will be registered paramedics, or demonstrate how they ensure that any mentors who are not registered paramedics have relevant experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors noted that some of the practice educators mentoring students are not registered paramedics. Some of the mentors are ambulance technicians. The programme team stated that this programme would not accept any mentors that were not registered paramedics and that the information provided was for other programmes currently run by the university. However, practice educators stated that ambulance technicians could mentor students but this would be limited to students in year one of the programme. The visitors were therefore unclear on the requirements for practice educators and mentors to be registered paramedics. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that all practice educators must be registered with us the visitors require information about their experience, qualifications and training relevant to the practice placement to ensure they are able to deliver their role effectively. The visitors therefore require clarification on the requirements for practice educators to be registered paramedics. Where practice educators and mentors are not registered paramedics the visitors require supporting evidence which demonstrates how their experience, qualifications and training are appropriate to act as a practice educator or mentor on this programme.

### 5.10 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

**Condition:** The education provider must provide evidence to demonstrate that there is regular and effective collaboration with placement providers outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb).

**Reason:** With reference to the conditions under SETs 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.9 of this report the visitors cannot be certain that there is regular and effective collaboration with non-ambulance placement providers. Specifically the visitors note that without seeing a clear audit process for approving and monitoring all non-ambulance placement settings they cannot be certain that there is regular and effective collaboration in place. The programme team stated that they attend regular meetings with non-ambulance placement settings and that there is continued communication throughout the placement process, however, the visitors were not provided with any evidence to support this. In addition to this, there were no representatives from non-ambulance placement settings present at the practice educator meeting, the visitors were therefore unable to triangulate the information they had heard. The visitors therefore require evidence which outlines a clear audit process and regular communication with non-ambulance placement settings to ensure that this standard is met.

### 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 must demonstrate how students and practice educators are appropriately prepared for placements outside of South East Coast Ambulance service (SECAmb).

**Reason:** From the documentation provided and discussions with the programme team it was stated that students are advised of what to expect in non-ambulance placement settings. However, in discussions with the students it was stated that they felt unprepared for non-ambulance placements. Specifically, students were unaware of the learning outcomes associated with the placements and what the intended outcome was. In addition to this, with relation to the condition under SET 5.10 of this report, the visitors were unable to see how the education provider effectively communicates with non-ambulance placements to ensure they are prepared to take students. The visitors note that having a clear understanding of the learning outcomes associated with each placement is imperative to ensuring both students and practice educators are prepared for placement. The visitors therefore require further documentation which clearly demonstrates that students and placement providers are provided with clear learning outcomes and objectives for non-ambulance placement settings to ensure they are fully prepared for placement.

### 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 communicate any changes to the assessment strategy and design as a result of the changes to learning outcomes.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current learning outcomes and associated assessment methods ensure that those who successfully complete the programme will meet the SOPs for paramedics. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. The visitors note that changes to the learning outcomes for the programme will subsequently impact the assessment strategy and design in ensuring that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes and associated assessment methods, and demonstrate that these ensure that those who successfully complete the programme are able to meet the SOPs for paramedics.

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

**Condition:** The education provider must communicate any changes to the programme learning outcomes and respective assessment methods.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors were satisfied that the current assessment methods are effective in measuring the learning outcomes. However, throughout the visit it was stated that the internal validation panel will require the programme team to rewrite their learning outcomes to ensure they are delivered and assessed at level 6. Whilst the HCPC does not stipulate that level at which learning outcomes should be delivered it is noted that there could be significant changes to the learning outcomes as a result of the internal panel requirements. The visitors note that without seeing the changes to learning outcomes they cannot be certain the

assessment methods employed will measure the learning outcomes. The visitors therefore require the education provider to communicate any changes to the learning outcomes, and demonstrate that the assessment methods employed effectively measure the learning outcomes.

## Recommendations

**6.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.**

**Recommendation:** The visitors recommend that the education provider reviews the Workplace Evidence Tool (WPET) document to more clearly outline student's developmental needs.

**Reason:** From the documentation provided the visitors could see that the WPET document contains a section for placement providers to note any developmental needs for students. This information can be accessed by the student's next placement mentor. The visitors are therefore satisfied that this standard is met. However, the visitors note that the section within the WPET for highlighting developmental needs could provide more clarity in highlighting developmental needs to each student's next placement mentor and that there is a risk that this information could be overlooked. The visitors therefore recommend that the education provider revisits the WPET document to provide clearer guidance on noting students' developmental needs and how this can be picked up by their next placement mentor.

<div align="right">

Paul Bates
Mark Nevis
Sue Roff

</div>