

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Anglia Ruskin University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science
Mode of delivery	Full time Part time
HPC visitors	Pradeep Agrawal (Biomedical Scientist) Robert Munro (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Benjamin Potter
Date of postal review	20 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-01	d	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Anglia Ruskin - BSc (Hons) ABMS - FT&PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	City University
Programme name	Independent/Supplementary Prescribing
Mode of delivery	Part Time
HPC visitors	Jim Pickard (Chiropodist/Podiatrist) Andrew Newton (Paramedic)
Education executive	Benjamin Potter
Date of postal review	17 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's Report for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The programme did not run in 2007/08 and as such there is no external examiner's report for that year.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-01	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - City - SP - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Queen Margaret University
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist) Julie Wier (Operating Department Practitioner) Sarah Johnson (Occupational Therapist)
Education executive	Benjamin Potter
Date of assessment day	4 May 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Additional documents:

Appendix_7_CSP_Annual Quality Review_QMU_BScPhysio_2008_2009

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

The visitors noted that the responses to the external examiners' reports provided lacked rigour when addressing any issues raised. While the issues are intended to be addressed at the upcoming review the visitors could not determine how the education provider is to address these issues for the current cohorts and the students progressing through the existing programme. The visitors felt that the documentation provided did not demonstrate that clear and effective systems were in place to deal with the issues highlighted by the external examiners which may also affect SET 6.5. The visitors therefore require clear action plans, assessment strategy as well as schedule and amended module descriptors which demonstrate that there are effective systems in place to manage the programme and that the concerns of the external examiners addressed.

6.2 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes and skills that are required to practice safely and effectively.

Reason

In the external examiner's reports reference is made to the volume of summative assessment. While the visitors noted that the programme team intend to address these issues in the upcoming validation event they could not determine how the education provider is to address these issues for the current cohorts and the students progressing through the existing programme. In order for the visitors to be confident that these changes are appropriate in measuring the learning outcomes and skill required to practice safely and effectively, they require either updated module descriptors for the relevant modules where changes will occur or an action plan to address the concerns in the existing modules.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	f	EDU	PPR	AM Report - QMU - BSc (Hons) PH - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements	2
Narrative provided in response to update.....	2
Section Four: Additional Documentation	3
Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors.....	4
Visitors' comment	4

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	South Western Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Andrew Newton (Paramedic) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
Education executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	3 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Additional documentation for Ambulance Trust AM requirements

The audit form explained that there were no reports for two years ago. These were subjects which were covered in the approval visit to the programme which occurred in May 2008.

- Paramedic Pretest Guide
- Staff Bulletins
- Student Handbook
- Line Managers recommendation form / Occupational Health documents / Inoculations
- IHCD Rules & Regulations section 6
- South Western Ambulance Service Equality and Diversity Policy
- South Western Ambulance Service Business Plan
- Practice Placement Handbook
- Unit Monitoring Reports / Unit Lead Reports 1 – 4
- Example Student Portfolio
- End of Unit Evaluation Sheets
- External Examiner Report
- Guest Speaker List
- Tutor's Specialist Areas
- Practice Quality Development Division, Internal Placement Quality Review
- Placement Audit Tool
- HPC Standards of Proficiency Mapping Document / BPA Mapping Document
- Tutor Guide / Intended Learner Outcomes
- End of Placement Feedback Sheet (blank)
- Programme Lead Report / Action Plan
- Practical (OSCE) Assessment Sheets
- SWAST Assessment, Failure, Referral and Appeals policy

Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements

The following documentation was submitted in response to the additional annual monitoring requirements for the programme:

1. An update on the progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of their programme.

Narrative provided in response to update.

2. An update on the progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements.

Narrative provided in response to update.

3. An update on the availability resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Narrative provided in response to update.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	b	EDU	RPT	AM Report -Ambulance trust - SWAST - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Five.

