

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Name of programme(s)	HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practicing Podiatric Surgery, Part time
Approval visit date	30-31 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-12995-V5D9Z5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	4
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	5

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

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). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 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. For this particular visit, there is no Podiatric Surgeon on the panel, as this is within the rules around visitor section set out by the committee in June 2015.

Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Andrew Robinson	Orthopaedic surgeon
Susanne Roff	Lay
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Sara Eastburn	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	University of Huddersfield
---------------	--	----------------------------

Julie Hogan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	University of Huddersfield
Kim Bryan	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
Alison Hart	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
Alan Borthwick	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
John Malik	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practicing Podiatric Surgery
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
Proposed first intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 116
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01864

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meets our standards for the first time.

The education provider has developed and proposed a new route to train as a podiatrist practising podiatric surgery, which is based on prior learning and training. This programme is designed to assess trainees' prior experience through their formal education and career to date. Candidates will provide a portfolio of evidence which details how their previous education and work experience meets the learning outcomes for the programme, which are intended to ensure those assessed through the programme meet the HCPC standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery.

Using a panel of nine trainees who form a pilot group and academic staff, who will both assess the portfolio of evidence, the education provider will determine if the learning outcomes are met or not. The pilot group are elected to the College of Podiatry, Faculty of Podiatric Surgery committee and an academic who will be the independent moderator and chair of the group. The peer group will assess the reflective portfolio to determine if the HCPC standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery are met or not. The pilot group will then be able to assess claims of the remaining applicants who apply for annotation. There is no opportunity for trainees to make up experience after being assessed and there is no formal learning or teaching on the programme. There is also no opportunity for trainees to undertake practice placement experience. The programme itself consists entirely of the assessment of a trainees' experience, skills and knowledge.

As part of the visit, the visitors assessed whether the programme can be exempted from SET D (practice placements), as proposed by the education provider. After scrutiny of the programme via documentation and at the visit, the visitors concluded that the programme could be exempted from SET 5 as:

- the education provider demonstrated through the approval process that this not a taught programme;
- no additional training can be undertaken once the student has been admitted onto the programme, and no advice or guidance will be provided by the education provider which could constitute a learning plan
- the assessment of the candidate is completely retrospective; and
- applicants to the programme must have worked in an appropriate surgical training environment, which will be demonstrated through the admissions process.

However, in order for the programme to be exempted from SET 5 and approved, all of the conditions in this report must also be met.

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	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	As this is a new programme, this document is not required.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below. The visitors determined that a further visit is required to make an appropriate assessment of the response to the conditions. Any further visit would need to focus on the standards on which conditions have been set. This would include meetings with the programme team, senior team, and service users and carers. The education provider has suggested that the visit takes place on 18 and 19 March 2019 to allow the education provider sufficient time to prepare their response to the conditions and considering the start date of August 2019.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 23 January 2019.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the costs trainees will incur whilst studying on the programme to enable them to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the programme specification, which contained details about the admission criteria for the programme. However, there were no details provided about the costs trainees would incur for studying on the programme such as programme fees and potential travel or accommodation costs. Whilst at the visit, the visitors were provided with information about the fee structure and were made aware that other costs would be covered by the trainees. However, applicants were not aware of this information, therefore the visitors were concerned that without this information applicants would be unable to make an informed choice about the programme. Therefore, the education provider must provide further information demonstrating how applicants are provided with all the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up an offer of a place on the programme.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there is a management structure in place to manage the programme effectively.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry (COP) would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also read in the document tabled at the visit entitled, "Annotation of podiatric surgeons' agreement", the visitors noted that the education provider would receive funding from the COP for delivering this programme. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield. From a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that (COP) would advertise this programme to COP Fellows and would provide the education provider with a list of eligible applicants who they deem to meet the education provider's entry requirements. The visitors also noted that the education provider would conduct an interview process together with the members of the COP and service users and carers. The visitors were not clear whether the COP or the education provider would make the final decision about who would be accepted on to the programme. As such the visitors require some clarity around the nature of the relationship between the COP and the education provider. The visitors also require information detailing what the management structure of the programme is and what the role and responsibilities of the COP is, if any, in the delivery of the programme. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in the management and delivery of the programme in order to demonstrate how the programme will be effectively managed.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver and effective programme.

Reason: For this standard the visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae provided by the education provider in relation to this standard. Through their reading of the documentation and in discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the individuals who would be responsible for assessing the portfolios of the trainee pilot group would be the trainees themselves. This pilot group would include one of the programme staff Matthew Rothwell. The visitors could not see how the education provider will ensure that the trainees would have the relevant qualifications or experience to enable them to assess portfolios on this programme. Additionally, the visitors could not determine how the trainees on this programme are prepared for their role in assessing trainee portfolios. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. The visitors heard that the programme lead would moderate the portfolio assessments however they were unclear how the programme lead had the appropriate qualifications and experience to assess trainees on this programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates how they ensure that individuals with the appropriate skills and experience to assess and make a judgement, that the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are met, will assess the portfolios for the pilot group on the programme. The visitors understood that individuals from the pilot group who successfully completed the programme would be

employed on an affiliate lecturer basis to assess subsequent cohorts on the programme and felt this arrangement was appropriate.

B.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that staff responsible for the delivery of this programme are supported in undertaking relevant continuing professional and research development.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae and programme specification. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research, teaching and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. In the meeting with the programme team, the visitors were told that the programme team engages in some development. For instance, a member of the programme delivery team is currently undertaking professional training in podiatric surgery and were supported by the education provider to undertake professional development. However, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not determine what development opportunities are in place for affiliate lecturers or for others in the core staff team. The visitors were therefore, unable to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors were in particular unclear about how the trainees on the programme, who will assess each other's portfolio, will be supported to develop the required skills to assess the portfolios. Additionally, the visitors could not see how the same trainees who will become affiliate lecturers once they have successfully completed the programme, will be supported through their staff development to assess the subsequent cohorts of trainees. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence how the education provider ensures that staff, including affiliate lecturers, are supported to undertake relevant continuing professional and research development to ensure the delivery of an effective programme.

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to trainees and staff.

Condition: The education provider must ensure that the virtual learning environment resource used by staff and trainees is appropriate for the programme and developed before the planned start date for the programme.

Reason: The education provider delivered a presentation of the virtual learning environment (VLE). The visitors saw the information contained on the VLE was incomplete and not fully developed and that this would be the main learning resource trainees would use to complete their portfolio and gain access to pertinent information. The visitors saw some of the areas of the online portfolio trainees would have to complete as part of their portfolio of evidence, however they could not see how trainees are informed about how to complete the portfolio. The programme team explained that they would provide guidance in the introductory day of the programme delivered at the education provider. The visitors were also told that trainees who could not physically attend the first day of the programme would be able to access resources via the VLE instead. However, the visitors did not have sight of what information would be provided to the trainees on that day or the resources that would be available on the VLE for those who could not attend physically which would help them to complete the portfolio.

Therefore they could not make a judgement as to whether the information provided to support trainees to access and use the resource was sufficient and would effectively support the trainees to complete their portfolio via the VLE. The visitors therefore require further evidence of how the VLE is appropriate to the delivery of the programme and is readily available to trainees and staff.

B.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that it provides adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing for trainees outside of the academic setting.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that there is a range of student services available to trainees who require additional support. The visitors noted that a majority of the trainee's time is spent compiling their portfolio, away from the academic setting. As such, the visitors considered that trainees must be able to access the welfare and wellbeing facilities when away from the academic setting too. However, they could not determine how trainees would access these support facilities from locations, which are remote from the education provider. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how trainees gain access to welfare and wellbeing facilities outside of the academic setting and how trainees are informed about this.

B.13 There must be a trainee complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the process for dealing with trainee complaints raised against other trainees who are tasked with assessing their peers on the programme.

