University of Plymouth, Chiropody / podiatry 2024-25

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve chiropodist / podiatrist programmes at the University of Plymouth. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programmes against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programmes are fit to practice.

We have
- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Reviewed the programmes against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area
- Decided all standards are met, and that the programmes are approved

Through this assessment, we have noted:
- Through this assessment, we determined that quality activity was not required, as the education provider had made a thorough submission.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. These are new programmes the education provider is seeking approval for.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: • whether the programmes are approved
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: • The provider's next performance review will be in the 2027-28 academic year. • The programmes have been approved and will be delivered by the education provider from September 2025.

Included within this report

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 approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and programmes detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme 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 approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:
- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme(s)

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

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

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 this review:

Fiona McCullough	Lead visitor, Dietitian
Wendy Smith	Lead visitor, Chiropodist / Podiatrist
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 24 HCPC-approved programmes across eight professions. It is a Higher Education Institution and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1995. The already approved chiropodist / podiatrist programmes include the POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH) annotation.

There are two post-registration programmes for independent prescribing and supplementary prescribing annotations.

The education provider is made up of three faculties all of which have several schools based within them. The HCPC approved programmes are based in the Faculty of Health and are spread across the School of Health Professions, School of Biomedical Sciences, School of Nursing and Midwifery, School of Psychology and the Peninsula Medical School. The proposed programmes will be based in the School of Health Professions. Currently, the education provider delivers degree apprenticeship programmes in podiatry and occupational therapy in England and they are in the process of seeking approval for a dietetics apprenticeship with a start date of September 2025.

The proposed programmes are modelled on the currently approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship) and the MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) degrees. They are closely aligned to this existing provision, however, as the proposed programmes will be delivered in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, there will be some differences as degree apprenticeships are currently only available in England. There will therefore be a difference with the funding model for learners and there will be no end point assessment included in the design of the programmes. There is also a unique element to the proposed programmes, which is the delivery method. A blended learning model will be used for the programmes whereby all theoretical teaching will be delivered online.

The education provider engaged with the performance review process in the current model of quality assurance in 2022-23. The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process will be in the 2027-28 academic year. The reason for a recommendation of a five year monitoring period was the visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Their data points demonstrated they are performing as expected with regards to learner satisfaction, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.

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 2 of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Biomedical scientist	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2014

	Chiropodist / podiatrist	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2005
	Dietitian	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2004
	Occupational therapy	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2008
	Operating Department Practitioner	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2003
	Paramedic	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2008
	Physiotherapist	☒Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	2004
	Practitioner psychologist	☐Undergraduate	☒Postgraduate	1995
	Radiographer	☒Undergraduate	☐Postgraduate	2019
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2006

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.

This data is for existing provision at the institution, and does not include the proposed programme(s).

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Learner number capacity	994	1011	2024	The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is

				proposing through the new provision. Through this review we considered if there were sufficient resources for the proposed programmes due to the remote delivery of the programmes. It was noted the majority of the resources would be shared with the learners on the already approved BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship) and MSc Podiatry (pre-registration) degrees, which are also delivered remotely.
Learner non-continuation	3%	4%	2020-21	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 1%. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there is no impact on SETs considered.

Outcomes for those who complete programmes	93%	94%	2020-21	This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects. The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there is no impact on SETs considered.
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	2024	The definition of a Gold TEF award is "Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector." We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there was no impact on SETs considered.
Learner satisfaction	79.9%	81.8%	2024	This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects. The data point above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms. When compared to the previous year's data point,

				the education provider's performance has improved by 5%. We did not explore this data point through this assessment because there is no impact on SETs considered.
HCPC performance review cycle length	N/A	5 years	2022-23	The education provider engaged with the HCPC through the performance review process and a five-year review period was agreed. Their next performance review will take place in 2027-28.

We did not consider data points / intelligence from other organisations through this approval review.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programmes align with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programmes, the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Information for applicants** –
  - The University of Plymouth Student Admissions Policy (2021/22) is an institution wide policy that will apply to the proposed programmes. It provides details on the policy and procedure for making information available to applicants.
  - The proposed programmes are work based learning degrees. Employers will therefore be involved with the recruitment and selection process for applicants. Due to the nature of these programmes, the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) will not be used and applicants will be required to apply directly.

