

---

## Performance review process report

London Ambulance Service NHS Trust, 2018 - 21

---

### Executive summary

Process stage – final visitor recommendation reached, covering:

- We have found the Provider to have reflected openly and honestly on the various sections of the Portfolio and have been cooperative when responding to our queries.
- They have detailed some interesting innovations and procedures they have developed and deployed in the review period.
- We have not found any risks or area of concern that require immediate attention or referral to another process. We also note that the Providers only provision with us is now closed with the final learners due to complete this academic year.
- We have also not found the required data points and have therefore recommended the shorter 2-year monitoring period. We note that this will not be required as the Provider will no longer be listed as one of our approved Providers.
- We are passing this report along with our recommendation to the Education Training Panel meeting planned for 31.03.2023

---

Previous consideration	N/A – This is the Provider’s first engagement with the Performance Review process since the launch of the HCPC Education department’s Quality Assurance Model
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• when the Education Provider’s next engagement with the performance review process should be</li></ul>
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the Provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Subject to the Panel’s decision, the provider’s next performance review would have been in the 2023-24 academic year. However, this will not be required due to programme having closed.</li></ul>

---

## Included within this report

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:.....	1
Section 1: About this assessment .....	3
About us .....	3
Our standards.....	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The performance review process.....	3
Thematic areas reviewed.....	4
How we make our decisions .....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: About the education provider.....	5
The education provider context .....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider .....	5
Institution performance data .....	5
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	6
Portfolio submission.....	6
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	7
Section 4: Findings.....	7
Overall findings on performance .....	7
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	7
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	11
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection .....	12
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions .....	15
Data and reflections .....	16
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	17
Assessment panel recommendation.....	17
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution .....	19

## Section 1: About this assessment

### About us

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.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

### Our standards

We approve Education Providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which 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.

### Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with Education Providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the Education Provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an Education Provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the Provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

### **Thematic areas reviewed**

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

### **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 design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education Providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an Education Provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from Education Providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### **The assessment panel for this review**

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this Education Provider:

Sue Boardman	Lead visitor, Paramedic
Gordon Pollard	Lead visitor, Paramedic
Ann Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Alistair Ward-Boughton-Leigh	Education Quality Officer

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The Education Provider currently delivers 1 HCPC-approved programmes from 1 profession area. It is a private provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2000.

This performance review case is the first case that the Provider will complete, however they were previously assessed under the Annual monitoring process last completing this in 2019-20. The programme was granted ongoing approval following this event and remained an approved programme. However due to the entry level uplift changing for paramedics the programme will no longer remain as an approved programme with the final cohort completing within this academic year (some completing in 2023 due to extension to their study).

### Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The Provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2015

### Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	54	22	04.07.2022	The data we have available indicates that the Provider's programme has capacity for 54 learners. From their portfolio we learn that they currently have 22 learners on their programme. This could be connected to the Provider's programme closing but was highlighted to the visitors to look into this further.

Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	N/A	Null	04.07.2022	As the Provider is a private provider certain data points are not available (such as HESA and OFS) to the provider from external sources. In cases such as these we have asked the Providers to reflect on these areas and provide the data if they have it available. The visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	N/A	Null	04.07.2022	Not available as this is a private provider Private Provider and an alternative is not available. The visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review were referred to the reflections regarding this section in the Providers portfolio.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Null	04.07.2022	Not available as this is a private provider Private Provider. The visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review were referred to the reflections regarding this section in the providers portfolio.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	N/A	Null	04.07.2022	Not available as this is a private provider Private Provider. The visitors were made aware of this ahead of their review were referred to the reflections regarding this section in the Providers portfolio.

### Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

#### Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

## Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided and worked with the Education Provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we had some areas of clarification that we discussed with the Provider via email but did not identify areas of risk that required quality activities. All information and visitors' assessment are instead contained section four's summary of findings. This format of presenting the findings in section four and clarifying some areas through dialogue with the provider allowed us to consider whether the Education Provider was performing well against our standards.

