
Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route (September 2024)

Members: Steven Vaughan (Chair)
Katie Thirlaway

Enquiries: Francesca Bramley, Secretary to Committee
secretariat@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

1. 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
Association of Clinical Scientists	CAS-01383-Q6P7D7	Beverley Cherie Millar Natalie Fowler	Two years	Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26).	Focused review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service user and carer involvement – the education provider has made progress in this area, but this remains underdeveloped against our expectations linked to SET 3.7 (service users and carers must be involved in the programme). We should actively review this area to ensure the education provider has embedded service users in a sustainable way. • Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) – there is a gap present where the education provider only required applicants from April 2024 onwards to demonstrate competence against the revised SOPs. To address

					<p>this area, the education provider must demonstrate that all new applicants via the route from September 2023 were / are assessed against the revised standards of proficiency for clinical scientists, which may include remedial action.</p> <p>Performance review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners – visitors acknowledged the efforts made to gather learner feedback, however recommended this area should be reviewed in the next performance review. The reason for this is to ascertain learner feedback once all relevant feedback has been considered from the recent responses they have received.
Boots Hearingcare	CAS-01373-S0X7F7	Hazel Anderson and Joanna Lemanska	Two years	Through this review, the education provider has not provided data points which are equivalent to those from those in external supplies available for other organisations. It is also not clear whether this data has been externally verified. Where data is not equivalent to those in external supplies available for other organisations, nor externally verified, we need to understand risks by engaging with the education provider on	There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

				a frequent basis (a maximum of once every two years).	
British Association of Sport and Exercise Sciences	CAS-01385-G3G2J9	Garrett Kennedy Fleur Kitsell	Two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26). • Service users and carers use of technology, practice placement educators and capacity of practice-based learning have been referred to the next performance review to be considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service users and carers – referred to next performance review. • Use of technology – referred to next performance review. • Practice placement educators – referred to next performance review. • Capacity of practice-based learning – referred to next performance review.
Cardiff Metropolitan University	CAS-01392-X4Z2C6	Emmanuel Babafemi Susan Lennie	Five years	The visitors were satisfied with the overall performance of the education provider across the themes. Data shows the education provider is performing comparably to benchmark across the different areas. The education provider responds to recommendations from external regulators and professional bodies. There were no risks identified which could suggest the need for an earlier review.	None

Edinburgh Napier University	CAS-01376-C9F3C4	Jennifer Caldwell Kathryn Campbell	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 learners, service users and practice educators. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings 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. 	None
-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------------	------------	--	------

<p>Guildhall School of Music and Drama</p>	<p>CAS-01358-B3L0W5</p>	<p>Kathryn Campbell Rachel Bell</p>	<p>4 years</p>	<p>We are recommending a four-year ongoing monitoring period for this education provider. We are choosing a shorter period than five years as we have one area of referral. We considered that four years is sufficient time for the education provider to consider and act on our referral. This also reflects their performance in this process.</p>	<p>We noted from the education provider's reflections that service users and carers are involved in their process. However, we have found these to be limited to face-to-face interactions only. By the next performance review, we recommend that the education provider supply further reflections / details of service users and carer involvement. We recommend they reflect on the collaboration beyond the seminars and more robust feedback from both learners and SU&C on their interactions. SU&C feedback should also be collected on this and used to help inform positive change.</p>
<p>Metanoia Institute</p>	<p>CAS-01394-Z5K9K5</p>	<p>Garrette Kennedy Rosemary Schaeffer</p>	<p>Two years</p>	<p>The lack of comparable data supply across all three areas that were assessed. Although the education provider has now established two out of the three data points we use in our assessment, we will require them to have all three data points established to be considered for a longer review period. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance across all themes and have not identified any significant risk.</p>	<p>None</p>

Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust	CAS-01386-M1N7V2	Garrett Kennedy Rosemary Schaeffer	Two years	<p>In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26) • Several areas that need picking up in two years, as noted in the referrals column 	<p>Some areas should be referred to the next performance review assessment. The information provided linked to these areas reflected on the recent changes made and the increase in learner numbers, which represented ongoing challenges. The visitors acknowledged there were plans in place to manage these changes, however recommended the following area should be referred to the next performance review for further review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resourcing, including financial stability • Academic quality • Placement quality • Learner feedback
Roehampton University	CAS-01359-C7G2D7	Kathryn Campbell Elaine Streeter	5 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 include learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, and external examiners. • The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. 	There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider engaged with other relevant professional or system regulator(s), including the British Association of Art Therapy (BAAT), the British Association of Music Therapy (BAMT), the British Association of BADth and the British Psychological Society (BPS). • 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. 	
St Mary's University, Twickenham	CAS-01360-W0K6J7	Fleur Kitsell Kathryn Campbell	Four years	The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's overall performance. Although across some of the themes, the visitors noted the education provider focused more on describing what they did rather than its impact. In addition, we noted the ongoing development of the School-wide Service User/Carer Strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection on the new service user and carer strategy to understand how it has progressed – performance review • Future plans around interprofessional education – performance review

				The visitors considered that service user and carer involvement is still an area of development. Although the education provider appeared to be managing this well, the visitors determined four years is an appropriate time to enable the education provider to have implemented and assess the impact of the new strategy.	
The Academy for Healthcare Science	CAS-01380-T9F5Z4	Natalie Fowler Beverley Cherie Millar	Two years	Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26)	None
The National School of Healthcare Science	CAS-01388-C3C4L2	Beverley Cherie Millar & Natalie Fowler	Two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26). • The capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level), resourcing, including financial stability and external examiners have been referred to the next 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) – referred to next performance review. • Resourcing, including financial stability – referred to next performance review. • External examiners – referred to next performance review.