Reason: From the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there is a trainee complaints process in place. From their review of the process and in discussions with the education provider, it was unclear to the visitors what the process is should a trainee make a complaint against a fellow trainee who is acting in the capacity of a peer assessor. As the trainees in the pilot group will be expected to assess and make a judgement on the work of their fellow trainees the visitors were unclear how the complaints process would work should a trainee raise a complaint about their assessors on the programme. The visitors therefore require further information about the process for trainees to make a complaint about a fellow trainee/assessor or appeal a decision made about the assessment of their portfolio. Additionally, the visitors require information about how the process for dealing with these complaints feeds in to the complaints process at the education provider and how trainees are informed of this process.

B.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified any mandatory components and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must identify mandatory components of the programme and the associated monitoring mechanisms, the consequences for not meeting these requirements, and demonstrate how this information is effectively communicated to trainees.

Reason: The education provider delivered a presentation of the virtual learning environment (VLE). The visitors saw the information contained on the VLE was incomplete and not fully developed. The visitors also heard trainees would be expected to attend a day in the academic setting to learn about expectations and requirements on the programme. For instance, trainees would be given information about support available to them and how to complete their portfolio by accessing the VLE. The visitors also heard trainees who could not attend the academic session could access the information using the VLE. The visitors heard that trainees must attend or engage via the VLE in the preparatory session at the start of the programme. Due to the physical attendance or virtual access requirements not being clearly defined at this stage, and the documentation not clearly stating the attendance requirement for trainees, the visitors could not determine that trainees are aware of the mandatory attendance requirements for this programme. Additionally the visitors heard what could be done to monitor participation but could not determine that the education provider had a clear process in place for monitoring of required participation. It follows that the visitors could not determine how trainees would be made aware of these requirements or the consequences for not meeting requirements set out by the education provider. As such, the visitors require the following information to determine whether this standard is met:

- the elements of the programme where trainee attendance or access via the VLE is mandatory;
- how attendance or access of mandatory elements is monitored
- the consequences for trainees who do not meet the mandatory attendance or access requirements for the programme; and
- how trainees, clinical supervisors and staff are made aware of this information.

B.16 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a clear policy for service user and carer involvement on this programme, that the service users and carers are supported in their role and that this involvement is appropriate to the programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors met a service user who was involved in a podiatry programme delivered by the education provider. From discussions with the service user, the visitors noted that they were not involved in this programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that service users and carers will form part of the programme board and will be involved in interviewing trainees. The visitors were not provided with minutes from programme board meetings to demonstrate service user and carer involvement. They also did not meet service users and carers with relevant experience to this programme who would be on the programme board and would interview trainees. They were also unable to establish how those service users and carers would be prepared for their role in the programme and the plan for continued service user and carer involvement in the programme. As such, they were unable to determine how service users and carers have been or will be involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require information, which demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in this programme, the plans to support them in their role and how their involvement is appropriate to the programme.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

Reason: From their review of the programme specification, the visitors understood that there are four programme learning outcomes and the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery were grouped together under learning outcome 3. From the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that trainees are expected to be able to demonstrate they meet all of the learning outcomes by the time they complete the programme. The visitors noted that there is one assessment task for the programme, which is to complete the portfolio; they also noted that the assessment criteria refers to the programme learning outcomes. However, the visitors were not provided with the details of how the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery, contained with learning outcome 3, would be contained within the portfolio so that trainees and assessors can see where those standards and the wider learning outcomes would need to be demonstrated throughout the portfolio. The visitors were also unable to see how the assessment criteria, which states “the programme learning outcomes will apply”, ensures that the learning outcomes and thus the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery would be assessed within the portfolio. The visitors were therefore unable to determine whether the learning outcomes ensure that those who complete the programme will meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. As such, the visitors require documentation, such as detailed portfolio assessment content, which clearly articulates how trainees who successfully complete the programme cover the learning outcomes, which deliver the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

C.5 The curriculum must make sure that trainees understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics and/or the NMC’s code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their podiatric surgery practice.

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how they ensure that trainees understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics and/or the NMC’s code: standards of conduct performance and ethics on their podiatric surgery practice.

Reason: The visitors were directed to page 38 of the Student Handbook Partnership Statement Page 38 for this standard. The visitors noted that trainees are “advised” to ensure their practice is in line with the HCPC standards. In a presentation demonstrating the portfolio that trainees must complete the visitors could not determine how the education provider ensures that trainees understand the implications of the HCPC’s standards of conduct, performance and ethics and/or the NMC’s code: standards of conduct, performance and ethics on their podiatric surgery practice. For this standards to be met the visitors require additional information which demonstrates how the education provider ensures trainees understand the implications of above standards on their podiatric surgery.

E.5 The measurement of trainee performance must be objective and ensure safe and effective podiatric surgery practice.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate how the measurement of student performance is objective and ensures fitness to practise at placement.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation and in discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the individuals who would be responsible for assessing the portfolios of the pilot group of trainees would be the trainees themselves. The trainees would mark their peer's assessment on the programme. The visitors noted that the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery is the criteria which the portfolios are assessed against. However, the visitors could not see how trainees' performance on the programme could be objectively measured by a fellow trainee to ensure that they meet the standards, due to the conflict of interest. The visitors were told by the programme team that the peer reviews would be the first stage of assessment and would be followed up by an academic marking process completed by the programme lead. However, as the programme lead does not have any qualifications or experience in podiatric surgery the visitors could not determine how the two levels of assessment are appropriate and objective. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates the assessment strategy which ensures trainee portfolios are assessed objectively and ensure safe and effective podiatric surgery practice.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate what effective monitoring and evaluation systems are in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Reason: Through their reading of the documentation and in discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the individuals who would be responsible for assessing the portfolios of the pilot group of trainees would be the trainees themselves. The trainees would mark their peer's assessment on the programme. The visitors noted that the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery is the criteria which the portfolios are assessed against. The visitors were told by the programme team that the peer reviews would be the first stage of assessment and would be followed up by an academic marking process completed by the programme lead. However, as the programme lead does not have any qualifications or experience in podiatric surgery the visitors could not determine how the two levels of assessment ensure that the marks are moderated and the appropriate standards in assessment are achieved. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates what moderation systems are in place and the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms which ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

E.9 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for a procedure for the right of appeal for trainees.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the appeal procedure that is in place for this programme, how this process takes account of any procedure at the education provider and how this is communicated to students

Reason: In their review of the documentation the visitors noted that this programme is non-credit bearing. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that there is an appeal process for credit-bearing, taught programmes at the education provider, and contained within the assessment regulations. The visitors also heard that this appeal procedure would also apply to this programme. However, they were unclear how the trainees and all involved in the delivery of the programme would be aware that the appeal procedure would apply to this programme, as it is non-credit bearing and does not have a taught element. As such the visitors require further evidence which describes the appeal procedure for trainees on this programme and how all involved in the programme would be made aware of this information.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the external examiner will be a professionally qualified podiatrist and an individual who is approved by both the education provider and the College of Podiatry. The visitors noted that the role of the external examiner is to ensure academic and professional standards are maintained on the programme. They did note that although the external examiner must be qualified in the podiatrist profession, there was no requirement in the assessment regulations for the external examiner to be registered with the HCPC or whether other arrangements would be agreed the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were unable to determine how a podiatrist would have the necessary experience and qualifications in the practice area that would enable them to ensure that academic and professional standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are maintained on the programme. As such, the visitors require the education provider to review the assessment regulations to ensure that they specify the requirement for at least one external examiner to be appointed who is appropriately experienced and qualified in a relevant area of practice to ensure they can provide a level of appropriate and relevant, external quality assurance for the programme. Additionally, the assessment regulations should stipulate that the external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

HCPC approval process report

Education provider	Education provider
Name of programme(s)	Master of Podiatric Surgery, Part time
Approval visit date	30-31 October 2018
Case reference	CAS-12995-V5D9Z5

Contents

Section 1: Our regulatory approach.....	2
Section 2: Programme details.....	3
Section 3: Requirements to commence assessment.....	3
Section 4: Outcome from first review.....	4

Executive Summary

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.