We have reported on how the Provider is performing on all areas through the [Summary of findings section](#).

## Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

### Overall findings on performance

#### Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

#### Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
  - The Provider stated that their approved programme is fully funded by themselves and is managed by a stand-alone assigned training team and an administrative / managerial support network. The Paramedic Academy Steering Group was constituted at the start of the programme to support the programme's inception. The 'stand-alone' nature of team resourcing means that the programme is self-sufficient from a resourcing point of view.
  - The programme has now closed with the last graduation date planned for 31/03/2023 and the tutors who have subject-matter expertise will be reassigned to Education Centres elsewhere in London.
  - Module leads have been developed over the course of the programme. These tutors have developed levels of expertise and subject specialism which will be retained as staff are moved across the organisation and London in different roles.
  - We note that the Programme is fully funded by the Provider and there is a stand-alone assigned training team and an administrative and managerial support network. We found the provision to be fully resourced, stable and had no concerns for this section.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
  - Programme staff have developed links with groups such as their patient's forum, external clinical groups such as the Sickle Cell Society

and Macmillan Cancer research, and internal colleagues such as Trades Union representatives. Learners were also able to gain a good understanding of Paramedic governance due to liaison with the HCPC tribunal service.

- The Provider has reflected on how, should they seek future approval of a new programme in the future they would use previous experiences in their future planning. They will continue to liaise with internal and external partners for their other range of non-HCPC courses. As a guide to progress, the CQC (Care Quality Commission) noted that “The service engaged well with patient groups and the wider community to plan and manage services and all staff were committed to improving services continually.”
- The Provider has reflected on the challenges they have faced and the learning they have gained from this. This includes that liaison with paramedic education was voluntary for their patients in the patient's forum. This at times affected the running of the programme in terms of interviewing prospective candidates and inconsistency of patients available for this. The Provider discusses how this would feature in any future programmes they run with consistency of the learner's experience being factored into their future planning.
- We noted that the programme staff have developed links with the LAS (London Ambulance Service) Patients Forum, external clinical groups such as the Sickle Cell Society and Macmillan, and internal colleagues such as Trades Union representatives' colleagues such as Trades Union representatives. We found this all shows the active healthy partnerships in place and had no concerns regarding this area.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
  - The Provider has discussed how progression boards provide governance on course management and maintenance of assessment and educational standards. External examiners provide feedback on all module reports throughout the programme, which are responded to by the Programme Lead(s) via the Exam Board. Feedback on placement quality and provision is provided by learners to the Placements team. This shows how the Provider was supported by both internal and external governance structures and learner experience is considered by the analysis of learner feedback.
  - The progression boards present the Provider with the opportunity to review their programme structure by means of a SWOT analysis. They reflect that by undertaking a SWOT analysis, they were able to ascertain whether they needed to change any structures for the benefit of the learner group. The reports highlighted, for example, the need to ensure that the Tutor pool was fully resourced to meet the programme requirements, and changes in Tutor provision have been instigated in light of these. This would a system they continued if they seek approval of a new programme in the future.
  - The Provider also discussed the increasing demand for paramedic programmes in London. With six HEI's feeding into the clinical and Emergency Department units in the greater London area and each HEI



has their own placement team and requirements. Additionally, each one having many placement requirements, which has meant that the Trust has had challenges in ensuring placement availability. Future partnership arrangements with institutions will mean that any placement activity is likely to be facilitated through these mechanisms.