- o It was noted there was no information provided on how the employer was involved with the decision making process and ensuring applicants are suitable for the programmes from their perspective. We referred this to be explored further through stage 2 of the approval process.
  - o Applicants will be able to access information through recruitment events online, open days and the interview. Information relating to entry criteria, professional requirements and fees is available on the programme webpages.
  - o The proposed programmes were closely aligned to the existing podiatry degree apprenticeship provision, with the exception of these programmes being delivered remotely outside of England. The employer will therefore be responsible for providing their employees with information relating to the programmes. We will need to assess how this is managed by the employer and how applicants find out about and understand the programme requirements to make an informed decision about taking a place on the programmes.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health** –
  - o To meet the requirements, applicants are required to provide evidence of the level of their English language, at a minimum of GCSE grade 4, as part of the application process. Alternatively, applicants can provide evidence of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with a score of at least 7 or above and with no component less than 6.5. All applications will be screened for suitability and applicants will be required to attend a values based recruitment interview.
  - o As part of the admissions process, applicants will be required to complete an occupational health screening and provide a satisfactory enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate. If there were any concerns identified via these checks the Professional Issues Committee for the Faculty of Health would consider the concerns. This ensured the applicants suitability for the programmes and confirmed they were safe to work with vulnerable adults and children.
  - o These policies were institution wide and will apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L)** –
  - o Information on this area was outlined in the education provider's Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy. This policy varied across the programmes and the specific requirements were therefore outlined in the programme specifications. All applicants were assessed on an individual basis and prior learning and experience was considered through a mapping exercise against the learning outcomes of the modules of the specific programme. If applicants were able to demonstrate skills and learning these would be considered through these processes and exemptions would be applied.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –

- o The education provider had an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy, which included the Dignity and Respect Policy and Religious Diversity Policy. These policies demonstrated the education providers commitment to creating a diverse and inclusive culture where all learners were treated fairly and equally. To ensure learners were not discriminated against through the admissions process, all decisions were made based on 'merit' and no protected characteristics were considered through this process.
- o In addition to the above policies there was also an equality analysis tool kit to provide further guidance in this area. This ensured the equality, diversity and inclusion policy were applied appropriately across all programmes.
- o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: We referred the relationship between the education provider and employer in the following area to Stage 2 of the process:

- o SET 2.1 - the employer will be responsible for providing their employees with information relating to the programmes and will be involved with making an informed decision about taking a place on the programmes. We will need to assess how applicants find out about and understand the programme requirements to make an informed decision about taking a place on the programmes.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register[1]** –
  - o The education provider had a range of policies to ensure the programmes they delivered were at an appropriate level and meet the threshold for entry to the Register. These policies included the University of Plymouth Annual Review Procedure, Periodic Review Procedure and External Examiner Policy. Through the application of these policies the education provider ensured all programmes were being delivered at the required level and were up to date.
  - o The education provider currently offers an undergraduate and postgraduate podiatry apprenticeship degree. The proposed programmes were closely aligned to this existing provision, however, as they will be delivered in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, there will be differences as degree apprenticeships were currently only available in England. Therefore, there is a difference with the funding

---

[1] This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

model for learners and there is also no end point assessment included in the design.

- o The education provider had the staff, and the institutional infrastructure and experience, to deliver the proposed programmes. They had a large number of HCPC-approved programmes and so had the institutional knowledge and capacity to deliver the proposed programmes. Alongside this, we noted the current BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship) and the MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration) programmes both had elements, which were delivered remotely. The current infrastructure was therefore sufficient to support the delivery of the proposed programmes.
- o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

- **Sustainability of provision** –
  - o The education provider stated that the Faculty of Health, in which the proposed programmes would be based, was "the largest Faculty within the University, and was therefore well positioned to support the development and delivery of new programmes." Through market research they had gathered evidence, which demonstrated there was a demand for the proposed programmes across the Home Nations.
  - o All new programmes were considered and approved by the Academic Development and Partnerships Committee (ADPC). This process assessed the programmes sustainability from a financial and resourcing perspective. To ensure programmes remained sustainable the senior management team reviewed programmes through the Annual Programme Review process and identified any risks that may impact the programmes.
  - o The proposed programmes will be funded through tuition fees and the employers will be responsible for covering this through sponsorships. In addition to this, the School evaluates its financial position regularly to ensure the programmes long term sustainability.
  - o They also noted their collaboration with local partners in the development of the programmes, to ensure that it would meet the needs of employers and other stakeholders.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

- **Effective programme delivery** –
  - o The education provider had a portfolio of podiatry programmes, which they have been delivering since 2005. Therefore, there was a large amount of institutional experience and expertise available, as well as resources to support the delivery of the proposed programmes.
  - o Through the use of a wide range of clinically experienced staff, the education provider ensured the content delivered within the programmes was kept up to date. Alongside this they also used visiting lecturers to deliver on specific specialisms, which enhanced the learner experience and developed their knowledge further in the profession.