The following is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that programme(s) detailed in this report meet our standards of education and training (referred to through this report as 'our standards'). The report details the process itself, the evidence considered, and recommendations made regarding programme approval.

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). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation of the visitors, inclusive of conditions and recommendations. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make 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 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. For this particular visit, there is no Podiatric Surgeon on the panel, as this is within the rules around visitor section set out by the committee in June 2015.

Details of the HCPC panel for this assessment are as follows:

Gordon Burrow	Chiropodist / podiatrist (Prescription only medicines – administration)
Andrew Robinson	Orthopaedic surgeon
Susanne Roff	Lay
Tamara Wasylec	HCPC executive
Shaista Ahmad	HCPC executive

Other groups involved in the approval visit

There were other groups in attendance at the approval visit as follows. Although we engage in collaborative scrutiny of programmes, we come to our decisions independently.

Sara Eastburn	Independent chair (supplied by the education provider)	Education provider
---------------	--	--------------------

Julie Hogan	Secretary (supplied by the education provider)	Education provider
Kim Bryan	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
Alison Hart	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
Alan Borthwick	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative
John Malik	External panel member	College of Podiatry representative

Section 2: Programme details

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery
Mode of study	PT (Part time)
Entitlement	Podiatrists practising podiatric surgery
Proposed first intake	01 August 2019
Maximum learner cohort	Up to 15
Intakes per year	1
Assessment reference	APP01865

We undertook this assessment of a new programme proposed by the education provider via the approval process. This involves consideration of documentary evidence and an onsite approval visit, to consider whether the programme meet our standards for the first time.

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	Reason(s) for non-submission
Programme specification	Yes	
Module descriptor(s)	Yes	
Handbook for learners	Yes	
Handbook for practice based learning	Yes	
Completed education standards mapping document	Yes	
Completed proficiency standards mapping document	Yes	
Curriculum vitae for relevant staff	Yes	
External examiners' reports for the last two years, if applicable	Not Required	As this is a new programme, this document is not required.

We also expect to meet the following groups at approval visits:

Group	Met
Learners	Yes
Senior staff	Yes
Practice education providers	Yes
Service users and carers (and / or their representatives)	Yes
Programme team	Yes
Facilities and resources	Yes

Section 4: Outcome from first review

Recommendation of the visitors

In considering the evidence provided by the education provider as part of the initial submission and at the approval visit, the visitors' recommend that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that our standards are met at this time, but that the programme(s) should be approved subject to the conditions noted below being met.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is insufficient evidence that standards are met. The visitors were satisfied that a number of the standards are met at this stage. However, the visitors were not satisfied that there is evidence that demonstrates that the following standards are met, for the reasons detailed below. The visitors determined that a further visit is required to make an appropriate assessment of the response to the conditions. Any further visit would need to focus on the standards on which conditions have been set. This would include meetings with the programme team, senior team, practice educators and service users and carers. The education provider has suggested that the visit takes place on 18 and 19 March 2019 to allow the education provider sufficient time to prepare their response to the conditions and considering the start date of August 2019.

We expect education providers to review the issues identified in this report, decide on any changes that they wish to make to programmes, and then provide any further evidence to demonstrate how they meet the conditions. We set a deadline for responding to the conditions of 23 January 2019.

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the admissions information that applicants will receive to demonstrate that they will have all of the information they require to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were referred to the programme specification, which contained details about the admission criteria for the programme. This information included the requirement for an "Enhanced DBS Check...required by the Disclosure and Barring Service". However, there were no details provided about who would pay for a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check to be carried out.

Additionally, the visitors did not see information about any additional costs trainees may incur such as programme fees and travel costs on placement. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed the education provider would pay for the cost of the DBS and trainees would need to pay the costs for travel to placements. Due to the lack of this information in the programme documentation, the visitors could not see how trainees are made aware of the costs trainees would incur on this programme. As such, the education provider will need to ensure that information provided to the trainee regarding additional costs is accurate so they can make an informed choice about whether to take up a place on the programme.

In addition to this, the programme specification states, “Applicants should have written confirmation of a podiatric surgical training post with an appropriately trained surgical tutor/clinical supervisor or equivalent”. From discussions with the programme team, the visitors were informed that this surgical training post would form the practice-based learning element of the programme, which will be audited by the education provider. However, the visitors could not see how potential applicants would have access to the information contained within the programme specification. The visitors were unable to see how the education provider intends to communicate the following information to prospective applicants:

- any associated costs to the trainee;
- costs incurred to trainees on the programme including accommodation and travelling to and from placements; and,
- the admissions criteria specifically the expectation that trainees must have written confirmation of a podiatric surgical training post.

Therefore, the visitors require further information, which demonstrates that applicants have the information they require to make an informed choice about the programme.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the criteria used to assess applicants ensures that they have the relevant academic and professional entry standards to be admitted onto the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors reviewed the professional and academic entry requirements on page 7 of the programme specification of the document. From this information and discussions with the programme team, the visitors were not clear about the selection and entry criteria used to select applicants onto the programme. Specifically, it states “Applicants should have a College of Podiatry National Training Number or equivalent”. However, the visitors were unable to identify that an equivalent to this exists and therefore could not determine whether or not the equivalent to this would be an appropriate entry standard. The visitors were unable to determine from the evidence provided and from discussions at the visit, whether the admissions procedures will be applying appropriate academic and professional entry standards and how this will be communicated to applicants. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence about the criteria used to assess trainees throughout the selection process to ensure that they have the relevant, knowledge, skills and ability to undertake the programme and how this is communicated to applicants.

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and professional entry standards.

Condition: The education provider must ensure the criteria used to assess applicants ensures that they have the relevant knowledge, skills and ability to be admitted onto the programme.

Reason: From a review of the documentation provided prior to the visit, the visitors read that all the modules taught on this programme require “POM-S and POM-A”. However, this admission criterion was not included within the entry criteria provided. In discussions with the programme team, they confirmed that the applicant would need to have a POM-S and POM-A annotation to apply for the programme. As the visitors were provided with different information about what is required at the application stage they were unable to determine whether the admissions procedures apply appropriate academic and professional entry standards. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to ensure that the entry requirements are made clear in the documentation provided to applicants and are consistent throughout.

A.3 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition: The education provider must define the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms applicable to the programme and how this information is made available to potential applicants.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were directed to the generic university APEL policy. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees would be able to gain accreditation for prior learning on this programme. For instance, if they had completed 300 hours in the placement setting they could receive 120 credits which would be equivalent to part 1 of the existing programme delivered by the College of Podiatry. However, the visitors could not determine, from the evidence provided, what criteria would be applied to assess that an applicant’s prior learning or experience meets the required standards and ensures that the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are met via this process to ensure safe and effective practice. The visitors could not determine where this criteria is clearly articulated in the documentation regarding the APEL process to ensure that applicants could access it. Additionally, the visitors could not determine what the process is for applying the policy regarding applications with APEL considerations. For instance, the visitors could not determine who would make an assessment that the prior learning of an applicant met the required standard or whether they were qualified and experienced to make that judgement. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate what the process is regarding the application of the APEL policy, by what criteria prior learning and experience is measured and assessed and how this information is made available to prospective applicants.

B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the commitment that has been made to ensure the programme is viable and has a secure place in the education providers' business plan.

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that approval was requested for a maximum of 40 students on this programme. In discussions at the visit, the visitors heard that only six trainees had undertaken the College of Podiatry (COP) podiatric surgical training programme, with three fully completing the training programme. The visitors also heard that the education provider requires a minimum of 10 trainees to permit a module to run and to be viable. From the information provided, the visitors considered that if a similar number of trainees undertake the programme, then it may not be viable according to the education provider's minimum participant requirements. Therefore, the visitors require further documented evidence to demonstrate that there is sufficient interest in the programme to ensure the programme is viable and can run effectively.