- We note the programme is supported by both internal and external governance structures. Progression boards provide internal governance, two external examiners validate the received reports and / or request changes as necessary. In addition, the learner experience is considered by the analysis of learner feedback. We found the provider to be performing well here and had no concerns.
- **Interprofessional education –**
  - The Provider developed several internal and external placement opportunities to introduce the learner to broader areas of healthcare provision including via urgent care centres. Internally, learners were developed in the skills of clinical audit by appropriately trained professionals from the clinical audit team. The Short Focus Placement required the learner to reflect on their learning experience, and the usefulness of these placements as learning environments were able to be reviewed / refined by the education team.
  - The Provider reflects that in future, when planning or considering new programmes for other regulated awards, they will have a range of placements / good relationships with providers that can support the learning experience.
  - We found the Provider to have demonstrated that they have developed a number of internal and external placement opportunities to introduce the learner to broader areas of healthcare provision. We note also that their reflections regarding interprofessional education is centred around placements. Internally learners were developed in the skills of clinical audit by appropriately trained professionals from the clinical audit team.
- **Service users and carers –**
  - The Provider has referred to their 'Freedom to Speak up' and 'Duty of Candour' policies, and a robust complaint procedure in place that can be utilised by SU&Cs. They state that they have a clear commitment to learn from their mistakes and have embedded this as an essential part of their Paramedic practice tuition.
  - Their Practice Assessment Document for semester A, B and C had elements of practice relating to liaison with service users. These were reviewed at the end of each semester and each learner had to submit a formative and summative on each element, which was witnessed in practice by a senior registered clinician. They state that this structure is included in other awards the Provider provides (non-hcpc programmes).
  - The Provider also discussed the process they have in place to respond to any breach of trust incidents. They state that in the event this occurred they would record the incident and devise and action plan in

response. This would help the learner understand the implications of a breach and plan their future work.

- We found the Provider has demonstrated how at the inception of the programme, strong links were established with the Patients Forum, who contributed to the interview process, course delivery and also sat on the Steering Committee. We found they have demonstrated how LAS meets and intends to maintain the standards for Service users and carers. We had no concerns on this area finding the Provider to be performing as expected in this area.
- **Equality and diversity –**
  - The Provider states that they have delivered significant equality and diversity tuition and have a system to respond to any allegations that the equality & diversity policy has been breached in any way. They reflect that any breach is regrettable but that it is important for them to have processes in place to address this and a willingness / openness to do so.
  - They also discussed that CQC have assessed this and noted that the 'service promoted equality and diversity in daily work and provided opportunities for career development. There was a general culture of inclusivity and of teamwork across services.'
  - The Provider has also discussed how their 'Listening into Action' Facebook page has been instrumental in monitoring equality & diversity issues. This has been accessible for all their staff and where transgressions have occurred, whilst regrettable does provide them the opportunity to address these.
  - We found the Provider to have demonstrated how they have delivered significant equality and diversity tuition and responds to any allegations that equality & diversity policy has been breached in any way. We found them to promote equality and diversity and inclusiveness across their trust and to be open and honest about the issues raised. The information showed how they used these as learning opportunities and we have no concerns for this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
  - The Provider has confirmed the programme was due for closure and at the time of their submission was going through their final cohort. The programme closed in January 2023. Learning materials were continuously updated throughout the final 'teach-out' of the programme and the tutorial team remained available for the learners throughout.
  - Their reflections indicate the programme had been successful throughout its duration and offered a route for learners to gain paramedic status. They also received positive feedback from external examiners. The Provider continued to review the delivery of their programme ahead of closure. They did so to assist with the construction and delivery of any other future internal programmes.
  - We note how the Provider uses horizon scanning to identify long term challenges and opportunities. The Provider has discussed the closure of the programme but also how they will keep the programme up to date during its teach-out. We found them to demonstrate an effective

