Visitors' report

Name of education provider	Sheffield Hallam University
Programme name	Diploma of Higher Education Paramedic Practice
Mode of delivery	Full time
Relevant part of the HCPC Register	Paramedic
Date of visit	10 – 11 December 2015

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 23 March 2016. At the Committee meeting on 23 March 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 to consider major changes proposed to the programme. The major change affected the following standards - the level of qualification for entry to the Register, programme admissions, programme management and resources, curriculum, practice placements and assessment. The programme was already approved by the HCPC and this visit assessed whether the programme continued to meet the standards of education and training (SETs) and continued to ensure that those who complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency (SOPs) for their part of the Register.

This visit was an HCPC only visit. The education provider did not validate the programme at the visit and the professional body did not consider their accreditation of the programme. The education provider supplied an independent chair and secretary for the visit.

Visit details

Name and role of HCPC visitors	Frances Ashworth (Lay visitor) Paul Bates (Paramedic) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
HCPC executive officer (in attendance)	Hollie Latham
Proposed student numbers	Direct entry: 50 per cohort, one cohort per year Ambulance trust entry: 20 per cohort, two cohorts per year
First approved intake	September 2004
Effective date that programme approval reconfirmed from	April 2015
Chair	Simon Bromley (Sheffield Hallam University)
Secretary	Helen Garner (Sheffield Hallam University) Sandra Clark (Sheffield Hallam University)

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	☒	☐	☐

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)	☒	☐	☐

Recommended outcome

To recommend a programme for ongoing 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 55 of the SETs have been met and that conditions should be set on the remaining three SETs.

Conditions are requirements that the education provider must meet before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. 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 did not make any recommendations for the programme.

Recommendations are observations on the programme or education provider which do not need to be met before the programme can have its ongoing approval reconfirmed. Recommendations are made to encourage further enhancements to the programme, normally when it is felt that the particular standard of education and training has been met at, or just above the threshold level.

Conditions

3.8 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The programme team must revisit programme documentation to ensure it is up to date and that the terminology in use is correct and reflective of the current terminology used in relation to statutory regulation and the HCPC.

Reason: The visitors noted that the programme documentation submitted by the education provider included several instances of incorrect and out of date terminology. For example, page 13 of the ECA student handbook states that "As part of the paramedic programme and agreed placement hours with College of Paramedics (CoP) and Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), students are expected to complete 750 hours on each placement year" this is incorrect as the HCPC does not stipulate that students must complete a set number of placement hours. The documentation also includes a number of outdated references such as Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) instead of the current Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), as well as using the HCPC's old name HPC and referencing outdated curriculum guidance documents. Additionally, the documentation did not articulate that students coming onto the programme via the ambulance trust would have access to the Calderdale and Huddersfield library facilities. Whilst the students were clearly aware of the ability to use these facilities the visitors note that this is not currently communicated appropriately within the programme documentation.

The visitors therefore, require documentation to be revised to remove all instances of incorrect terminology and ensure it communicates up to date information on the resources available to students. This way the visitors can be sure that the documentary resources available to support students' learning are being effectively used and that this standard is met.

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 clearly articulate the learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency (SOP) with specific reference to paediatric care. This will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for their part of the register.

14.12 be able to conduct a thorough and detailed physical examination of the patient using appropriate skills to inform clinical reasoning and guide the formulation of a differential diagnosis across all age ranges

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum, the above mentioned SOP is addressed. Specifically, the visitors could not locate where students would be taught skills specific to paediatric care. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that paediatric care is covered in module 2A active learning, module 2B PALS theory and in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The programme team also communicated detail of what was covered in each of these modules. The visitors were satisfied that the curriculum areas identified by the programme team were appropriate to address this

SOP, however, without seeing this articulated within the programme documentation the visitors cannot be sure that this will be delivered within the stated modules for the duration of the programme. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to clearly articulate where the above SOP is delivered specifically in relation to paediatric care. In this way, the visitors can ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

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 clearly articulate the assessment of learning outcomes for the programme modules to clearly reflect the following standard of proficiency (SOP) with specific reference to paediatric care. This will ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the SOPs for their part of the register.

14.12 be able to conduct a thorough and detailed physical examination of the patient using appropriate skills to inform clinical reasoning and guide the formulation of a differential diagnosis across all age ranges

Reason: From a review of the programme documentation the visitors were unable to locate, where in the curriculum, the above mentioned SOP is addressed. Specifically, the visitors could not locate where students would be taught skills specific to paediatric care. In a meeting with the programme team it was stated that paediatric care is covered in module 2A active learning, module 2B PALS theory and in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs). The programme team also communicated detail of what was covered in each of these modules. The visitors were satisfied that the curriculum areas identified by the programme team were appropriate to address this SOP, however, without seeing this articulated within the programme documentation the visitors cannot be sure that this will be delivered within the stated modules for the duration of the programme. The visitors note that without seeing where in the curriculum this SOP is met, they cannot make a judgement on how this SOP is assessed. The visitors therefore require the programme documentation to clearly articulate where the above SOP is assessed, specifically in relation to paediatric care. In this way the visitors can ensure that those who complete the programme are safe and effective practitioners.

Frances Ashworth
Paul Bates
Graham Harris