B.1 The programme must have a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to show that the programme is supported by practice education providers and the strategy for staffing this programme to demonstrate that the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry (COP) would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield. The visitors noted that the entry requirements stipulate "applicants should have written confirmation of a podiatric surgical training post with an appropriately trained surgical tutor/clinical supervisor or equivalent." As such, learners are responsible for sourcing their own surgical tutor and surgical trainee placement. During the practice educators' meeting the visitors were unable to meet with those who would be responsible for providing placement opportunities such as the NHS trusts who recruit to podiatric surgical training posts. Therefore they could not ascertain the level of support from the NHS trust as a potential practice education provider for this programme. They were also unable to determine how relationships between the practice education providers and the education provider were formed and maintained. Therefore the visitors were unable to establish how the education provider had ensured that the NHS trusts and any other potential practice education providers were in support of and committed to the delivery of this programme as they were unable to meet them. The visitors also noted that visiting lecturers formed an integral part of the delivery of the programme. However, it was unclear how such individuals were appointed to contribute to the programme in this capacity, beyond being put forward to them by the COP. The visitors reviewed no further evidence to explain the capacity of visiting lecturers who were available to support the programme, and the areas in which they would be involved. As such the visitors require further information which demonstrates

how the education provider forms and maintains effective and collaborative relationships with practice education providers and visiting lecturers. In this way, the visitors will be able to determine whether the programme has a secure place in the education provider's business plan.

B.2 The programme must be effectively managed.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence that there is a management structure in place to manage the programme effectively.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield. However, from a review of the documentation, the visitors understood that the programme would be managed by the education provider and delivered in part by the College of Podiatry (COP) in collaboration with the education provider. In discussions and from the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit, the visitors heard that the COP would support a variety of areas such as "the provision and support of practice learning opportunities for students at both institutions". However, the entry requirements state that learners find their own trainee placement and surgical tutor before applying. From the disparity in the information provided, the visitors could not clearly see what the management structure of the programme is and what the role and responsibilities of the COP is, if any, in the delivery of the programme. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in the management and delivery of the programme in order to demonstrate how the programme will be effectively managed.

B.5 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified, experienced and, where required, registered staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate who is responsible for teaching each element of the programme and how they ensure that these members of staff are appropriately qualified and experienced.

Reason: For this standard the visitors reviewed the curriculum vitae provided by the education provider in relation to this standard. Through their reading of the documentation, they could not ascertain who, from the staff CVs provided, would be teaching each element of the programme to ensure that they are appropriately qualified and experienced to do so. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were made aware of who would be leading modules and teaching certain elements of the programme. However, they could not determine who would teach the podiatric surgery practice-specific elements of the programme and therefore whether they were appropriately qualified and experienced to teach those elements of the programme. The visitors heard that affiliate/visiting lecturers would teach certain parts of the programme however, the visitors did not have details about who those lecturers were and what elements they would be teaching. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to

deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrates who is responsible for teaching each element of the programme and how they ensure that they have the appropriate qualifications and experience to deliver the learning. In this way, the visitors can determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

B.6 Training must be delivered by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate who is responsible for teaching each element of the programme and how they ensure that that these members of staff have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Reason: This condition links to the condition placed on B.5. For this standard, the visitors reviewed the curricula vitae provided by the education provider in relation to this standard. Through their reading of the documentation, they could not ascertain who, from the staff curricula vitae provided, would be delivering each element of the programme to ensure that they have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to do so. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors learned who would be leading modules and teaching some elements of the programme. However, they could not determine who would teach the podiatric surgery professions-specific elements of the programme and therefore whether they were appropriately qualified and experienced to teach those elements of the programme. The visitors heard that affiliate lecturers would teach certain parts of the programme however, the visitors did not details about who those lecturers are and what elements they would be teaching. As such, the visitors could not determine whether there is an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme. Therefore, the visitors require evidence which demonstrated who is responsible for teaching each element of the programme and how they ensure that they have the relevant specialist expertise and knowledge to deliver the learning.

B.7 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they ensure that staff responsible for the delivery of this programme are supported in undertaking relevant continuing professional and research development.

Reason: To evidence this standard the visitors were directed to the staff curriculum vitae, programme specification and the placement handbook. From the documentation, the visitors were unable to determine how the teaching staff maintained their research and professional development to enable them to deliver an effective programme. At the visit, the visitors were told that the programme team engages in some development. For instance, a member of the programme delivery team is currently undertaking professional training in podiatric surgery and were supported by the education provider to undertake this professional development. However, from discussions with the programme team, the visitors could not determine what development opportunities are in place for affiliate lecturers or for others in the core staff team. The visitors were therefore, unable to gain a full understanding of the current participation from staff in research and continued professional development. The visitors were unclear about how the programme team, specifically affiliate lecturers will be supported through their staff

development to deliver the podiatric-surgery specific elements of the programme. The visitors therefore require further information to evidence how the education provider ensures that staff, including affiliate lecturers, are supported to undertake relevant continuing professional and research development to deliver the programme effectively.

B.8 The resources to support trainee learning in all settings must be effectively used.

Condition: The education provider must develop the virtual learning environment resource, which supports trainee learning, before the planned start date for the programme and is effectively used.

Reason: The education provider delivered a presentation of the virtual learning environment (VLE). The visitors saw the information contained on the VLE was incomplete and not fully developed. Although the visitors heard that the students would have access to pertinent programme information, they did not have sight of the information that students would have access to within the VLE whilst studying on this programme. The visitors noted that because the content specific to this programme was not available for the visitors to see within this resource, they could not determine if it supports trainee learning. For instance, they could not see how a trainees would know what they are expected to learn on each module and how they are assessed for each element of the programme. As such, they could not see how trainees in the practice-based setting, accessing the VLE would know what they are expected to achieve for each module or how their learning would be assessed. Additionally, it was unclear which elements of the programme recorded via lecture capture must be accessed by the trainee and how the education provider monitors engagement by trainees. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to demonstrate what information will be contained within the VLE to determine if the learning resources are appropriate to support trainee learning at the start of the programme.

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to trainees and staff.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that the learning resources, including IT facilities, will be appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to students and staff.

Reason: This condition links to the condition placed on B.8. The education provider delivered a presentation of the virtual learning environment (VLE) trainees and staff would have access to on the programme. The visitors saw the information contained on the VLE was incomplete and not fully developed and that the trainees would use the VLE to access core learning resources. Although the visitors heard that, the students will have access to pertinent programme information, including module schedules, reading lists, lecture capture, assessments and resources they did not have sight of the information that students would have access to within the VLE whilst studying on this programme. The visitors noted that because the content specific to this programme was not available for the visitors to see within this resource, they could not determine if it is appropriate to the curriculum. For instance, they could not see how trainees would know what they are expected to learn on each module and how they are assessed for each element of the programme. Additionally, the visitors noted that trainees would complete an online portfolio of evidence from practice placement experience. However they could

not see how trainees are informed about how to complete the portfolio. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to provide the information that will be contained within the VLE to determine if the learning resources are appropriate to the curriculum and readily available to staff and students at the start of the programme and how trainees are informed about how to utilise the VLE to complete the portfolio on placement.

B.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that it provides adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees whilst they are in the practice-based setting.

Reason: From their review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that there is a range of student services available to trainees who may require additional support. The visitors noted that trainees may have placements far from the education provider and in those instances they could not determine how trainees would access the support or facilities they needed when they are in the practice-based setting. As such, the visitors require further evidence of how trainees out in the practice based setting can gain access to welfare and wellbeing facilities they need to support their learning and how the education provider informs trainees about this.

