

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy, Full time
Date submission received	28 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13817-Q2L9C7

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Anthony Power	Physiotherapist
Tracey Clephan	Dietitian
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive
John Archibald	HCPC executive (observer)

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Physiotherapist
First intake	01 September 2005
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07658

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: In a review of the documentation provided for this annual monitoring audit, the visitors noted that the education provider had submitted a CV for Sean Kilmurray who is the current programme leader. As this standard has been revised it now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement for the programme. From the information provided the visitors have not seen what the formal process is to appoint an

individual with overall professional responsibility for the programme. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.7 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors read that service users and carers are involved in the delivery of several modules. However, they noted that the audit form states “Service user and carer involvement in the programme is not monitored formally”. From the information provided, the visitors were unable to establish how the education provider would monitor and evaluate service user and carer involvement within the programme. As such, the visitors require evidence of the strategy used to monitor involvement of service users and carers within this programme.

Suggested evidence: Evidence of monitoring and evaluation of service users and carers within the programme.

Section 5: Visitors’ recommendation

Considering the education provider’s response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC’s decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science, Full time
Date submission received	04 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-13777-D7F7N1

Contents

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

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 annual monitoring 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.

Through undertaking this process, we have noted areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes in section 6 of this report.

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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Calum Delany	Speech and language therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC observer

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2014
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 20
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07662

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Placement monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that they will ensure the person who is appointed in this role is appropriately qualified and experienced, and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register. The education provider also noted that if there was a change to the person in this role, they will inform the HCPC. However, this standard has been revised, and now requires that the education provider has an effective process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. This means that

the education provider would no longer need to notify the HCPC of any further changes to the person in this role, if we can be assured there is an effective process in place to ensure the person appointed to this role is appropriate. From the information provided, the visitors have not seen what process the education provider has in place to ensure this. As such, the visitors require further information about the process the education provider has in place to ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process the education provider has in place to appoint an appropriate person to lead the programme, and if it becomes necessary, to identify a suitable replacement.

3.4 The programme must have regular and effective monitoring and evaluation systems in place.

Reason: For this audit, the HCPC requires the education provider to submit monitoring of service user and carer involvement and monitoring of practice-based learning for the last two years. The education provider has provided some information in relation to involvement of service users and carers on the programme and feedback from a service user who has been involved. In relation to practice-based learning the education provider has provided feedback from learners on practice-based learning. However, the visitors have not seen information in relation to how this feedback has been evaluated, and whether any actions have been put in place as a result. For example, the visitors have not seen how the education provider evaluates whether the service user carer involvement on the programme is effective, or whether the education provider has identified areas for further development and action plans. Similar to this, the visitors have not seen how the feedback from learners on practice-based learning is monitored and evaluated, for example to identify areas for development and actions plans. From the information provided, the visitors could not determine how monitoring information in relation to service user and carer involvement and practice-based learning is used and analysed, to demonstrate that there is an effective monitoring and evaluation system in place for those areas. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence of the monitoring of service user and carer involvement, and practice-based learning for the last two years.

Suggested evidence: Further evidence of the monitoring of service user and carer involvement, and practice-based learning for the last two years.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: To evidence this standard, the education provider explained that the learners have a 'trust induction' in the first week of placement, and during this induction they are informed about the trust policy on raising concerns about the safety and well-being of service users. The education provider referred to the 'Work-based learning handbook' which includes a section about how the trusts policies for raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users will be discussed during a comprehensive induction. The visitors could not find information on what the process is to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of services. In addition, the visitors could not determine whether the learners would have access to the information about raising concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users after

the induction has taken place, should they need to refer to it. The visitors were also not clear whether any concerns raised would be managed through the education provider, through the trust, or both. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. Therefore, the education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what the process is for supporting and enabling learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how the learners have access to this information should they need to refer to it.

Suggested evidence: Information about the process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users, and how learners have access to this information.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to this section at this time, but should consider whether to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future.

As part of this annual monitoring audit, HCPC now requires education providers to submit evidence of their monitoring of practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement for the last two years. Through the audit submission and additional documentation, the visitors could see that there are monitoring processes in place and that the education provider has intentions to have a more formal, documented approach to monitoring of the practice-based learning experience in the future. The visitors note that while this intended approach to monitoring would be satisfactory going forward, the education provider should consider how this monitoring relates to both practice-based learning and service user and carer involvement. The visitors also found that the education provider should consider how monitoring includes the *functioning* of practice-based learning, rather than referring only to practice-based learning experience. As such, the education provider should consider providing information on the development of their monitoring processes for both service user and carer involvement, and practice-based learning when they next undergo HCPC monitoring processes.