- o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- o The proposed programmes will be delivered online, and we will therefore need to understand how the education provider will ensure it is resourced by a wide range of clinically experienced staff and visiting lecturers. We referred this to Stage 2 of the approval process.
- **Effective staff management and development** –
  - o The education provider had a 'Staff Development Policy' which sets out their approach to staff management and supporting staff to develop in their roles. This contributed to effective management and development of staff and aimed to improve the quality of their work and ensured the success of the programmes. It was an ongoing process, closely linked to their annual appraisal process, which was outlined in the Performance Development Review Policy.
  - o In addition to this, the Teaching Qualifications and Recognition Policy outlined how staff were required to demonstrate their level of training when they were recruited to the role. These policies ensured all staff had the relevant experience and skills to deliver the relevant programmes.
  - o New members of staff were required to complete an Introduction to teaching and learning (ITL) module. Other training staff were required to complete included Diversity in the Workplace, Mental Health Awareness, Safeguarding – Including Prevent and Recruitment and Selection for Panel Members. There was a range of other mandatory training that staff could access.
  - o The Heads of School and Academic Leads monitored staffing levels to ensure they were appropriate and continued to meet regulatory requirements. For the proposed programmes staff from the existing podiatry programmes would be involved with the delivery of the programmes. Staffing levels would be assessed in line with the education providers existing processes.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level** –
  - o The Apprenticeship Hub team were an institution-wide team and supported all partnerships at institution level. They worked with employers and clinical partners on agreements and contracts and ensured expectations were clear. It is not clear how the Apprenticeship Hub team will work with the proposed programmes. We will therefore seek further clarification on this through stage 2 of the approval process.
  - o For the proposed programmes the education provider will collaborate with a range of stakeholders from the NHS Trusts and independent podiatry practices. This would include working with Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board in Wales, who have already expressed an interest in this programme. At this stage there were no confirmed

employers for Scotland and Northern Ireland and therefore it was not clear where the learners were confirmed as coming from. We understand the education provider was in the process of confirming the employers, however it was difficult to assess the sustainability of the programmes and understand how the education provider and employers would work together without this information. We therefore considered the sustainability of the programmes through stage 2 of the approval process. This included understanding how the resourcing/threats/support will be recognised and managed. These policies are institution wide and will apply to the proposed programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: We referred the relationship between the education provider and employer in the following area to Stage 2 of the process:

- o SET 3.1 – at this stage there were no confirmed employers for Scotland and Northern Ireland and therefore it was not clear where the learners were confirmed as coming from. We understood the education provider was in the process of confirming the employers, however it was difficult to assess the sustainability of the programmes and understand how the education provider and employers will work together without this information. We will therefore consider the sustainability of the programmes through stage 2 of the approval process. This will include understanding how the resourcing/threats/support will be recognised and managed. In addition to this, we need to understand how the Apprenticeship Hub team will work with the proposed programmes.
- o SET 3.2 - how the education provider and employer understand the responsibilities of all involved, and work together to deliver an effective programme. We will need to understand how the education provider will ensure the programmes will have access to a wide range of clinically experienced staff and visiting lecturers.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Academic quality** –
  - o The policies to monitor the quality of the programmes were outlined in the Annual Review Procedure, Periodic Review Procedure and the External Examiners for modules and taught programmes of study Policy and Procedure. These policies ensured the continuous improvements of the programmes and maintained the quality.
  - o At the Annual Programme Monitoring Committee Meetings all programmes were reviewed. The purpose of these meetings was to ensure the programmes were meeting quality standards and to discuss any issues related to the learner experience that needed to be addressed.

- o Learners completed annual feedback questionnaires and external examiners actively contributed to all programme monitoring and evaluation systems.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments** –
  - o The education provider had a range of policies in this area that applied at institution and faculty level. At institution level the Raising Concerns Policy and Fitness to Practice Policy applied and then at faculty level the Placement Audit Policy and the Placement Incidents and Concerns Policy applied. These policies ensured practice learning environments are safe and supportive for learners to practice in.
  - o The education provider and employer will have specific policies and processes in place to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users (SET 3.17). We referred this to Stage 2 of the approval process for consideration.
  - o All practice learning environments were audited every three years, however if there were any concerns raised by an individual or through the quality assurance mechanisms this could take place earlier. They were also required to have workplace agreements in place with the education provider, which outlined the roles and responsibilities.
  - o The education provider delivered and monitored training and continuing professional development (CPD) for practice educators. This ensured practice educators had the required knowledge, skills, and experience to work with learners. The academic team delivered a training session annually to all practice-based learning providers and met approximately three times a year. This enabled the education provider to gather feedback and discuss programme developments, which ensured the programmes continued to meet requirements.
  - o Placement Development Team meetings took place annually for individual programmes. These meetings were attended by representatives from the education provider and practice-based learning environments. The purpose of the meeting was to review the placements and identify any areas where there may be issues that needed to be addressed and to gauge the learner and practice educator experience and to gather feedback. These meetings were also used to plan for future placements and identify any areas where improvements may be required.
  - o Learners provide feedback on their placement experience at the end of the placement. This feedback was gathered both informally and formally through the completion of evaluations and reviewed through the quality assurance and audit processes.
  - o All learners were required to complete mandatory training to prepare them for their placements. The training they were required to complete included Basic Life Support, Infection Control, Mental Capacity Act and Safeguarding Children. Learners on the proposed programmes will

also be required to complete this training prior to commencing their placements.