B.13 There must be a trainee complaints process in place.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate the process for dealing with trainee complaints raised whilst on the practice-based learning aspect of the programme, and how this feeds in to the complaints process at the education provider.

Reason: From the programme documentation, the visitors noted that there is a trainee complaints process in place at the education provider. However, from their review of the process and in discussions with the education provider, it was unclear to the visitors what the process would be, if a trainee should make a complaint when in the practice-based setting. As the trainees will spend a substantial amount of time in the practice-based setting, the visitors considered it important for the trainees to be made aware of how to make a complaint when in practice based settings. The visitors therefore require further information about the process for trainees to make a complaint outside of the academic setting, and about how the process for dealing with these complaints feeds in to the complaints process at the education provider. The visitors also require information demonstrating how trainees are informed of this process, to determine whether this standard is met.

B.15 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified any mandatory components and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The education provider must identify mandatory components of the programme and the associated monitoring mechanisms, the consequences for not meeting these requirements, and demonstrate how this information is effectively communicated to trainees.

Reason: The education provider delivered a presentation of the virtual learning environment (VLE). The visitors saw the information contained on the VLE was incomplete and not fully developed. Although the visitors heard that the students would have access to pertinent programme information, they did not have sight of the information that students would have access to within the VLE whilst studying on this programme. The visitors noted that because the content specific to this programme was not available for the visitors to see within this resource, they could not determine which elements of the programme were compulsory for trainees to attend or access via the VLE. From the programme team the visitors heard that there were compulsory elements of the programme. The visitor were that for those who could not physically attend a compulsory session at the education provider, they could access the session via the VLE lecture capture facility. When asked if accessing the session via lecture capture is compulsory, the visitors noted that it could be, and that engagement could be monitored. The visitors heard that 100 per cent attendance is required of trainees on the practice-based element of the programme. The visitors heard that the clinical supervisor would be expected to report a trainee's non-attendance to the programme team. However, the visitors were unclear how the education provider ensures that the clinical supervisor is aware of this responsibility and at what point they should contact the education provider. Additionally, the visitors were unclear how trainees would be made aware of the attendance requirement for the practice based element of the programme. Due to the physical attendance or virtual access requirements not being defined at this stage, and the documentation not clearly stating the attendance requirement on practice based learning, the visitors could not determine what the mandatory attendance requirements are for this programme. Additionally the visitors heard what the education provider could do to monitor attendance or access of the VLE but could not determine that the education provider had a clear process in place for monitoring of required attendance or access. It follows that the visitors could not determine how trainees would be made aware of these requirements or the consequences for not meeting requirements set out by the education provider. As such, the visitors require the following information to determine whether this standard is met:

- the elements of the programme where trainee attendance or access via the VLE is mandatory;
- how attendance or access of mandatory elements is monitored
- the consequences for trainees who do not meet the mandatory attendance or access requirements for the programme; and
- how trainees, clinical supervisor and staff are made aware of this information.

B.16 Service users and carers must be involved in the programme.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that there is a clear policy for service user and carer involvement in this programme, that the service users and carers are supported in their role and that this involvement is appropriate to the programme.

Reason: At the visit, the visitors met a service user who was involved in a podiatry programme delivered by the education provider. From discussions with the service user, the visitors noted that they were not involved in this programme. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors heard that service users and carers will form part of the programme board and will be involved in interviewing trainees. The visitors were not provided with minutes from programme board meetings to demonstrate service user and carer involvement. They also did not meet service users and carers with relevant experience to this programme who would be on the programme board and would

interview trainees. They were also unable to establish how those service users and carers would be prepared for their role in the programme and the plan for continued service user and carer involvement in the programme. As such, they were unable to determine how service users and carers have been or will be involved in the programme. Therefore, the visitors require information, which demonstrates how service users and carers are involved in this programme, the plans to support them in their role and how their involvement is appropriate to the programme.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery

Condition: The education provider must clearly articulate how the learning outcomes for the programme modules ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

Reason: For this standard, the visitors were directed to the module specifications on pages 24 to 41. From their review of the module specifications, they could not establish where each standard for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery was addressed within the learning outcomes. The visitors reviewed the programme intended learning outcomes, on page 2 of the programme specification, and noted that there are 17 learning outcomes. However, the visitors could not see how those learning outcomes would deliver the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. The visitors reviewed the standards mapping document, which is meant to map where in the programme curriculum, the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery will be covered. In some instances, the mapping was made to module level learning outcomes, and in other areas, links were made more generically to programme level outcomes. In addition, there were instances where learning outcomes didn't fully address the requirements of the standards. For instance, for standard 1.8 the visitors were directed to the "Podiatric Surgery in Practice" module specification and to learning outcomes two and three within the specification. The visitors were able to see that learning outcomes two and three should be covered in the module. The visitors noted that learning outcome three, "Synthesise detailed knowledge of anatomy and human locomotion to apply in the context of podiatric surgery", seemed to relate to HCPC standard 1.8, "understand anatomy in the in the context of podiatric surgery and how surgical intervention can impact on human locomotion". However, on closer inspection the visitors could not see how the part of the standard, which requires a trainee to demonstrate that they understand how surgical intervention can impact on human locomotion, is covered in that learning outcome. The visitors also noted that throughout the programme documentation, they were unable to see where the learning outcomes map to and deliver the required standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. As such, they were unable to determine that the learning outcomes ensure that those who complete the programme will meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. Therefore, the visitors require the education provider to review the documentation and provide detailed information about how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure that trainees who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

C.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any relevant curriculum guidance.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the programme reflects the

philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in any curriculum guidance relevant to podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

Reason: From a review of the programme specification and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the programme curriculum incorporates the existing surgical training programme curriculum developed and delivered by the College of Podiatry. As such, the visitors understood that the programme should reflect the philosophy, core values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in that curriculum. However, from their review of the documentation the visitors could not determine how that curriculum has fed in to the development of this programme curriculum. As such, the visitors require evidence, which clearly describes how the relevant curriculum guidance, was used to develop this programme's curriculum so that the visitors can make a judgement as to whether it is reflected in the new programme curriculum. The visitors note that the programme may not reflect some curriculum guidance, and where this is the case, they require a rationale for the departure from the curriculum guidance they have cited, which explains how trainees are able to practice safely and effectively.

C.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how integration of theory and practice will be central to the curriculum.

Reason: From the documentation provided the visitors were able to see that the course structure would involve a day of theoretical learning in the first month of the year followed by practice-based learning with assessments interspersed throughout the year. This structure applies to all three years of the programme. The visitors could also see from the module specifications that trainees would first undertake the module Podiatric surgical assessment and diagnosis, which aims to "incorporate theoretical principles of podiatric surgical assessment and diagnosis into [your] clinical practice". The visitors were able to see how theory is integrated in to the practical parts of the programme. However from a review of the module descriptors, the visitors were unclear about how practice based elements are covered in the context of theoretical learning within the programme. As such, the visitors were unable to determine whether the programme structure enables the integration of theory and practice throughout this programme, specifically in the academic elements of the programme. Therefore, the visitors require further evidence of the delivery pattern for theoretical elements of the programme, and how this ensures that integration of theory and practice will be central to the curriculum.

D.2 The length of time spent in practice placements must be appropriate to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the range of placement settings that trainees will experience to support the delivery of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any

decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield.