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, Full time
Date submission received	05 December 2018
Case reference	CAS-14002-W1V9S4

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors' recommendation	3

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Calum Delany	Speech and language therapist
Eloise O'Connell	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2012
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 6
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07902

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Placement monitoring reports from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer monitoring reports from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	Staffordshire University
Name of programme(s)	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Sciences), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Sciences), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Sciences), PT (Part time) BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Sciences), PT (Part time)
Date submission received	30 November 2018
Case reference	CAS-13919-N6V2M1

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Visitors' recommendation	4

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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Stephen McDonald	Biomedical scientist
Calum Delaney	Biomedical scientist
Ismini Tsikaderi	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Blood Sciences)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across all programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07905

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Infection Sciences)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across all programmes)

Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07906

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Cellular Sciences)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across all programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07907

Programme name	BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science (Genetic Sciences)
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Profession	Biomedical scientist
First intake	01 September 2017
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 30 (across all programmes)
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07908

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted	Reason(s) for non-submission
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes	
Internal quality reports from the last two years	N/A	The programmes were approved with a first intake date of September 2017, and therefore one year of internal quality reports is available.
External examiner reports from the last two years	N/A	As the programmes have only run from September 2017, they are not subject to external examiner reporting yet. This is due to external examiners only reporting for

		levels 5 and 6 of the programme, which have not yet run.
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	N/A	
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes	
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes	

Section 4: Visitors' recommendation

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continue to be met, and therefore recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 30 January 2019 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

HCPC annual monitoring process report

Education provider	University of East Anglia
Name of programme(s)	DipHE Paramedic Science, Full time
Date submission received	28 November 2018

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	2
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	3
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 annual monitoring 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).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports. 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:

Patricia McClure	Occupational therapist
Vincent Clarke	Paramedic
Rabie Sultan	HCPC executive

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	DipHE Paramedic Science
Mode of study	FT (Full time)
Profession	Paramedic
First intake	01 April 2016
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 40
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	AM07944

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continued to meet our standards over the last two academic years. This assessment formed part of our regular monitoring required of programmes on a cyclical basis.

Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require 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.

Required documentation	Submitted
HCPC annual monitoring audit form, including completed standards mapping	Yes
Internal quality reports from the last two years	Yes
External examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Responses to external examiner reports from the last two years	Yes
Practice based learning monitoring from the last two years	Yes
Service user and carer involvement from the last two years	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

3.3 The education provider must ensure that the person holding overall professional responsibility for the programme is appropriately qualified and experienced and, unless other arrangements are appropriate, on the relevant part of the Register.

Reason: The visitors determined that the education provider has provided the curriculum vitae of an appropriate and experienced person who holds overall professional responsibility for this programme, However, this standard now requires the education provider to demonstrate there is a process in place to identify a suitable person and, if it becomes necessary, a suitable replacement. As the visitors could not see any evidence of what process is in place to identify a suitable person or a replacement for this post, they could not determine whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence showing the process in place to recruit a programme leader, such as recruitment processes, job descriptions or person specifications.

3.17 There must be an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Reason: The audit form makes reference to appendices 13, 14 and 15 for this standard. Appendices 13 and 14 document have not been provided, therefore, from the information provided, the visitors were not clear on what the process is for learners raising and escalating concerns regarding the safety and wellbeing of service users in the practice based setting. The visitors require further evidence that demonstrates there is an effective process in place to support and enable learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users.

Suggested evidence: Relevant document submission detailing the process of how learners can raise concerns in the workplace and how they are supported and made aware of this process.

4.2 The learning outcomes must ensure that learners understand and are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors were unable to see evidence of how learning outcomes address the ethics and professional behavioural expectations of this programme. They could not see evidence within the learning outcomes to demonstrate how learners are expected to understand and be able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Therefore, the visitors require further information which demonstrates these standards are delivered within this programme, in order to make a judgement about whether this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Evidence demonstrating how the learning outcomes address expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. Additionally the evidence should specify which learning outcomes specifically ensure the SCPEs are addressed.

6.2 Assessment throughout the programme must ensure that learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

Reason: From the information provided, the visitors could not determine where the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) are assessed through the programme, in a way that will ensure learners demonstrate they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour. This standard now requires that assessments

throughout the programme ensure that learners are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the SCPEs. As the visitors have not seen this within the documentation, the visitors require further evidence that demonstrates how this standard is met.

Suggested evidence: Appropriate evidence that shows how the assessments ensure that learners can demonstrate that they are able to meet the expectations of professional behaviour and the SCPEs.

Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme remain approved.