- o There will be specific policies and processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners. We needed to understand which policies apply in which situation (SET 4.10). We referred this to Stage 2 of the approval process for consideration.
- o Due to the proposed programmes being delivered remotely, we needed to consider how the education provider ensures practice educators have the programme specific understanding to deliver and assess the learning outcomes (SET 5.7); and learners and practice educators have the information they require to be prepared before going into the practice environment (SET 5.8). We referred these areas to Stage 2 of the approval process for consideration.

- **Learner involvement** –
  - o The education provider was committed to ensuring learner involvement and used a range of mechanisms to do this, such as the learner representative role. The policies and procedures to support learner involvement were outlined in the Student Charter and the Education and Student Experience Strategy.
  - o Learners were encouraged to be involved with the programmes through the Staff Student Liaison Committee, Programme Committees and the recruitment process for academic staff. The Peer Assisted Learning Scheme (PALS) also enabled learners to take up a leadership role to support their peers through the programme. Alongside this, they also had the opportunity to become ambassadors, which enabled them to be involved with open days and learner recruitment.
  - o Through the learner representative, learners were able to provide feedback about the programmes and raise any issues or concerns they had, which were then further discussed at the Programme Committees. Other mechanisms for learners to provide feedback included the module evaluations, which were completed at the end of the module and reviewed by the module lead.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
  - o Due to the proposed programmes being delivered remotely, it was not clear how learner involvement would be facilitated. We needed to understand how this will be coordinated and how learners will be involved with the proposed programmes remotely. Alongside this we also needed to understand how the education provider will communicate to learners the parts of the programmes where attendance is mandatory. We referred these areas to Stage 2 (SET 3.8 and 4.11) of the approval process.

- **Service user and carer involvement** –
  - o There is a School-wide Service User and Carer Group, which the individual programmes work with to involve service users and carers with their programmes. Programme teams meet with them quarterly to

discuss how they can be involved with the programmes and gather feedback.

- o Service users and carers were involved with programmes in different ways, however much of the involvement included curriculum development, admissions process and supporting and facilitating the delivery of modules.
- o Currently the service user and carer group lead in this area at school level. There was no policy to support this area at institution or school level and no indication of the education providers plans to develop a policy. If the education provider chooses to develop this at an institution level, this should be considered further through their next performance review in 2027-28.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: We referred the relationship between the education provider and employer in the following area to Stage 2 of the process:

- o SET 3.8 and 4.11 - it was not clear how learner involvement would be facilitated, given the programmes would be delivered remotely. Alongside this we also need to understand how the education provider will communicate to learners the parts of the programmes where attendance is mandatory. We will need to understand how this will be coordinated and how learners will be involved with the proposed programme.
- o SET 3.17 – the specific policies and processes in place to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. We need to understand which policies apply in which situation and who responds.
- o SET 4.10 - There will be specific policies and processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners. We will need to understand which policies apply in which situation.
- o SET 5.7 and 5.8 - Due to the proposed programmes being delivered remotely, we will need to consider how the education provider ensures practice educators have the programme specific understanding to deliver and assess the learning outcomes (SET 5.7); and learners and practice educators have the information they require to be prepared before going into the practice environment (SET 5.8).

<u>Learners</u>

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- • **Support** –
  - o There were institution wide policies to support learners, which could be accessed via The University of Plymouth Student Hub. Some of the services available were the Disability Service, Careers Service, Mental Health Support and Health and Medical Wellbeing Services. All services were available on campus, however learners were able to access some services online. These services included the counselling

service and mental health support and study skills workshops. Due to these programmes being delivered remotely we needed to clearly understand what support learners will have access to remotely. therefore,ore needed to understand which policies apply in each situation and how learners know about these; how learners access academic support while in their place of employment; and whether and how processes are shared between the employer and the education provider.

- o All learners were allocated a Personal Tutor to provide them with pastoral and academic support, which included referral to specific support services. This tutor supports learners through the duration of the programme and provides advice relating to issues that maybe impacting their attendance. The attendance requirements were outlined in the Attendance and Engagement Policy.
- o Learners were encouraged to provide feedback both negative and positive. The Student Complaints Procedure outlined the process for learners to complain. The education provider encouraged learners to use these processes, as it enabled them to respond to issues and concerns and improve services. It also acted as a mechanism to enhance the learner experience.
- o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- o For the proposed programmes, it was not clear how the support provided and available to learners would be available and accessible to the learners on the proposed programmes. We referred this to Stage 2 (SET 3.13) of the approval process.