The visitors also agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation on how the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Five.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

The visitors noted that the external examiner report received for one year ago was for the FdSc in Paramedic Science and not the IHCD Paramedic Award. The Response to the External Examiner's report one year ago appeared to respond to this external examiners report and the visitors would therefore like to receive two copies of the external examiner report and response to the external examiners report for the last year for the IHCD Paramedic Award. This documentation will allow them to be satisfied that there are effective management processes in place to ensure the quality of education provision on the programme is maintained.

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Reason

From the review the documentation submitted in response to the first additional question asked by the Education and Training Committee, the visitors noted that the education provider had introduced a step wise airway management record book which they indicated could be found in appendix 3 (page 8, section 1.5) and in appendix 10. The visitors could not find the step wise airway management record book and were therefore concerned about where the education provider integrated these skills within the programme and would like therefore like to receive further information to determine whether this standard continues to be met.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC Register unless other arrangements are agreed.

Reason

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	b	EDU	RPT	AM Report -Ambulance trust - SWAST - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

The visitors noted from the documentation that the external examiner appeared to have changed. The visitors were unsure when or if this had occurred. In order to ensure that this SET continues to be met, they would like to receive confirmation from the education provider whether the external examiner had changed during the last two years and if necessary, appropriate documentation.

Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

There is also sufficient evidence the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' comment

The visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to reviewing the submission. While HPC's Education and Training Committee asked for some additional information and while it is recognised that this required additional documentation; the visitors articulated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as outlined in Section Two. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the standards of education and training (SETs) continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

The visitors would like to recommend to the education provider that it reviews its use of the terminology 'accreditation' in relation to HPC. HPC does not accredit programmes, rather it approves them and the visitors felt that the use of accreditation within the documentation could be misleading to students and other stakeholders associated with the programme.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	b	EDU	RPT	AM Report -Ambulance trust - SWAST - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)	3

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	The Robert Gordon University
Programme name	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitor(s)	Fleur Kitsell (Physiotherapist) Katie Bosworth (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Mandy Hargood
Postal review	13 July 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: In audit mapping there is reference to the staff curriculum vitae(cv). Whilst most of the cvs were there the visitors did not receive the curriculum vitae for Victoria Park. In order to be assured that Victoria has the relevant knowledge and expertise to teach on the programme, the visitors would like to receive documentation that demonstrates that this standard is met.

3.11 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Reason: In the audit mapping document, it was stated that the attendance requirements for each module was included. However the attendance was not always clear in all the module descriptors. The visitors would like to receive documentation that sets out the attendance for the programme including how attendance is monitored and how students are informed about attendance for the programme.

5.7.2 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the timings and the duration of any placement experience and associated records to be maintained.

Reason: In the audit mapping document it said that the module descriptor for CA6E (HS4026) is now an elective placement. However the module descriptor does not demonstrate this. The visitors would like to receive practice placement documentation that informs the students regarding the elective placement so that they can be assured that the students are clear as to what they need to do in terms of obtaining an elective placement.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - RGU - MSc PH - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	c	EDU	PPR	AM Report - RGU - MSc PH - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Abertay, Dundee
Programme name	BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated)
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Robert Keeble (Biomedical Scientist) Mary MacDonald (Biomedical Scientist)
Education executive	Benjamin Potter
Date of postal review	2 September 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that no further documentation was required in order to make a recommendation.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-09-06	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Abertay - BSc(Hons) BMS - FT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Dundee
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 9)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The education provider did not submit a completed SETs mapping document as part of the audit form.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason

The annual monitoring audit submission made reference to concerns raised by the external examiner in regards to the assessment procedures of the programme.

It was commented under 'Conduct of Assessment (b)' that the assessment questions might not "draw out the analytical and reasoning skills indicated" (Henderson - session 2007-2008). There was a comment under 'Conduct of Assessment (a)' that it was not "completely clear how assessment addresses the scope of the learning outcomes" (Henderson - session 2008-2009).

