
Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route (November 2023)

Members: Helen Gough (Chair)
Penny Joyce
Katie Thirlaway

Enquiries: Karen Flaherty, Head of Governance
Karen.flaherty@hcpc-uk.org

ETC makes all decisions on programme approval and on other operational education matters. Decisions are categorised into three ‘tiers’, which are categorised based on risk, whether recommended outcomes are challenged by providers, and/or whether there is a significant negative impact for the provider and/or learners. Meetings of the ETP are reserved for items which require a higher level of oversight or discussion before a decision can be made.

This agenda is for tier 1 papers-based decisions only. These decisions are by nature low risk. Decisions are made at this tier in a specific set of limited circumstances, most importantly when education providers have not provided any comments on the outcome through ‘observations’ and therefore this is no disagreement about the recommendation put forward by lead visitors or the executive.

Each section of the agenda has an explanation of the recommended process outcome, with information which enables the Panel to make a decision.

Agenda item

Enc

1. Approval

a. Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions

1

For each programme listed, partner visitors have judged that conditions must be met before approval can be granted. These conditions relate to one or more of our education standards being met. Education providers have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendation made.

The Panel is asked to consider information in the **enclosure (report)**, decide whether conditions must be met before approval for each programme, and if so what those conditions should be.

Education provider	Programme name	Mode of study
Medipro Limited	Paramedic	Full time

b. Programmes recommended for approval

For each programme listed, partner visitors have judged that:

- the provision is of sufficient quality to meet relevant education standards
- the provider has demonstrated that facilities provided are adequate to deliver education and training as proposed

Therefore, they are recommending that the programmes are approved, subject to satisfactory monitoring. Education providers have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendation made.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
Keele University	CAS-01334-N4F1N2	Patricia McClure and Joanne Stead	Through this assessment, we have noted the	The programme is supported by the Director of Education and the Director for Postgraduate Programmes. These roles are in place. The Programme Director has been

			<p>programme(s) meet all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.</p>	<p>appointed. They will be joined by another two members of staff who will be HCPC and RCOT-registered. The business case has provision for further staff as the programme develops and learner numbers increase. The staff: student ratio will be maintained at 1:15 as per RCOT recommendations.</p> <p>The education provider has developed clinical and simulation suites under the Faculty Director of Skills and Simulation. These are both within several Clinical Skills Houses both on campus and at University Hospital North Midlands Clinical Education Centre. The on-campus simulation suite will include specialist occupational therapy provision. For example, semi and fully adapted kitchens. The education provider informed us they offer on-site library facilities, clinical suites, and learner services. They use service users within teaching in all years of the programme and as lay members of the Student Staff Voice Committee.</p> <p>The education provider informed us many of the teaching resources and support mechanisms are in place. They are an education provider with multiple health related programmes already in place. Further specific resources for the programme are in advanced planning. These were part of the initial and full business case approved in 2022 in anticipation of this new programme of study.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Programmes		
Programme name	Mode of study	Nature of provision
MSc Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Taught (HEI)

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
University of Derby	CAS-01305-Z4Q5N5	Matthew Catterall and Gemma Howlett	Through this assessment, we have noted: The programme met all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.	High level business plan in place for staffing as cohorts increase. The programme will be delivered from WMAS's bespoke training centre. The education provider are in the process of costing items to mirror these facilities. Initial advertisements for recruitment have gone out.
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Practice Apprenticeship			Work based learning	Apprenticeship

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
Roehampton University	CAS-01200-H3L1Q0	Carol Rowe Jennifer Caldwell	The education provider has demonstrated how the proposed programme will meet all the relevant HCPC education standards. We have therefore recommend that the programme should be approved.	<p>The programme is supported by a robust roster of staff. Sufficient staff are in place and ready to support the introduction of the programme. They have robust systems and policies in place to support staff development and academic responsibility of their staff.</p> <p>The education provider has library resources in place to support the introduction of the new programme. Existing physical resources available for their nursing provision has been adapted to support the new physiotherapy programme.</p> <p>Training resources and processes for developing and supporting practise education supervisors will</p>

				be adopted and repurposed to suit the proposed provision.
Programmes				
Programme name			Mode of study	Nature of provision
MSc Physiotherapy			Full time	Taught provision (HEI)

2. Performance review

a. Review period for institutions which have been subject to the performance review process

For each provider listed, partner visitors have judged that the provision is of sufficient quality to continue to meet relevant education standards. They are recommending review periods as follows, for the reasons noted in the table. Education providers have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendation made.