and responsive use of horizon scanning and have no concerns for this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
  - The Provider discussed how prior to recommencing normal activity, all education centre sites had to be audited for Covid compliance. Maximum programme attendance regimes were introduced, leading to alternative programme arrangements. There was an increase in the use of PPE (personal protective equipment) in the Providers facilities due to the pandemic. The Provider has also discussed the challenge for both their Learners and Tutors of providing good quality care in a very unknown operational context. Their reflections show they have learnt a significant amount in this period, that they can take forward into both their educational programmes, and in the operational arena.
  - The Provider also discussed the implementation of distance learning and move to blended learning, which prior to the pandemic was not an area they had invested. Tutors had to initially to return to operational duties due to the pressures on their provision. This did disrupt the ‘flow’ of the programme and made its management more challenging. The ‘recovery’ period i.e. the period of gradual return, was also complex, because specific regimes e.g. maximum room numbers etc. had to be followed to ensure learner and Tutor safety. The Provider will continue review the delivery of all its programmes, in relation to the changing Covid situation (and with an emphasis on a blended learning approach which allows for a distance-learning strategy to be further adopted). We note the Providers reflections on covid auditing and maximum course attendance regimes. This led to areas of discussion and learning around PPE, provision of good quality care in trying circumstances and the introduction of distance learning. Furthermore, tutors and learners returning to operational duties and the impact of Covid.
  - We have no areas of concern over how LAS has responded to Covid 19 and are satisfied that they will respond appropriately to any new strains or outbreaks of Covid 19.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
  - The Provider has discussed how they moved to two new bespoke clinical education sites which provided simulation suites. It also allowed tutors to present practical scenarios in an engaging and realistic way. The Provider will incorporate the use of advanced simulation in other regulated and non-regulated programmes they deliver.
  - The Provider has discussed different technological innovations they deployed in their provision. This includes their use of Microsoft Teams

as a short-term solution for presentations. All staff were issued with iPads to access course material and on-line learning. They also introduced a new Student Management System named 'AtLAS.' These innovations allowed learners to access course materials / submit assignments in a more efficient manner.

- Covid presented the Provider with the opportunity to test these distance learning solutions and received feedback on these. They reflected that some learners did feedback on the difficulties they faced accessing on-line modules and staff reflected that they preferred face-to-face interactions. The feedback also gave the Provider the chance to make changes and improve from mistakes.
- The use of filmed sessions has also improved the learner experience, by giving the learner real-time feedback. The use of filmed scenarios is now being included in the other regulated and non-regulated awards that the Trust runs, which will further improve the learner experience at all levels.
- We note from their reflections that the Provider has moved its education provision to two new bespoke clinical education sites, at Brentford and Newham respectively. Which include simulation suites, which will allow course Tutors to present practical scenarios in a more engaging and realistic way. We also note their use of new software such as AtLAS and Teams with AtLAS specifically being a powerful integrated IT system that will enable staff of all grades and learners to communicate more efficiently. The Provider has given good examples of how staff feel about technology and innovations. We have no concerns for this area and agree they are performing well.
- **Apprenticeships –**
  - The Provider has stated their current HCPC approved programme does not have an apprenticeship route and there has been no direct link between this programme and any external Apprenticeship scheme. Due to their HCPC-approved provision closing there is no ambition to introduce an approved apprentice route.
  - We found there to have been no direct link between this programme and any external apprenticeship scheme. We therefore had no comments or concerns on this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
  - The Provider has not reflected on this section. They have in other areas discussed how their programme is closing and no further cohorts are being accepted. They are on the 'teach-out' stage of their provision

meaning existing learners will be support until completion. The programme officially closed in January 2023.

- We sought further clarifications from the Provider. We have noted this area as non-applicable due to the nature of the programme being internal to them. We were unable to judge the provider performance in relation to this section due to lack of information. We would expect to see this and would in other review highlight this as a point of development before their next review. But as the programme has already closed the Provider will not be required to complete another Performance Review.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
  - The Provider has reflected on the assessments they have faced from the CQC. The recent report from the CQC noted the Providers assessment of risks to patients and acting on these risks. They have also noted the Providers staff working well together and with other health agencies. They commented that the Provider provides good care and treatment to their patients and provide good levels of advice to them on how to lead healthier lives. This report is not specific to their HCPC-approved provision but of the whole Trust.
  - The Provider reflects that they will continue to be patient-focussed and will continue to engage in external regulation as a core part of our educational activity even after their approved provision closes.
  - We found the Provider to have detailed and demonstrated how they meet and intend to continue to meet and maintain the standards of assessment of practice Education Providers by external bodies.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
  - The Provider has reflected in the section on data that they have not instigated the National Student Survey. They instead conduct their own internal feedback mechanism, which addresses learner satisfaction and course management commentary. We have noted this have not concerns for this area.
  -
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
  - The Provider has not reflected on this section. They have in other areas discussed how their programme is closing and no further cohorts are being accepted. They are on the ‘teach-out’ stage of their provision meaning existing learners would be supported until completion. The programme officially closed in January 2023.
  - We were unable to determine the Providers performance regarding this section due to lack of evidence. We do note that the Provider has internal monitoring systems in place and they reconfirmed this after we requested clarification from them. We note their internal system in terms of monitoring learners and an internal feedback regimen for programme and welfare issues. This is reviewed at the end of each semester. We have no ongoing concerns or questions for this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
  - The Provider reflected their staff are members of the College of Paramedics (CoP) and learners have had access to continuing