The responses to the external examiner reports for 2007-2008 (Action Plan in Response to External Examiners' Comments Session 2007-2008) made reference to Henderson's comment and stated "discussion has taken place....and hopefully the matter will be resolved". The responses to the external examiner reports for 2008-2009 (Action Plan in Response to External Examiners' Comments Session 2008-2009) made no reference to the external examiners' comments.

The visitors therefore require further information to indicate what action, if any, was made in response to these external examiner comments to ensure the assessment design and procedures continue to assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-26	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Dundee - SP SCQF 9 - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Documentation	2
Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s).....	2

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	University of Dundee
Programme name	Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF 11)
Mode of delivery	Part time
HPC visitor(s)	Paul Bates (Paramedic) Kathryn Heathcote (Physiotherapist)
Education executive	Ruth Wood
Date of assessment day	17 June 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago

The education provider did not submit a completed SETs mapping document as part of the audit form.

Section Three: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Four.

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Reason

The annual monitoring audit submission made reference to concerns raised by the external examiner in regards to the assessment procedures of the programme.

It was commented under 'Conduct of Assessment (b)' that the assessment questions might not "draw out the analytical and reasoning skills indicated" (Henderson - session 2007-2008). There was a comment under 'Conduct of Assessment (a)' that it was not "completely clear how assessment addresses the scope of the learning outcomes" (Henderson - session 2008-2009).

The responses to the external examiner reports for 2007-2008 (Action Plan in Response to External Examiners' Comments Session 2007-2008) made reference to Henderson's comment and stated "discussion has taken place....and hopefully the matter will be resolved". The responses to the external examiner reports for 2008-2009 (Action Plan in Response to External Examiners' Comments Session 2008-2009) made no reference to the external examiners' comments.

The visitors therefore require further information to indicate what action, if any, was made in response to these external examiner comments to ensure the assessment design and procedures continue to assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practice.

Section Four: Recommendation of the visitor(s)

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-26	b	EDU	PPR	AM Report - Dundee - SP SCQF 11 - PT	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

Annual monitoring visitors' report

Contents

Section One: Programme Details	1
Section Two: Submission Details	1
Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements	2
Narrative provided in response to update.....	2
Section Four: Additional Documentation	3
Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors.....	4
Visitors' comments	4

Section One: Programme Details

Education provider	Welsh Ambulance Services NHS Trust
Programme name	IHCD Paramedic Award
Mode of delivery	Full time
HPC visitors	Andrew Newton (Paramedic) Graham Harris (Paramedic)
Education executive	Tracey Samuel-Smith
Date of assessment day	3 August 2010

Section Two: Submission Details

The following documents were submitted as part of the audit submission:

- A completed HPC audit form
- Internal quality report for one year ago
- Internal quality report for two years ago
- External Examiner's for one year ago
- External Examiner's Report for two years ago
- Response to External Examiner's report one year ago
- Response to External Examiner's report for two years ago
- Additional documentation for Ambulance Trust AM requirements

On the audit form and in the covering letter the education provider indicated that the external examiners report; the education provider's response to the external examiners report; and the internal quality document from one year ago was

included within the submission. The visitors were unable to locate these documents.

- Paramedic job description
- Paramedic person specification
- NLIAH information sheet 23
- IHCD rules and regulations section 8: recognition of prior learning
- IHCD qualification report forms 2007 – 2008 and 2008 – 2009
- Senior education and development lead CV
- WAST programme information pack
- Library inventory
- WAST student daily diary, tutorial and corrective action plan record
- Practice placement guidance and objectives
- JRCALC guidelines
- Preceptorship structure for newly qualified paramedics
- Letter to newly qualified paramedics
- IHCD rules and regulations section 6: Paramedic training
- Paramedic course joining letter
- FPEC audit documentation
- WAST assessment, failure, referral and appeals policy
- IHCD guidance to candidates
- IHCD paramedic pre-entry examination instructions
- IHCD guidance to accredited centres: Practical assessments
- IHCD guidance notes for tutors
- IHCD guidance to accredited centres
- IHCD rules and regulations section 9: examinations and assessment

Section Three: Additional Annual Monitoring Requirements

The following documentation was submitted in response to the additional annual monitoring requirements for the programme:

1. An update on the progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of their programme.

Narrative provided in response to update.