- **Ongoing suitability** –
    - o The ongoing suitability of learners was considered through the education providers Disciplinary Procedures and the Fitness to Practice Procedures. Learners were also required to complete annual declarations to confirm there had been no changes with their circumstances regarding their DBS and health status.
    - o Through induction learners were informed of the professional expectations and requirements they were expected to meet. These were regularly assessed through the programmes, through the assessments learners complete and the workplace evaluations.
    - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E)** –
    - o The education provider was committed to inter professional learning and had established the Plymouth Integrative Health and Social Care Education Centre (PIHC) to support this and provide further learning opportunities for learners. The Centre bought together a range of professions for learners to collaborate with, develop their skills and knowledge further. Each school had a Interprofessional Learning Lead

who was linked to the PIHC and worked with them to develop interprofessional learning opportunities for learners.

- o Inter professional learning opportunities were embedded into the modules across all programmes. Alongside this there were also other initiatives where learners from different professions come together to draw on each other's experience, knowledge and learn more about the subject areas. These initiatives included Tea-Time Teaching session, which was a monthly session delivered by peers from different professions and Schwartz Rounds where learners and staff discussed various aspects of their training. It was clear there were a range of inter professional learning opportunities available for learners, however it was not clear if these opportunities would be accessible remotely to the learners on the proposed programmes. We therefore needed to understand the education providers plans to provide learners on the proposed programmes with access to inter professional opportunities. We referred this to Stage 2 of the approval process for consideration.
- o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion** –
  - o The education provider had a range of policies to support equality, diversity and inclusion, which demonstrated their commitment to this area. These included the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy, The Dignity and Respect policy, Religious Diversity Policy and the Trans Policy for staff and students. Alongside this, there was a range of training available to staff that they could access to educate themselves further in this area. These policies helped to create a supportive and inclusive environment for learners. All programmes were required to adhere to these policies and embed them within their teaching.
  - o The annual programme review process ensured equality, diversity and inclusion policies were being applied appropriately. The process helps to improve performance and identify areas for improvement.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: We referred the relationship between the education provider and employer in the following areas to Stage 2 of the process:

- o SETs 3.13 - it was not clear how the support provided and available to learners would be available and accessible to the learners. Due to these programmes being delivered remotely we need to clearly understand what support learners will have access to remotely. We will therefore need to understand which policies apply in each situation and how learners know about these; how learners access academic support while in their place of employment; and whether and how processes are shared between the employer and the education provider.

- o SET 4.9 - It was clear there were a range of inter professional learning opportunities available for learners, however it was not clear if these opportunities would be accessible remotely to the learners on the proposed programmes. We will therefore need to understand the education providers plans to provide learners on the proposed programmes with access to inter professional opportunities.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:
- **Objectivity** –
  - o The education provider had in place a number of policies around assessment and moderation, designed to ensure that learners' work and achievement was considered in a fair way. For example, there was an Anonymous Marking Policy and an Extenuating Circumstances Policy. All programmes were required to follow these policies and report their compliance during reviews. Clear guidance was issued for learners around these policies.
  - o External Examiners were involved with all elements of assessments and provided independent input into the assessments to ensure quality and academic standards were maintained.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Progression and achievement** –
  - o The Attendance and Engagement Policy outlined the requirements for learner attendance and progression. Attendance was also monitored through the education providers S4 digital system, which was an online system used by staff to access and monitor data relating to learners. This system enabled staff to identify concerns regarding learner engagement and address them by providing them with the appropriate support.
  - o The Academic Regulations outlined the requirements for academic progression and awards, which applied to all programmes. To ensure quality and consistency all marks were reviewed by the Subject Assessment Panel and Award Assessment Board. As part of this process the Assessment Setting, Marking and Moderation Policy was also applied, whereby external examiners were required to review a sample of assessments to ensure consistency.
  - o These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.
- **Appeals** –
  - o The appeals procedure applied to all programmes and allowed learners to submit an appeal relating to a decision that had been made regarding their progression, which could include challenging the mark they have received for a module.

      o   These policies were institution wide and would apply to the proposed programmes.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1. As noted through the previous section there are areas to take forward into stage 2. These are outlined below.

