
Resources for education providers

SET 3.8 – Involving learners

3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

Purpose of the standard

- Learners must be able to *contribute* to the programme in some way

Considerations

- Education providers must provide evidence which shows how they **ensure** learners are involved
- Learners must be able to contribute to the **quality**, **effectiveness**, and **continuous improvement** of the programme
- Involvement may be in design, delivery, and / or review of the programme

Evidence you could provide



Processes that ensure learners:

- contribute through governance arrangements
- feed back on specific areas of the programme, for example, teaching



Processes which ensure you act on learner feedback



How you ensure good engagement with the National Student Survey (NSS), and act on feedback as required



How processes allow for any learner representatives to contribute to the programme

Case study 1

SET 3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

This standard is about how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Background: The University of Middlemarch submitted a major change form highlighting that they will be introducing a Degree Apprenticeship route for their BSc (Hons) in Speech and Language Therapy. The HCPC have made the decision that the SLT programmes at the education provider should be visited to consider the impact of the introduction of the new route.

Approach: The existing SLT programmes involve learners in several ways, including:

- having class representatives from each year on the course committee;
- asking learners for feedback on completion of each module; and
- considering National Student Survey (NSS) results as part of annual programme development.
- The education provider plans to involve learners in the same way in the new programme.

Evidence: To evidence this standard, the education provider has given minutes of course committee meetings, and examples of changes made to the existing programme due to learner feedback.

Case study 1

Questions to consider:

1. Could this approach meet the standard?
2. How could this approach be improved?
3. What other standards could be impacted by this approach?
4. How else could this standard be met?

Things to think about:

1. Degree Apprenticeship learners may have different expectations of the programme, and different experience to the existing learners. Therefore, does the approach to learner involvement need to be different?
2. Does the education provider have any information about how the governance structure works and how learners' feedback will be implemented, sufficient and embedded throughout the programme?
3. How could learners be involved in other areas of the programme, for example, the design, delivery and review?

Case study 2

SET 3.8 Learners must be involved in the programme.

This standard is about how the experience of learners is central to the quality and effectiveness of the programme.

Background: Redshire University are due to submit evidence for their 2019-20 annual monitoring audit for their Doctorate in Counselling Psychology programme. The programme leader remembers that the programme struggled to evidence that service users and carers were involved in the programme when required to do so by the HCPC, and that this resulted in an approval visit to the programme. The programme met this standard by demonstrating there was an overarching policy for continuing service user and carer involvement, in admissions and programme management.

Approach: The education provider will ask third year learners to be on the admissions panel, along with a practice educator, a service user and carer representative, and the admissions tutor. The programme leader will provide all panel members a score sheet with guidance on how to score applicants appropriately. The panellists will have a joint meeting after each interview sessions to make decisions about who should be admitted to the programme, with the admissions tutor having the casting vote.

The education provider also currently has a 'buddy system' where third year learners mentor first year learners. To help prepare them for their role, third year learners are offered non-mandatory training before mentoring starts. The training session includes how to be an effective and supportive mentor, and to feed into wider support available.

Evidence: The education provider has provided a narrative of how they consider they meet this standard.

Case study 2

Questions to consider:

1. Could this approach meet the standard?
2. How could this approach be improved?
3. What other standards could be impacted by this approach?
4. How else could this standard be met?

Things to think about:

1. There are four people on the panel, could this be intimidating for applicants?
2. Do the panel members need more than a score sheet? What other support and / or training is available to them on aspects such as equality and diversity considerations, and the approach to recruitment?
3. With the admissions tutor having the casting vote, are the other panel members integral or is the involvement tokenistic?
4. How will the buddy be supported? Is optional training enough?
5. The education provider submits a narrative? What evidence could they use to back it up?