2. An update on the progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements.

Narrative provided in response to update.

3. An update on the availability resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions.

Narrative provided in response to update.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-25	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Ambulance Trust - WAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Section Four: Additional Documentation

The visitors agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation. The additional documentation is listed below with reasons for the request. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Five.

The visitors also agreed that additional documentation was required in order to make a recommendation on how the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. Following receipt of the documentation, the visitors made a final recommendation which can be found in Section Five.

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

From the submission the visitors found it very difficult to determine when the changes outlined in the audit form had occurred. They noted that a visit had taken place to the IHCD Paramedic Award on 11 and 12 March 2008 and that programme approval was reconfirmed from 1 June 2009. They therefore appreciated that some of the documents may already have been reviewed by visitors at the visit or in response to any conditions placed on continued programme approval. If this is the case these changes will already have been assessed.

The education provider has stated that the since programme approval has been reconfirmed, the programme has not run as sufficient numbers of students are completing alternate approved programmes within the vicinity. The visitors noted that the education provider has made changes to the IHCD Paramedic Award so that it stays in line with guidance from outside agencies, in case they should need to run the programme again. The visitors were unable to identify which of the changes outlined in the audit form had been made since programme approval had been reconfirmed and subsequently where they could find the specific changes within the documentation submitted.

The visitors were unable to determine from the audit form and documentation submitted whether the changes outlined have already been reviewed as part of the approval process (visit in March 2008); should be reviewed as part of this annual monitoring submission; or are future plans and therefore need to be reviewed as part of a major change submission. They would therefore like to receive clarification from the education provider stating when each of the changes outlined in the audit form had or is due to occur and where they can find the specific evidence to identify any changes which should be assessed as part of this annual monitoring submission. This clarification will allow them to be satisfied that there are effective management processes in place to ensure the quality of education provision on the programme is maintained.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-25	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Ambulance Trust - WAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Reason

On the audit form and in the covering letter the education provider indicated that the external examiners report; the education provider's response to the external examiners report; and the internal quality document from one year ago was included within the submission. The visitors were unable to locate these documents and were therefore unable to make a recommendation. The visitors would therefore like to receive confirmation of where these can be found or if needs be, receive them, to allow them to be satisfied that there are effective management processes in place to ensure the quality of education provision on the programme is maintained.

Section Five: Recommendation of the visitors

There is sufficient evidence that the programme continues to meet the standards of education and training and that those who complete the programme will continue to meet the standards of proficiency for the profession. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

There is also sufficient evidence the programme has addressed the Education & Training Committee's requirements for updates on: progress of implementing and embedding professional skills into the delivery of the programme; progress of implementing the range of appropriate placements; availability of resources and confirmation of the ongoing provisions. An approval visit is not required and continued approval should be granted.

Visitors' comments

The visitors wished to point out that the comprehensive nature of the submission was not entirely conducive to reviewing the submission. While HPC's Education and Training Committee asked for some additional information and while it is recognised that this required additional documentation; the visitors articulated that the education provider should consider the relevance of submitted documentation as the documentation necessary for an audit submission such as this is usually far less than provided for this audit. The annual monitoring process is a retrospective one focusing on programmes with ongoing approval and as such a submission usually only consists of the required documentation as outlined in Section Two. Any additional information is only needed when the programme has undergone changes which affect how the standards of education and training (SETs) continue to be met. The visitors would therefore like to highlight to the education provider that the volume of documentation, and subsequently work, is not necessary for any future HPC annual monitoring audit.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2010-08-25	c	EDU	RPT	AM report - Ambulance Trust - WAS NHS Trust - IHCD PA - FT	Final DD: None	Public RD: None