- SET 2.1 - the employer will be responsible for providing their employees with information relating to the programmes and will be involved with making an informed decision about taking a place on the programmes. We needed to assess how applicants find out about and understand the programme requirements to make an informed decision about taking a place on the programmes.
- SET 3.1 – at this stage there are no confirmed employers for Scotland and Northern Ireland and therefore it is not clear where the learners are confirmed as coming from. We understand the education provider is in the process of confirming the employers, however it is difficult to assess the sustainability of the programmes and understand how the education provider and employers will work together without this information. This will include understanding how the resourcing/threats/support will be recognised and managed. In addition to this, we need to understand how the Apprenticeship Hub team will work with the proposed programmes.
- SET 3.2 - how the education provider and employer understand the responsibilities of all involved, and work together to deliver an effective programme. We need to understand how the education provider will ensure the programmes have access to a wide range of clinically experienced staff and visiting lecturers.
- SET 3.8 and 4.11 - it was not clear how learner involvement will be facilitated, given the programmes will be delivered remotely. Alongside this we also needed to understand how the education provider will communicate to learners the parts of the programmes where attendance is mandatory. We will need to understand how this will be coordinated and how learners will be involved with the proposed programme.
- SET 3.17 – the specific policies and processes in place to support learners to raise concerns about the safety and wellbeing of service users. We needed to understand which policies apply in which situation and who responds.
- SET 4.10 - There will be specific policies and processes in place for obtaining appropriate consent from service users and learners. We needed to understand which policies apply in which situation.
- SET 5.7 and 5.8 - Due to the proposed programmes being delivered remotely, we needed to consider how the education provider ensures practice educators have the programme specific understanding to deliver and assess

the learning outcomes (SET 5.7); and learners and practice educators have the information they require to be prepared before going into the practice environment (SET 5.8).

- SETs 3.13 - it was not clear how the support provided will be available and accessible to the learners. Due to these programmes being delivered remotely we needed to clearly understand what support learners will have access to remotely. We therefore needed to understand which policies apply in each situation and how learners know about these; how learners access academic support while in their place of employment; and whether and how processes are shared between the employer and the education provider.
- SET 4.9 - It was clear there are a range of inter professional learning opportunities available for learners, however it was not clear if these opportunities will be accessible remotely to the learners on the proposed programmes. We therefore needed to understand the education providers plans to provide learners on the proposed programmes with access to inter professional opportunities.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- The current podiatry staff team will be involved with the delivery of the proposed programmes. The Programme Leads and Academic Lead will be responsible for the proposed programmes and will have operational and strategic oversight.
- The education provider offer a range of facilities on campus which are utilised by the learners on the current podiatry programmes. Due to these programmes being delivered remotely, learners will only require access to online resources and teaching spaces will not be required.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based	WBL (Work based learning)	Chiropodist / podiatrist POM – Sale / Supply (CH) and POM - Administration	12 learners, 1 cohort per year	17/09/2025

MSc Podiatry Work-based (Pre-Registration)	WBL (Work based learning)	Chiropodist / podiatrist POM – Sale / Supply (CH) and POM - Administration	5 learners, 1 cohort per year	17/09/2025

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Data / intelligence considered

We also considered intelligence from others (e.g. prof bodies, sector bodies that provided support) as follows:
- NHS England (South West) – we did not receive information which we considered would impact on this assessment.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission.

The education provider's submission demonstrated all standards were met and therefore no quality activities were required.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the [Findings section](#).

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that

standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:
- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment.
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
  - The selection and entry requirements are clearly defined and appropriately aligned with the level of the proposed programmes. Applicants must hold GCSEs (or equivalent) in English and Maths at grade C/4 or above, along with a minimum of one A-level or equivalent level three qualification. For entry to the MSc programme, a minimum of a 2:1 undergraduate degree or equivalent recognised study is required. As part of the admissions process, all applicants will be required to participate in a values-based recruitment interview.
  - Applicants are required to have an Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check and occupational health clearance. This information is available on the education provider's website and is accessible to applicants.
  - Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 2.1. We noted the employer and education provider would engage with applicants to make a decision about taking a place on the programmes.
  - The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.
- **SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership** –
  - There was evidence of regular collaboration with practice education providers and learners. They were involved with the development of the programmes and will continue to be involved through the programme committee meetings and participation with the Periodic Reviews when the programmes commence. Alongside this the education provider hold annual programme committee meetings where all stakeholders are invited. These meetings enabled the education provider and stakeholder to collaborate and provided them with an opportunity to gather feedback to improve and discuss other aspects of the programme.