From the evidence provided prior to the visit the visitors understood that practice based learning will take place in the trainees' surgical training post and that the College of Podiatry is supporting the practice-based learning on this programme through providing surgical tutors approved by the College of Podiatry to supervise the trainees on the programme. The visitors noted that trainees can learn and be assessed in a range of settings including "NHS primary care, acute and mental health Trusts, the private and independent sector and social care settings". In the programme specification, the visitors noted that the surgical placement sites are approved by the education provider and the College of Podiatry Faculty of Podiatric Surgery, and are subject to one of two agreements with the education provider: a learning development agreement or practice partnership agreement. As the visitors did not have site of these agreements they could not determine whether there is a range of placement settings approved that trainees will experience on this programme. In discussions with the programme team the visitors were unable to see how the education provider ensures parity of experience for the trainees by ensuring that all trainees have the opportunity to experience the range of placements or the agreements in place to ensure the availability of those placements to trainees on this programme. In the clinical supervisor meeting, the visitors met with representatives of the College of Podiatry Faculty of Podiatric Surgery and heard reassurances that the college is committed to supporting the programme by identifying suitable surgical tutors. However the visitors did not meet with those who would be surgical tutors on the programme nor did they meet individuals from the placement settings such as representatives from the NHS or mental health trusts during the visit who would be able to demonstrate their commitment to providing placement opportunities to trainees or employers who would be in a position to provide and commit staff resources, such as surgical tutors, to support trainees on this programme. The visitors noted the importance of ensuring trainees have sufficient exposure to a variety of placements. However, the visitors could not find further detail in the documentation which evidenced the availability of a range of placement experiences, in particular how these placement will be integrated within the programme and information on the learning outcomes which have been agreed must be achieved with their placement providers. In addition, the visitors were unable determine the number, duration and range placements available for trainees on the programme and which placement providers would be responsible for providing these experiences. The visitors therefore, require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures there is an appropriate number, duration and range of placements to support the delivery of the programme, and the achievement of the learning outcomes for all trainees.

D.3 The practice placements must provide a safe and supportive environment.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how their process for approving placements will ensure that placements provide a safe and supportive environment for trainees.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any

decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield.

This condition relates to the condition on standard D.4. In the programme specification and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that surgical placement sites are approved by the education provider and the College of Podiatry Faculty of Podiatric Surgery. The visitors were not provided with written details of the formal approval process itself however they noted in the documentation that placement providers are subject to one of two agreements with the education provider: a learning development agreement or practice partnership agreement. As the visitors were not provided with the system for approving placements or what approval criteria the placements must meet to be approved by the education provider they could not determine whether the process for approving placements is effective and thorough. Additionally, the visitors noted that surgical placement sites are subject to a learning development agreement or practice partnership agreement with the education provider. The visitors were unclear how the education provider chooses between these two documents and what part the agreements play in the approval and monitoring of practice placements. Specifically, how these agreements ensure that the placement settings meet with the education provider's approval and monitoring criteria. In the programme specification, the visitors read that placements were monitored against the Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) audit criteria. This audit system is categorised by professions including podiatrist but not podiatrist practising podiatric surgery, as such the visitors were unclear whether the criteria used by the PPQA to audit placements for the listed professions would be appropriate for this area of practice or whether the audit criteria matched with the criteria required by the education provider, which was not provided to the visitors. As such the visitors could not determine the following:

- the criteria practice placements must satisfy in order to meet with the education provider's approval;
- The system for first approving a placement setting;
- How the education provider monitors the placement to ensure it continues to meet their approval criteria; and,
- How often placements are monitored.

The visitors therefore, require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures that there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements prior to trainees undertaking their placements

D.4 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate what thorough and effective system is in place for approving and monitoring all placements.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield.

In the programme specification and in discussion with the programme team, the visitors noted that surgical placement sites are approved by the education provider and the College of Podiatry Faculty of Podiatric Surgery. As the visitors were not provided with a detailed account of the system for approving placements or what approval criteria the placements must meet to be approved by the education provider they could not determine whether the process for approving placements is effective and thorough. Additionally, the visitors noted that surgical placement sites are subject to a learning development agreement or practice partnership agreement with the education provider. The visitors were unclear how the education provider chooses between these two documents and what part the agreements play in the approval and monitoring of practice placements. Specifically, how these agreements ensure that the placement settings meet with the education provider's approval and monitoring criteria. In the programme specification, the visitors read that placements were monitored against the Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) audit criteria. This audit system is categorised by professions including podiatrist but not podiatrist practising podiatric surgery, as such the visitors were unclear whether the criteria used by the PPQA to audit placements for the listed professions would be appropriate for this profession or whether the audit criteria matched with the criteria required by the education provider, which was not provided to the visitors. For example, the visitors were unclear whether the audit process included a check of what the equality and diversity policies at the placement setting or whether practice placements were expected to adopt the equality and diversity policies of the education provider. At the visit the visitors were told that the programme delivered by the college of podiatry required a more robust approach to quality assuring the programme. However, in discussions with the programme team the visitors could not determine what measures the team were taking to ensure that there was a more robust quality assurance process in place to ensure parity and quality of experience among trainees in placements on this programme. Additionally, the visitors were not clear on what would happen should an issue arise on placement whereby the trainees would need to undertake a different placement. They could not determine the process for dealing with issues such as poor quality and break down of placement and who would be responsible for finding the learner another suitable training opportunity. As such the visitors could not determine the following:

- the criteria practice placements must satisfy in order to meet with the education provider's approval;
- The system for first approving a placement setting;
- How the education provider monitors the placement to ensure it continues to meet their approval criteria;
- How often placements are monitored; and,
- The process for dealing with placements whereby quality falls below the required level or the placement is no longer available and the trainees requires a new placement.

The visitors therefore, require further evidence to show how the education provider ensures that there is a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all practice placements prior to the first trainees undertaking their placements.

D.9 There must be regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement provider.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of the regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice placement providers.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield.

From the evidence provided prior to the visit the visitors understood that practice based learning will take place in the trainees' surgical training post and that the College of Podiatry is supporting the practice-based learning on this programme through providing surgical tutors approved by the College of Podiatry to supervise the trainees on the programme. The visitors noted that trainees can learn and be assessed in a range of settings including "NHS primary care, acute and mental health Trusts, the private and independent sector and social care settings". In the programme specification, the visitors noted that the surgical placement sites are approved by the education provider and the College of Podiatry Faculty of Podiatric Surgery, and are subject to one of two agreements with the education provider: a learning development agreement or practice partnership agreement. As the visitors did not have site of these agreements they could not determine how collaboration with the various practice education providers such as NHS, private sector and social care settings is regular and effective. In discussions with the programme team and the representatives from the college of podiatry, the visitors noted that there was regular communications and collaboration in various forms between them, through meetings and joint development of the curriculum. However this standard is concerned with the collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers such as the NHS and non NHS placement providers. As the visitors were unable to meet with representatives from the NHS trusts or those from non-NHS settings during the visit, they were unable to determine that there is regular and effective collaboration between the education provider and the practice education providers. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this standard is met. The visitors therefore require further evidence that the collaboration between the education provider and practice placement provider will be regular and effective.

D.10 Trainees and clinical supervisors must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment which will include information about:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which trainees must meet;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates how pertinent information about learning outcomes to be achieved and timing and duration of placements is communicated and understood by trainees and clinical supervisors.

Reason: This relates the conditions placed on standards C.1. From their review of the programme documentation the visitors noted that they were unable to determine where in the curriculum and assessment documentation the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are covered in full. The visitors also could not determine where the learning outcomes deliver the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. Additionally, the visitors had a demonstration of the VLE, from the demonstration given they were unable to ascertain where in the assessment documentation trainees and clinical supervisors would know which learning outcomes were to be achieved at which stage in the placement. The timing and duration of the placement experience was not clear to the visitors within the assessment documentation as such, they were unsure how clinical supervisors and trainees would know what learning outcomes should be covered at various stages in the placements. As such, the programme team must provide evidence which demonstrates how the learning outcomes and timing and duration of experience are communicated to trainees and clinical supervisors to ensure they are fully prepared for placement.

D.10 Trainees and clinical supervisors must be fully prepared for the practice placement environment which will include information about:

- **the learning outcomes to be achieved;**
- **the timings and the duration of the experience and associated records to be maintained;**
- **expectations of professional conduct;**
- **the professional standards which trainees must meet;**
- **the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of, failure to progress; and**
- **communication and lines of responsibility.**

Condition: The education provider must provide evidence which demonstrates how pertinent information about assessment procedures and implications of, and any actions to be taken in the case of, failure to progress is communicated and understood by trainees and clinical supervisors.