				performance review to be considered	
The SMAE Institute	CAS-01389-N4G1F8	Nicholas Haddington Paul Blakeman	Two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the lack of established data points. We shall work with the education provider to develop the required data. This data will then be available to be used at their next performance review (2025-26). • Interprofessional education has been referred to the next performance review to be considered 	Interprofessional education – referred to next performance review.
The University of Bolton	CAS-01368-W8X6S0	Joanna Finney Tim Hayes	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 learners, service users and practice educators. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. • The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. 	None

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
University Centre South Devon	CAS-01396-P2J7V9	Robert MacKinnon Joanna Finney	Two years	The lack of comparable data supply across all three areas that were assessed. Although the education provider has now established two out of the three data points we use in our assessment, we require them to have all three data points established to be considered for a longer review period. In addition, this data needs to be externally verified before submission to us upon agreed timeframes. The visitors were satisfied with the education provider's performance across all themes and have not identified any significant risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development around interprofessional learning – performance review • Resourcing members on to the Patient, Carer and Service User group (PCSUG) – performance review

<p>University College Birmingham</p>	<p>CAS-01364-C3D5C3</p>	<p>Helen White and Kathryn Campbell</p>	<p>Five years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. • The education provider engages with a professional body and considers sector and professional development in a structured way. • Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further centralising the service user within teaching and learning – focused review • Viability of the apprenticeship programme – focused review
<p>University of Bath</p>	<p>CAS-01408-C3Z1B3</p>	<p>Rosemary Schaeffer Garrett Kennedy</p>	<p>Five years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies and other relevant professional or system regulators. They considered professional body findings in 	<p>None</p>

				<p>improving their provision. The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. • 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. 	
University of Chichester	CAS-01390-Y5Z5J7	Fleur Kitsell Joanna Finney	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 learners, service users and practice educators. • The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. • The education provider considers sector and 	None

				<p>professional development in a structured way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
University of Dundee	CAS-01369-R9Y8G0	Nicholas Haddington Duane Mellor	Five years	<p>The visitors considered that the education provider had reflected appropriately. They agreed they are performing well across all portfolio areas. They also engaged well with the performance process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activity and requests for clarification, were comprehensive and reflective. The information we reviewed shows there has been effective strategic oversight of the programme. There are no</p>	None

				ongoing issues or processes which pose risks that we will need to review specifically before 2028-29.	
University of Glasgow	CAS-01371-S8M2J0	Garrett Kenedy Rosemary Schaeffer	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 learners, service users and practice educators. • The education provider engaged with one professional body, the British Psychological Society. They considered professional body findings 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. 	None

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes. 	
University of Gloucestershire	CAS-01398-X9B4M1	Alexander Harmer Amy Taylor	Five years	The education provider has performed well across all areas. There were no risks identified throughout the assessment. Where there were issues, the education provider has clearly articulated how they addressed / are addressing them.	None
University of Strathclyde	CAS-01379-Y1R5M2	Hazel Anderson Lucy Myers	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 learners, service users and practice educators. The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. 	None

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
University of Westminster	CAS-01372-X6Q5G1	Emmanuel Babafemi and Julie Weir	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 learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, and external examiners. • The education provider engaged with a number of professional bodies and regulators, and considered their findings in improving their provision. • Data for the education provider is available through 	Service user and carer involvement – focused review

				<p>key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
University of Winchester	CAS-01400-F4F9S0	Duane Mellor Kathryn Campbell	Four years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visitors identified concerns around the sustainability of the dietetics programme. They were concerned that the programme may cease to be viable if the cohort falls below 12. Although, they noted the programme was seeking guidance from professional bodies they considered the education provider needs to put plans in place to deal with issues on practice-based learning limitations. • In addition, the visitors have made a referral to the education provider's next performance review. This is in 	Interprofessional education limited to practice-based learning – performance review

				<p>relation to interprofessional education as noted in the next column.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the visitors did not identify these as risks nor did they consider them areas to be referred to another review, the visitors recommended that because the above are being addressed, a four-year review period is most appropriate. The visitors considered four years will provide the education provider with sufficient time to address the two areas identified above. 	
University of York	CAS-01410-M3T5M1	Nicholas Haddington Wendy Smith	Five years	Overall, the visitors were satisfied with the education provider's reflection across all themes. They were reassured that there continues to be appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure quality. The education provider only delivers prescribing programmes and the visitors did not identify any risk. There were no issues referred to other processes and the data also supported their overall performance.	None

2. Focused review

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

None

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

For each provider listed, the executive has judged that the trigger investigated should be referred to another process for consideration. Education providers and any case contact 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, decide whether any action is required, and if so what that action should be.

Education provider	Review level	Review recommendation
Canterbury Christ Church	Programmes	Refer to performance review

3. Records change – provider consent

For each programme listed, the education provider has provided consent to close the programme / amend programme records. Programmes are either:

- Closing / have closed to new cohorts (where the last intake date is complete)
- Opening to replace an existing programme record (where the last intake date is not complete)

The Panel is asked to confirm these administrative changes to the list of approved programmes.

Education provider	Programme name	Mode of study	First intake	Last intake
AECC University College	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	
AECC University College	BSc (Hons) Radiography (Radiotherapy and Oncology)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	

AECC University College	MSc Dietetics (Integrated Degree apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	23/09/2024	
AECC University College	MSc Dietetics (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	16/01/2023	
AECC University College	MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	09/01/2023	
AECC University College	MSc Physiotherapy (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	01/01/2021	
AECC University College	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	16/01/2023	
AECC University College	MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	09/01/2023	