- o Evidence of a clear process was provided to ensure the availability and capacity of practice-based learning. Visitors considered there were appropriate mechanisms to source and manage practice-based learning and acknowledged they had a clear process to quality assure all practice-based learning opportunities.
- o The education provider submitted staff CVs to support the narrative stating that they had five full time equivalent (FTE) staff to deliver the programmes. The staff CVs demonstrated there were an appropriate number of staff who had relevant knowledge and experience, which included specialist subject knowledge and experience to deliver the programmes.
- o It was noted there were a range of resources available to support learners, such as the library and the Digital Learning Environment (DLE). Due to the delivery method of the programmes being remote, they have outlined the IT requirements for undertaking this programme. There were clear processes in place to ensure learners had access to appropriate support.
- o Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 3.13. It was noted there were appropriate arrangements in place to support the wellbeing and learning needs of learners in all settings. These arrangements included academic support, such as the Writing Café and resources to assist learners with academic writing in the form of study guides and a Learning Development Advisor. Alongside this pastoral support was provided via a personal tutor and learners were also provided with access to wellbeing services. These included the counselling service and access to Togetherall, which was a 24/7 service to support learners with mental health and wellbeing issues. This was outlined in the BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based and MSc Podiatry (Pre-reg) Approval Document.
- o Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 3.1. We noted the education provider were working closely with Scotland and Wales – Aberdeenshire NHS and Aberdeen City NHS and Betsi Cadwaladr NHS Wales. To ensure the programmes sustainability they had also liaised with the University of Plymouth's Market Insights team who had identified sufficient demand to support the proposed programmes. We recognised although the learner numbers would be low, there was still adequate demand for the programmes and when these programmes are advertised this demand will increase. The Apprenticeship Hub will also play a key role in supporting these programmes and will be responsible for the administration of the contracts and agreements with employers and managing the employer relationship. They will also be responsible for tracking learner progress and undertaking audits to ensure compliance requirements are met.
- o The BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based and MSc Podiatry (Pre-reg) Approval Document provided details of the programme management structure. Visitors noted the academic delivery of the Podiatry Work-Based Degree Programmes will be led by staff from the School of

Health Professions who have a range of clinical experience. Oversight of the work-based learning elements will be provided by the Associate Head of School for Practice Learning, while the Associate Head for Teaching and Learning, in collaboration with Module Leads, will be responsible for the delivery of academic modules. The Programme Lead will be responsible for the leadership of the programmes Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 3.8 in the BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based and MSc Podiatry (Pre-reg) Approval Documents. It explained the mechanisms through which learners would be involved with the programmes such as the learner representative role. This role would enable learners to have a voice and the elected representative would be responsible for sharing any feedback or comments relating to the programmes with the team. This would contribute to the development of the programmes and enhancing the learner experience. Learner representatives would be through the programme committee meetings and the annual programme monitoring process.

- o Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 3.17. It was noted learners would be required to report any concerns related to the safety and wellbeing of service users to their clinical supervisor and the Associate Head of School for practice learning. Both parties would then work with the learner to address the concerns raised. This was outlined in the BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based and MSc Podiatry (Pre-reg) Approval Documents.
- o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery** –
  - o The learning outcomes were mapped against the Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) mapping document and outlined in the module descriptors. The structure of the modules ensured learners met the SOPs.
  - o Professional behaviours and the standards of conduct, performance and ethics were embedded throughout the programmes to ensure learners understand the expectations. This has been considered in the programme development, course documentation and module descriptors.
  - o The philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base were clearly articulated in the structure and delivery of the programmes. This was evidenced through the module descriptors and programme specifications.
  - o There were appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the curriculum remained relevant to current practice. This included the programmes being designed to reflect the SOPs and the Royal College of Podiatry Competencies. It was noted, the knowledge and expertise of the academic staff and the ongoing collaboration with stakeholders would contribute to ensuring the curriculum remained relevant to current practice.

- The structure of the programmes ensured the integration of theory and practice. Visitors noted how clearly this was covered across the programmes and how it was embedded within the curriculum design.
- A variety of teaching and learning methods were identified, all of which were well-suited to achieving the intended learning outcomes. Visitors acknowledged that the programmes would be delivered remotely and noted that the chosen approach effectively supported the delivery of these outcomes.
- Visitors noted how the design of the programmes enabled learners to meet learning outcomes and develop their autonomous and reflective thinking skills throughout the programmes. This was evidenced through the programme specifications.
- The structure of the curriculum and assessment strategy ensures evidence-based practice is embedded throughout the programmes. This was demonstrated through the clinical practice paperwork and specific research-based modules, such as Evidence Based Practice, Research Methods and Research Project.
- We noted the education provider informed learners they were expected to attend all scheduled online lectures, which were a mandatory requirement. For those unable to attend, recorded sessions were made available. Attendance was also tracked using unique codes for each timetabled session, and engagement was monitored through activity on digital platforms.
- Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 4.9. It was noted the Employer Capacity Assessment, which was used to quality assure the practice-based learning environment, required learners to work in multi professional teams. In addition to this, learners will be provided with access to online interprofessional opportunities, which will be available via the Plymouth Integrative Health and Social Care Education Centre (PIHC). They will also have access to the Schwartz Rounds, which is a forum designed to support all health and social care professions. These forums are made of staff and learners from the different professions and are opportunities for individuals to discuss work, experiences and training and gain an understanding of other professions. The education provider recognises there is an increase in programmes being delivered remotely and have therefore made a range of inter professional learning opportunities available remotely.
- Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 4.10. It was noted learners were provided with guidance on obtaining consent in the Introduction to Podiatric Practice module. In addition to this, learners would be expected to follow local policies. For instance, those based in Wales would be required to follow the local consent policy provided by Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board for working with service users. Similar arrangements would be in place for those based in Scotland through the national PrBl Partnership Agreement between the five Scottish education providers. Normally learners who