Reason: From a review of the memorandum of understanding tabled at the visit and from discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that the College of Podiatry would be willing to provide support for this programme and collaborate with the University of Huddersfield in areas of mutual interest. The visitors also understood that the College of Podiatry will not play a formal role in the delivery of this programme and that any decisions regarding the programme delivery will be taken by the education provider, the University of Huddersfield.

From the documentation and through discussions with the programme team the visitors understood that trainees must pass their placement to successfully complete the programme. In discussion with representatives from the College of Podiatry in the practice educator meeting, the visitors heard that trainees will be offered 2-3 year, fixed term surgical training post contracts by the employer. The visitors were told, should a trainee fail their placement then the time limitation of their fixed, short term contract would prevent the trainee from continuing in that post for much longer after they have failed the programme. The visitors were not clear how this information was communicated to the trainees and clinical supervisors to ensure that they understand

the consequences for the job role and trainee position should trainees fail to progress. Consequently, the visitors require further evidence which clearly outlines to trainees and clinical supervisors the assessment procedures when a trainee fails to progress and the consequences in their trainee surgical post.

D.12 A range of learning and teaching methods that respect the rights and needs of service users and colleagues must be in place in the approved clinical learning environment.

Condition: The programme team must provide further evidence as to how they ensure that trainees, while on placement, introduce themselves appropriately and that service users and carers are appropriately informed of any trainee's role in their care or treatment.

Reason: In their review of the documentation the visitors noted content within the curriculum which covers consent. However in their review of the documentation and in discussion with the trainees at the visit, it was not clear how the education provider ensures that clinical supervisors are informed that they are expected to respect the needs of the service users by ensuring appropriate consent is gained for trainees to be involved in their treatment. The visitors require further information which demonstrates how clinical supervisors are informed that they are required to respect the needs of the service users by making them aware of trainees and by gaining appropriate consent from the service user for trainees to be involved. In this way the visitors can determine whether this standards are met.

E.1 The assessment strategy and design must ensure that the trainee who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how the learning outcomes deliver the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery and how the learning outcomes are assessed to ensure those who successfully complete the programme meet those standards.

Reason: This relates to the condition on standard C.1. From their review of the module specifications, the visitors could not establish where each standard for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery was addressed within the learning outcomes. For instance, for standard 1.8 the visitors were directed to the Podiatric Surgery in Practice module specification and to learning outcomes two and three within the specification. The visitors were able to see that five intended learning outcomes were covered in the module including learning outcomes two and three, referred to in the standards mapping document. The visitors noted that learning outcome three, "Synthesise detailed knowledge of anatomy and human locomotion to apply in the context of podiatric surgery", seemed to relate to standard 1.8, "understand anatomy in the in the context of podiatric surgery and how surgical intervention can impact on human locomotion". However, on closer inspection the visitors could not see how the part of the standard, which requires a trainee to demonstrate that they understand how surgical intervention can impact on human locomotion, is covered in the learning outcome. The visitors noted that this was a consistent issue across the programme documentation, where the learning outcomes do not clearly show how they deliver the required standards. As such, they were unable to determine that the learning outcomes ensure that those who complete the programme will meet the standards for podiatrists

practicing podiatric surgery. Consequently the visitors could not determine that the assessment design and strategy ensures that the trainee who successfully completes the programme has met the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery. Therefore, the visitors require detailed documentation, such as detailed module specifications and portfolio assessment content, which clearly articulates how trainees who successfully complete the programme cover the learning outcomes, which deliver the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery and how those learning outcomes are assessed.

E.4 Assessment methods must be employed that measure the learning outcomes.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate that assessments are clearly and appropriately linked to the learning outcomes, and that the assessment methods used are appropriate.

Reason: This relates to the above condition placed on standard E.1. From their review of the documentation, the visitors were not able to see how the marking criteria and assessment methods being used in the modules were linked to the learning outcomes which ensure that trainees meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery by the end of the programme. For instance, for module descriptor “Developing Podiatric Surgical Practice” the visitors noted that this module would be assessed via formative and summative assessments. The summative assessment would be a “6000 word or equivalent reflective structured portfolio demonstrating a range of surgical assessments and management skills” to measure learning outcomes 1-4. Learning outcome 3 incorporates all of the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. The visitors could not see how the summative assessment was an appropriate assessment method to measure that a trainee has met all of the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. The visitors were not provided with an assessment document so they could not determine whether the assessment methods measured each of the learning outcomes and therefore could not determine the appropriateness of the method of assessment. The programme team gave verbal reassurances in discussions that assessments would be linked to learning outcomes going forward, but the visitors considered that it was necessary for them to see written evidence of how this would be done, in order for them to be satisfied that the standard was met and ensure transparency of expectations of trainees. Therefore the visitors require the education provider to submit evidence showing how each method of assessment used in the programme is linked to a particular learning outcome and how that learning outcome delivers the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. In this way they can be confident that all students successfully completing the programme will have demonstrated the skills and knowledge needed to be safe and effective.

E.6 There must be effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The education provider must demonstrate how they will ensure that assessment of trainees’ placement portfolios is conducted by those who are appropriately qualified and experienced to do so and to appropriate standards.

Reason: In their review of the documentation and in discussions with the programme team, the visitors noted that the academic tutors assessing and moderating trainees are not qualified and/or trained in the subject areas in which they are expected to assess the trainees work. The visitors would expect that where the trainees demonstrate their learning on the subject of podiatric surgery academic staff who are experienced or qualified in the practice area would be able to ensure that the appropriate standard is achieved in the assessment. However, there is currently no one on the staff team with knowledge, expertise or a qualification in that subject area. As such the visitors could not determine how the appropriate standards in assessment are achieved or the effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms which are in place to ensure this. Therefore the visitors require further evidence which demonstrates the effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms which are in place to ensure appropriate standards in assessment.

E.7 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate the requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme.

Reason: In their review of the documentation, the visitors noted that there is are expected progression criteria on page 89 of the Master of Podiatric Surgery Placement Handbook. It denotes where the placement progress should link to the College of Podiatry's surgical training programme and how those stages link to the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. The visitors were unable to see what the consequences of not meeting these progression criteria would be for the trainee. For instance, the visitors could not see what would happen should a trainee fail to progress within the clinical setting or how this is communicated to the trainee and clinical supervisor. The visitors were also unable to see where in the assessment regulations is clearly specifies requirements for trainee progression and achievement within the programme. Therefore the visitors require to see how the assessment regulations clearly set out for trainees, the requirements they must achieve in order to progress on the programme. In this way the visitors can determine whether the trainees are provided with sufficient information about what is required of them to progress within the programme.

E.8 Assessment regulations, or other relevant policies, must clearly specify requirements for approved programmes being the only programmes which contain any reference to an HCPC-protected title or part of the Register in their named award.

Condition: The education provider must revisit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that the exit awards do not confer eligibility to apply for an annotation on trainees' registration, should the annotation of the HCPC register be approved.

Reason: The visitors noted in the documentation, that there are two possible exit points from this programme, the postgraduate certificate and postgraduate diploma in Clinical Podiatric Practice. In discussions with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees who achieved the exit awards other than the Master of Podiatric Surgery programme would not be eligible for an annotation with the HCPC. As such, the visitors require further evidence that the assessment regulations to clearly reflect that only on

completion of the Master of Podiatric Surgery could a trainee apply for the annotation, should the annotation be officially approved.

E.10 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence to demonstrate that the assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner who must be appropriately experienced and qualified and, unless other arrangements are agreed, be from a relevant part of the HCPC Register.