professional development guidance, and portfolio construction advice from the CoP.

- The Provider also states that a significant part of the programme's graduation day is given over to portfolio development and the maintenance of registration as a professional. This has helped spread the concept of professionalism, and the importance of professional registration, to the learner group. This level of advice and guidance will continue for the remaining learners on their programme.
- We note from the Providers submission that staff members are members of the College of Paramedics. Furthermore, learners receive CoP guidance, and portfolio construction advice, we have no areas of concern for this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**
  - The Provider has detailed how they have introduced a 'curriculum committee' that reviews programme and advises on any necessary changes due to internal or external influences. This remained in place for the remainder of the programme to advise on any changes and for the Providers ongoing actions post programme.
  - We noted from the Providers reflections how they have introduced a 'Curriculum Committee' which reviews programmes and advises on whether any actions or necessary changes are required. We also note the use of the filmed scenarios in this programme and its expansion to other programmes and will improve the learner experience at all levels. We found to be performing as expected here and have no concerns for this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
  - The Provider has stated that no specific changes have been made to the course (in the last year) in respect of professional body guidance.
  - We have no areas of concern as this is a closed programme and are confident that the Provider were making any changes required for patient safety.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**
  - The Provider has discussed how they have instigated a departmental restructure, encompassing a specific practice-based learning arm. This means they have been better able to support current Paramedic programme learners with this essential area of educational activity. This will be reflected upon in any further programmes they look to run.
  - The Provider has also moved some of the placement activity to reflect the emerging importance of different ways that the public access healthcare. This includes 111 placements, clinical hub placements and

Advanced Paramedic Practitioner placements. These are profiled towards the type of healthcare provision that the public are coming to expect as the norm going forward.

- The Provider discussed how they had to move placements internally to reflect the current loss of external placements. They reflected on the importance of placements and the importance of them provided a well-rounded learner experience. They will continue to facilitate internal placement activity and will re-establish external placements when that is the norm within wider health care settings.
- We note the Providers reflections in this area and have no areas of concern for this section. We have found the Provider to have demonstrated how they are managing the closure of this programme and the clear system they have in place to do this whilst continuing to support their learners.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**
  - The Provider discussed how they employ the use of a feedback form in each semester for learners. Thereafter, the Governance Manager undertakes follow up interviews with team members to review feedback which has been provided. During this process, they discuss area which will be further improved so that it is automated as part of the departments AtLAS Student Management System This will allow much quicker review of cohort feedback ‘results’, and when required more timely intervention. This has also been useful for programme development and led to changes in core departmental documentation and meeting structures.
  - The Provider has also discussed semester audit days where feedback is reviewed and any necessary changes are made to improve programme delivery. This has continued to take place as their programme teaches out. The Provider has also reflected that feedback is not always positive and can lead to intervention. They reflect on a welfare issue with one learner that required this. They also will continue to engage with learner feedback as an active process. The Provider describes themselves as a learning organisation and ready to receive feedback.
  - We note the Providers reflections in this area and also the examples they have provided.. Furthermore, we do not have a concern about the reduction of learner numbers from 54 to 22 as this is consistent with some learners looking for alternative programmes. We have no concerns for this as finding the Provider to be performing well in the context of a closing programme.
- **Practice placement educators –**