The Panel is asked to consider information in the table below and decide on the review period for each provider.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Institute of Biomedical Science	CAS-01234-T9S0R0	Peter Abel & Colin Jennings	2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education provider does not have established data points but are working with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

				for the next submission.	
				•	•
Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of Hull	CAS-01256-Q9Z6Y2	Carole Rowe Julie Weir	Five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Throughout the review, we have not identified any risks that would require us to review the education provider's performance sooner. Overall, the visitors were satisfied that the education provider had performed well across all themes. ○ We noted the education provider has one programme which has yet to see its first cohort graduate and a new apprenticeship route in another programme. We also noted new initiative around admission metrics that is being introduced in the 2023/24 academic year which will require us to consider their effectiveness in a few 	The education provider noted the introduction of new metrics for admission which will impact on their provision from the 2023-24 academic year. We will need to review the impact of this when the provider can reflect on implementation, which will be in the 2027-28 academic year.

				years' time. However, we are satisfied that reviewing these at the education provider's next performance review in 2027-28 does not pose any significant risk.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
The University of Lancaster	CAS-01257-Y4P0J7	Lyn McLafferty Natalie Fowler	4 years	4-year recommendation. Less than 5 due to ongoing development of the education provider approach and policies for IPE. 4 years deemed long enough for developments to be implemented and review first feedback / reflections on new IPE approach.	Development of IPE, continuing with existing plans to develop and enhance IPE

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of Leeds	CAS-01258-T8S7P2	Shaaron Pratt Joanna Lemanska	Three years	The reason for the recommendation of a 3-year monitoring period is that the visitors have determined that the education provider is low to medium risk. There are some	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflection on assessment of practice education providers by external bodies - referred to the performance review process.

				<p>areas outstanding where the education provider had not adequately addressed how they have dealt with or are dealing with issues. We considered that a 3-year review period will give the education provider with sufficient time to address the issues identified through the report:</p> <p><u>Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies</u></p> <p>Summary of issue: The education provider noted this is not applicable to their HCPC approved provision. As such they have not provided any reflection, the visitors needed reassurance around the processes the education provider has in place for external bodies to assess practice education. If any assessments had been undertaken and concerns raised, the visitors request to know what was done in response to any concerns raised.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring sufficient practice educators to manage the capacity of practice-based learning on the Independent & Supplementary prescribing for AHP programme- referred to the performance review process. • A review of the effectiveness of the innovation to the process of collecting and using feedback from practice educators Independent & Supplementary prescribing for AHP programme. This is due to commence from January 2024 - referred to the performance review process. • Profession specific graduate outcomes to understand how each programme / profession area is performing in this area - referred to the performance review process.
--	--	--	--	---	---

				<p>Ensuring sufficient practice educators to manage the capacity of practice-based learning</p> <p>Area(s) of practice applicable to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Annotation – Supplementary prescribing, Independent prescribing. <p>Programme(s) applicable to: Independent & Supplementary prescribing for AHP programme</p> <p>Summary of issue: The education provider's reflection as well as the additional information provided via quality activity lacked the level of detail to reassure the visitors that the education provider maintained sufficient practice educators to support the management of practice-based learning capacity. Therefore, further reflection on this is requested when next the education provider engages with the performance review process.</p> <p>Collecting and using feedback from practice educators</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Area(s) of practice applicable to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Annotation – Supplementary prescribing, Independent prescribing. <p>Programme(s) applicable to: Independent & Supplementary prescribing for AHP programme</p> <p>Summary of issue: The education provider had plans to develop a new process of collecting and analysing feedback from practice educators. We understood this would take effect from January 2024. To allow the education provider to have been able to introduce, monitor, and evaluate the new process, we will review this at their next engagement with the performance review process.</p> <p><u>Graduate outcomes</u></p> <p>Summary of issue: The visitors noted the education provider's reflection in this area lacked sufficient detail to help</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>them understand how each programme or professional area was performing. This is referred to their next performance review where the education provider is expected to submit a more detailed profession-specific reflection.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
University of the West of Scotland	CAS-01262-C6K1F8	Peter Abel Paul Blakeman	Five years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were local health Trusts, practice education providers, learners, service users, practice educators and programme staff. The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered 	None

				<p>professional body findings in improving their provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The education provider engaged with the NMC. They considered the findings of the NMC in improving their provision.• The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.• Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.• From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes. We saw	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				multiple examples of this in the initial portfolio and in responses to quality activity and requests for clarification.	
--	--	--	--	---	--