Reason: From reviewing the documentation, the visitors noted that the external examiner will be a professionally qualified podiatrist and an individual who is approved by both the education provider and the College of Podiatry. The visitors noted that the role of the external examiner is to ensure academic and professional standards are maintained on the programme. They did note that although the external examiner must be qualified in the podiatrist profession, there was no requirement in the assessment regulations for the external examiner to be registered with the HCPC or whether other arrangements would be agreed with the HCPC. In discussion with the programme team the visitors were unable to determine how a podiatrist would have the necessary experience and qualifications in the practice area that would enable them to ensure that academic and professional standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are maintained on the programme. As such, the visitors require the education provider to review the assessment regulations to ensure that they specify the requirement for at least one external examiner to be appointed who is appropriately experienced and qualified in a relevant area of practice to ensure they can provide a level of appropriate and relevant, external quality assurance for the programme. Additionally, the assessment regulations should stipulate that the external examiner is from the relevant part of the Register unless other arrangements are agreed with the HCPC.

Observations on Approval Process report

Case Reference CAS-12995-V5D9Z5 – Master of Podiatric Surgery

A.2 The admissions procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of prior (experiential) learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Condition

The education provider must define the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms applicable to the programme and how this information is made available to potential applicants.

Area of challenge or reason

In the course handbook and the additional evidence provided to the visitors included links to the University's regulations for awards about the APEL process. Here are below is the relevant regulation.

D2.8; APEL

A student wishing to make an APEL should be asked to complete a School-based APEL claim form and provide accompanying evidence. This would usually take the form of a portfolio comprising a collection of evidence to demonstrate how the experience claimed maps against the learning outcomes of the modules for which credit is sought. This would typically include some or all of the following:

- • Letters of support from current and/or previous managers
- • A personal statement describing the student's experience and why it is relevant in terms of the learning outcomes of the modules for which APL is being claimed. This will demonstrate the learning, knowledge and skills appropriate to the academic credit that being claimed
- • Evidence that supports the statement – such as copies of presentations, reports or projects undertaken in a previous employment.

In discussion with the student, a tutor may conclude that a format other than a portfolio is appropriate – such as a reflective account of the learning achieved or a performance-based assessment. In such cases, the proposed format should be agreed by the Chair of the SAVP before being confirmed with the student.

The module specifications were also provided these contain the learning outcomes that any applicant claiming APEL would need meet. On this course there is a requirement for any student to meet the practice-based learning hours as clinical attendance. This outlined in 18.2 in the programme specification document.

Applicants who wish to make an APEL claim are advised to contact the admissions tutor via the University website.

B.10 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

Condition

The education provider must demonstrate that it provides adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees whilst they are in the practice-based setting.

Area of challenge or reason

This information was provided to the visitors. The student services information in the course handbook are available to all students of the University. The course handbook is available to the students via the VLE. The services available to students are all accessible from any any location. Therefore, these are available to students in practice-based settings. The VLE, being used by the University, was chosen because of its usability on mobile devices, making it easily accessible in any location.

Students on the programme are informed of the availability of these services when they enrol at the University and shown where to find this information, via the VLE, if they are on placement. The Programme specification, 15.4.1, outlines the role of the personal tutor and the regular contact they will have the student during the course. The function of the personal tutor role is to keep close contact with the student and to discuss their academic and personal development. It also provides another source of information to the student, as during the personal tutor meetings information about these services can be provided by the personal tutor. It is important part of the personal tutor role to ensure the welfare and wellbeing of students while they are away from the University.

The personal tutor provision is reiterated in the course handbook, in the section information about placements and work based learning, and the placement handbook, in the section support for surgical trainees on placement, also reiterates the system for personal tutor meetings. As previously stated these documents are available via the VLE.

B.13 There must be a trainee complaints process in place.

Condition:

The education provider must demonstrate the process for dealing with trainee complaints raised whilst on the practice-based learning aspect of the programme, and how this feeds in to the complaints process at the education provider.

Area of challenge or reason

This information was provided to the visitors. There is the education providers complaints process, labelled as cause for concern. The course handbook and the placement handbook contain the relevant information on the complaints process on any part of this course. The course handbook is given to all students on the course via the VLE. The placement handbook is given to all students via VLE and all surgical tutors at the start of placement and via the VLE as they will be affiliates of the University.

Students on the programme are informed of the availability of this process when they enrol at the University and shown where to find this information, via the VLE, if they are on placement. The Programme specification, 15.4.1, outlines the role of the personal tutor and the regular contact they will have the student during the course. The function of the personal tutor role is to keep close contact with the student and to discuss if they have any concerns about placement. It also provides another source of information to the student, as during the personal tutor meetings information about this process can be provided by the personal tutor. It is important part of the personal tutor role to ensure the welfare and wellbeing of students while they are away from the University.

Case reference CAS-12995-V5D9Z5 HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practicing Podiatric Surgery, Part time

A.1 The admissions procedures must give both the applicant and education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to take up or make an offer of a place on a programme.

Condition

The education provider must provide further evidence of the costs trainees will incur whilst studying on the programme to enable them to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

Area of challenge or reason

The costs of any course would be supplied to any applicant via the University, as we have to comply with Competition and Marketing Authority regulations this information will not be set up until the course is approved. Once the course approved then the University website would provide the information to applicants before they had enrolled about the course fees.

B.10 The learning resources, including IT facilities, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to trainees and staff.

Condition

The education provider must ensure that the virtual learning environment resource used by staff and trainees is appropriate for the programme and developed before the planned start date for the programme.

Area of challenge or reason

The additional evidence provided for the visitors outlined to the attendance requirements that the applicants must attend for their enrolment date. They would then provided with information about completing their portfolio.

Proposed Schedule for HCPC Annotation enrolment date;

Time	Session
09-15-10-15	Introduction Course structure Using the University resources Meeting the Standards of Proficiency Assessment – Reflective Structured Portfolio
10-15-12-15	Introduction to Brightspace (VLE) Building your Portfolio What you can use as evidence
12-15-12-45	Enrolment
13-15-13-45	Meet your personal tutor
13-45- 14-45	Writing and critical appraisal at FHEQ level 7

14-45-15-45	Reflecting on practice at FHEQ level 7
15-45-16-15	The next steps How your portfolio is assessed Conclusion

B.11 There must be adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees in all settings.

Condition

The education provider must demonstrate that it provides adequate and accessible facilities to support the welfare and wellbeing of trainees whilst they are in the practice-based setting.

Area of challenge or reason

The student services information in the course handbook are available to all students of the University and all are accessible by electronic means. The podiatrists on this course are students of the University. Therefore, these are available to students in locations remote to the education provider. The VLE, being used by the University, was chosen because of its usability on mobile devices, making it easily accessible in any location.

The Programme specification, 15.4.1, outlines the role of the personal tutor and the regular contact they will have the student during the process. The function of the personal tutor role is to keep close contact with the student and to discuss their academic and personal development. It also provides another source of information to the student, as during the personal tutor meetings information about these services can be provided by the personal tutor. It is important part of the personal tutor role to ensure the welfare and wellbeing of students while they are away from the University. The proposed schedule for the enrolment date provided above in the additional evidence, shows that the students will meet their personal tutor on that date. This will provide an initial point of contact between and then to provide the student another source of information.

C.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery

Condition

The education provider must clearly articulate how the learning outcomes for the programme ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery.

Area of challenge or reason

The visitors were provided with the portfolio Assessment set sheet in the additional evidence sent to HCPC provides details of how a student would meet the standards of proficiency for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery. During the visit the visitors were shown the portfolio and how this would work through the VLE. The portfolio shows that the student would have to submit a reflective piece plus evidence about each of the standards for podiatrist practising podiatric surgery. The visitors were provided with details of how the standards of for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery were contained

in the portfolio. The programme learning outcomes also contain the standards, so completing the portfolio ensures that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards.