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

**Members**:  Maureen Drake (Chair)
Penny Joyce
Steven Vaughan

**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**                                 N/A

    **None**

    b.  **Programmes recommended for approval**                                                                N/A

    **None**

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 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Glasgow Caledonian University | CAS-01232-F8J2P3 | Jane Day<br><br>Paula Charlesworth | Five years | We have undertaken quality activities to arrive at our judgement on performance. The next review should take place during the 2027-28 academic year.<br><br>This is because: | None | 1i |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | • The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, practice educators and programme staff. All of these groups had opportunities to give their views and experiences of the programme, through various pathways.<br>• The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.<br>• The education provider works with regulatory bodies such as the Nursing & Midwifery Council, the Office for Students and NHS Education Scotland. They considered the findings of all these | |

| | | | | bodies in improving their provision.<br>• The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.<br>• From data points considered and reflections through the process, we know the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hidden Hearing Limited | CAS-01233-H5J3L3 | Robert MacKinnon<br><br>Amy Taylor | Two years | The visitors recognised the education provider had provided internally sourced data. We understood the data was not externally verified. Where data has not been externally verified, we need to understand risks by engaging with the education provider on a frequent basis, a maximum of once every two years. | Visiting sites – referred to next scheduled performance review<br><br>Structural changes – referred to next scheduled performance review<br><br>Service user input – referred to next scheduled performance review |

| | | | | | External verification of data – referred to next scheduled performance review |

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nottingham Trent University | CAS-01242-C3K4Y6 | Matthew Catterall and Paul Blakeman | Five years | Internal stakeholder engagement<br>• The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, external examiners, practice educators, service users and carers, EMAS, a local private ambulance service, primary alliance networks, and Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service.<br>External input into quality assurance and enhancement<br>• The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body | Managing practice education – referred to focused review<br><br>External practice education in social care and voluntary settings - referred to focused review<br><br>Learners ability to meet competencies – referred to focused review |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | findings in improving their provision.<br>• The education provider engaged with the NMC and RPS. They considered the findings of both in improving their provision.<br>• The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way<br>Data supply<br>• 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<br>What the data is telling us:<br>• From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement | |

| | | | | processes and acts on data to inform positive change. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University College London | CAS-01251-J8R1C4 | Susan Lennie<br><br>Lyn McLafferty | 3 years | 3-year ongoing monitoring period is being recommended. This will allow us to engage with the education provider in an appropriate length of time and monitor their learner number increases. | The total number of learners on their programmes is higher than expected. This will be explored via a focused review |

1iv

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Leicester | CAS-01264-W5B2J9 | Jo Jackson and Julie Weir | Five years | They engaged with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind.<br><br>They engaged with three professional bodies and considered professional body findings in improving their provision.<br><br>They considered sector and professional development in a structured way | n/a |

1v

| | | | | Data for the education provider is available through key external sources.<br><br>From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change | |

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Lincoln | CAS-01265-P8W9L1 | Jason Comber and Natalie Fowler | Five years | Internal stakeholder engagement<br>• The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, external examiners, practice educators, other education providers, key local NHS trusts, the Lincolnshire Training Hub and the Lincolnshire Talent Academy. | Withdrawn or cancelled practice education – referred to next scheduled performance review |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | • External input into quality assurance and enhancement<br>   o The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.<br>   o The education provider engaged with RPS. They considered the findings of NMC in improving their provision.<br>   o The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.<br>• Data supply<br>   o 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.<br>• What the data is telling us:<br>    ○ From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Manchester | CAS-01272-Z8K3T9 | Rachel Picton Rosemary Schaeffer | 5 years | Visitors were satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There were no risks or issues identified that were referred to another process. Visitors therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider. | There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process. |

| | | | | The following areas of best practice were identified: | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **Academic and placement quality -** Changes to the assessment have been made on the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology, which includes revisions to the thesis structure. As a result of this change there has been an increase in the publication of trainee research from 10% to 80%. | |
| | | | | o **Horizon scanning** – Visitors considered the use of simulated clinical learning as good practice. This was because it was viewed as a helpful teaching method that also contributed to the issues regarding practice-based learning capacity. | |
| | | | | o **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods** – The Flexible Learning Programme was considered as good practice by the visitors and was an initiative being developed across all | |

| | | | | programmes. Through this programme the education provider enabled learners to have flexibility with accessing teaching and provided the option for programmes to offer a range of assessments to accommodate learner needs.<br>**Equality and diversity** – Visitors considered the Manchester Access Programme as good practice. This programme was specifically aimed at learners from lower income backgrounds and supported them to progress and succeed within higher education. 95% of learners continued to further study through this programme, which demonstrated how effective the programme was | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Surrey | CAS-01267-X7S7X8 | Sarah Illingworth Keren Cohen | 5 years | Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were | There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process. |

|  |  |  |  | performing well. There are no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Visitors have therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider. |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University of the Highlands and Islands | CAS-01263-V8G6C4 | Jim Pickard<br><br>Beverley Cherie Millar | Five years | The visitors were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Data points show 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. | None |

1ix

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University of West London | CAS-01261-L9X2X8 | Jim Pickard | 5 years | 5-year ongoing monitoring period is being recommended. | The visitors have referred the use of new technology to the |

1x

| | | Vince Clarke | | The visitors were satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There were no risks or issues identified that were referred to another process.  This recommendation reflects the work the education provider has conducted throughout this review.

This will allow us to engage with the education provider in an appropriate length of time. We shall continue to monitor the education provider via the data we receive for them.

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. The education provider uses data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change. In terms of | education providers next review. This is an area that is still developing and can be reviewed next time. The visitor also note the high variability of learner satisfaction across their provision and have referred this matter to their next review. |

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | NSS score they are performing higher than the benchmark. | | |

| Education provider | Case reference | Lead visitors | Review period recommendation | Reason for recommendation | Referrals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| University of Brighton | CAS-01239-V1S1G5 | Mark Widdowfield Helen Best | 5 years | Visitors are satisfied with the submission and confirmed the professions and programmes regulated by the HCPC were performing well. There are no risks or issues identified that have been referred to another process. Visitors have therefore recommended a five year performance review monitoring period for the education provider. | There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process. | 1xi |

3. **Focused review**

    a. **Institutions / programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended**    N/A

    None

    b. **Institutions / programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended**    N/A

    None

4. **Records change – provider consent**

    N/A

    None