- The Provider states that following the amendments made due to covid the practise education is now returning to face-to-face learning. The provider will also continue to support their learners in the field but also allowing for some online elements, such as the PEd1 module remaining online.
- The Provider has made amendments to their signatory procedure due to covid pressures. This means that a Clinical Team Manager can sign off formative assessment criterion that has been witnessed by a Band 5 Paramedic. They reflected that this has improved the management of their programme and that they will continue to review practice assessment documents and programme feedback to determine if further improvements can be made.
- We have no areas of concern and are unable to find any concerns raised about the numbers, skill level, or commitment of PEd's throughout the portfolio.
- **External examiners –**
  - Programme managers received encouragement to increase the amount of filming that occurs on the programme. This included the filming of practical assessments that can be marked later and has had a positive effect on the programme management. Following this, the Provider will introduce filming of practical assessments within the other regulated / non-regulated awards that they run.
  - The programme continues to be well supported by external examiners, and good working relationships have been established. This relationship has been an important element in the governance of the whole programme.
  - We note the Providers reflections in this area and how they have two appropriate external examiners appointed. We note that these examiners had no concerns regarding professional and regulatory compliance. Both felt the management of assessment and quality was effective and transparent. We have no concerns in this area and find the Provider to be performing well.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Data and reflections

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- The Provider has reflected on the various data points that we look at. This being with the aggregation of percentage of learners not continuing. This data point is missing but the Provider has also reflected that this programme is registered as a closing programme. An alternative programme with HEI partner Cumbria University was instigated in the academic year 2019 / 2020. Learners that wanted to transfer had to declare their intentions to transfer.
- The next data point we reviewed was the aggregation of percentage of those who complete programmes in employment / further study. This data point were also missing but the Provider has reflected that all staff



remained in employment as employees of London Ambulance Service NHS Trust or other NHS providers. Furthermore, that the provision of an internal programme was able to meet the needs of their learners. The remaining learners will be supported to the end of their programmes of study and will thereafter be able to make a decision relevant to their personal circumstances. Such as remaining in the employment of London Ambulance Service or seek alternative employment elsewhere.

- The next data point discussed is the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award. This data point was missing, but the Provider has reflected that they undertake OTLA (Observation of Teaching, Learning and Assessment) and there is an internal quality assurance process which reviews marking / assessment activity. The policy intention is to provide Tutor / assessors with feedback that will enable them to develop their practice.
- The Provider has also reflected that they have been externally assessed by OFSTED and have scored 'good' on their scoring system. They also keep their programmes under regular review, and the analysis of what led them to achieve this score can be assimilated into this award and other programmes. They also reflect that the availability of staff to OTLA process has been a challenge, due to recent changes in job roles necessitated by a departmental restructure, and retirements. Additionally, the use of senior staff to undertake this process gives increased credibility to this strategy and is generally seen as important by teaching staff.
- The final data point we request is around learner satisfaction and we look at the National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27). This data point was missing, and the Provider has stated that they have not instigated the National Student Survey. They instead conduct their own internal feedback mechanism, which addresses learner satisfaction and course management commentary.
- We note the Providers approach to the data sections and that these data points are missing, this will contribute to or recommendation for ongoing monitoring. The Provider chose to reflect on the various sections and has provided ample evidence of reflection throughout the portfolio. We found all sections to be concise, open, honest and transparent and any mistakes made are learned from by the application of this method of self-reflection. We have identified no areas of concern or risk to the Provision and are content to conclude their review and allow the teach-out of their provision.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

**Assessment panel recommendation**

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- The Education Providers next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2023-24 academic year. However the Provider will no longer be one of our providers by then as their programme has closed

**Reason for next engagement recommendation:** We have found the Provider to have reflected openly and honestly on the various sections of the Portfolio. We have not found any risks or area of concern that require immediate attention or referral to another process. We have also not found the required data points to allow a longer review period and are also aware of the programmes closure. We have therefore recommended the shorter 2-year monitoring period, but also note that this will not be required as the programme will have ceased in its entirety before the date and the Provider will no longer be listed as one of our approved Providers.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
Paramedic Programme	WBL (Work based learning)	Paramedic			01/10/2015

Last intake date: 31/08/2020

Last graduation date: 31/03/2023