attend the University of Plymouth campus are required to sign 'Consent to Model for Students' document, however due to the nature of these programmes, whereby learners are not required to attend campus, this document cannot be used and therefore local policies will apply. This ensured there were appropriate processes to obtain consent.
- o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning** –
  - o Visitors noted the clear integration of practice-based learning in the programmes. Due to the nature of these programmes they recognised learners were based in supervised work based settings where they had exposure to a range of practice-based learning opportunities.
  - o It was noted there were appropriate processes to ensure an adequate number of qualified and experienced practice educators involved with practice-based learning. Part of this process was to ensure practice educators were registered with the HCPC and had completed the University of Plymouth Clinical Supervisor Learning Development training. This information also addressed the referral in Stage 1 relating to SET 5.7.
  - o There was evidence to demonstrate the structure, duration and range of practice-based learning, which was appropriate to support the SOPs and achievement of the learning outcomes. Given the nature of the programmes, learners will engage in a broad and in-depth range of practice-based learning experiences.
  - o Visitors acknowledged the education provider had established a variety of processes to ensure that, should an employer be unable to offer the full spectrum of these experiences, suitable and relevant alternatives are made available to support the learner's development.
  - o Visitors noted the additional information submitted regarding SET 5.8. As part of the admissions process, the individuals identified as practice educators will be formally recorded and thereafter, they are given access to relevant online documentation. They are also invited to attend online training sessions and an induction session prior to the programmes commencing. It was noted these sessions were also recorded and made available via the Digital Learning Environment to ensure all practice educators completed it. Learners attend an induction day prior to the programmes commencing and are provided with access to digital learning platforms and online material. Alongside this they are also advised to liaise with their personal tutors if they are unable to access specific information relating to their practice-based learning experience. This ensures learners and practice educators are provided with information in a timely manner to prepare them for practice-based learning.
  - o The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.
- **SET 6: Assessment** –

- The programmes were clearly mapped against the HCPC SOPs and the assessment strategy clearly demonstrated the assessments enabled learners to meet the SOPs.
- All assessments are linked directly to clinical practice, which enables learners to demonstrate they meet the expectations of professional behaviour, including the standards of conduct, performance and ethics.
- Assessment methods are clear and appropriate and are outlined in the module descriptors. It was noted the assessments were varied and linked directly to areas of professional practice, which enabled learners to meet the learning outcomes.
- The visitors therefore considered the relevant standard within this SET area met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:
- All standards are met, and therefore the programmes should be approved.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observations they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programme is approved.
- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2027-28 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Education and Training Committee Panel accepted the visitor's recommendation that the programme should receive approval

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
University of Plymouth	CAS-01739-Y9H3L0	Fiona McCullough and Wendy Smith	Through this assessment, we have noted: • Some stage 1 standards were considered further through stage 2 by the visitors and further evidence was sought from the education provider. Visitors reviewed all evidence for stage 2 and the supplementary evidence relating to the standards that were referred from stage 1 and confirmed they were satisfied.	Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities: • The current podiatry staff team will be involved with the delivery of the proposed programmes. The Programme Leads and Academic Lead will be responsible for the proposed programmes and will have operational and strategic oversight of the programmes. • The education provider offer a range of facilities on campus which are utilised by the learners on the current podiatry programmes. Due to these programmes being delivered remotely, learners will only require access to

				online resources and teaching spaces will not be required.
Programmes				
Programme name			**Mode of study**	**Nature of provision**
BSc (Hons) Podiatry Work-based			WBL (Work based learning)	Taught
MSc Podiatry Work-based (Pre-Registration)			WBL (Work based learning)	Taught

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	FT (Full time)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2020
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography with Ultrasound Fundamentals	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2024
BSc (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/02/2004
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2008
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy Apprenticeship Route	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			19/09/2022
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/08/2018
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2004
BSc (Hons) Podiatry	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/09/2005
BSc (Hons) Podiatry (degree apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)	FLX (Flexible)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2023
Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 6)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2019
Independent and Supplementary Non-Medical Prescribing (Level 7)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/09/2019
MDiet (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/08/2022
MOccTh (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2020

MPhysio (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
MSc Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2013
MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2021
MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	PT (Part time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/01/2021
PgDip Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
Post Graduate Diploma Occupational Therapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/2013
Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology	FT (Full time)	Practitioner psychologist	Clinical psychologist		01/01/1995