

## Section 1: Our regulatory approach

### Our standards

We approve programmes that meet our education standards, which ensure individuals that complete the programmes meet proficiency standards. The proficiency standards 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.

Programmes are normally [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to satisfactory engagement with our monitoring processes. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### 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 undertake assessment of evidence presented through our processes. The visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC).

The ETC make decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process report. The Committee meets in public on a regular basis and their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### HCPC panel

We always appoint at least one partner visitor from the profession (inclusive of modality and / or entitlement, where applicable) with which the assessment is concerned. We also ensure that visitors are supported in their assessment by a member of the HCPC executive team. Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Stephen Bendall	Orthopaedic surgeon
Paul Blakeman	Chiropodist / podiatrist
Thomas Galloway	Podiatric surgeon
Niall Gooch	HCPC executive

## Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04671

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery (degree apprenticeship)
Mode of study	WBL (Work based learning)

Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
First intake	01 September 2020
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	MC04692

We undertook this assessment to consider whether the programme continues to meet our standards, following changes reported to us via the major change process. The following is an overview of the changes from the information received via this process.

The education provider informed us that they were introducing a degree apprenticeship route.

### Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment

In order for us to progress with approval and monitoring assessments, we require certain evidence and information from education providers. The following is a list of evidence that we asked for through this process, and whether that evidence was provided. Education providers are also given the opportunity to include any further supporting evidence as part of their submission. Without a sufficient level of evidence, we need to consider whether we can proceed with the assessment. In this case, we decided that we were able to undertake our assessment with the evidence provided.

Required documentation	Submitted
Major change notification form	Yes
Completed major change standards mapping	Yes

### Section 4: Outcome from first review

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission, the visitors were not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence that our standards continued to be met at this time, and therefore require further evidence as noted below.

#### Further evidence required

In order to determine whether the standards continue to be met, the visitors require further evidence for the following standards for the reasons noted below.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programme(s), and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the standards.

#### B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

**Reason:** The visitors were broadly satisfied with the documentation submitted to them explaining the structure of the degree apprenticeship. As this was already an approved programme they did not need to review all the curriculum and assessment elements which had been brought into the apprenticeship from the existing programme. Enough information was available for the visitors to make a recommendation. However, they

considered that it would be useful for them to see greater detail about the relationship that the employers who would be taking apprentices would have with the University of Huddersfield. For example what, meetings or contacts would take place, and how often, and under what remit. This is because the main change in going to the apprentice model is that the relationship that the University of Huddersfield have with the employer becomes direct. Clarity is therefore needed around how primarily the learner, the employer, and the university interact consistently.

This would be useful to satisfy the visitors with regards to how the provider and the employer would manage the programme together and to deal with issues that arose or any problems might occur.

**Suggested evidence:** Details of the committees or groups that would form part of the working relationship between the University of Huddersfield, and information about how they would be used to ensure effective programme management under the new relationship.

## Section 5: Visitors' recommendation

Considering the education provider's response to the request for further evidence set out in section 4, the visitors are satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the standards continue to be met and recommend that the programme(s) remain approved.

This report, including the recommendation of the visitors, will be considered at the 12 November 2020 meeting of the ETC. Following this meeting, this report should be read alongside the ETC's decision notice, which are available [on our website](#).

## Section 6: Future considerations for the programme(s)

We include this section to note areas that may need to be considered as part of future HCPC assessment processes. Education providers do not need to respond to these areas through this assessment, but should consider how to engage with the HCPC around these areas in the future, for example through the monitoring processes. When this programme is next assessed against our standards, visitors will have access to this report, and will consider this section when making their recommendation on continuing programme approval.

The visitors were satisfied that the relationship between the University of Huddersfield and the partner employers had been appropriately elaborated in the additional documentation and so they considered that their concerns in that area were now met. They noted that the education provider was intending to use many of the same structures and channels of communication for this degree apprenticeship as they were for the existing approved programme.

They considered that this was appropriate and that it met the standard at threshold. However, they wished to note that this programme had different demands than the existing programme and that the kind of issues which might need to be raised between learners, the University of Huddersfield and the partner employers were therefore potentially different. They suggest therefore that the education provider keep under review the mechanisms they use in this area.