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

Members: Penny Joyce (Chair)
Steven Vaughan

Enquiries: Francesca Bramley, Secretary to Committee
secretariat@hcpc-uk.org

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

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

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

Agenda item

1. Approval

a. Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions

None

b. Programmes recommended for approval

For each programme listed, partner visitors have judged that:

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

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

The Panel is asked to consider information in the table below, and decide whether each programme should be approved.

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Quality of provision	Facilities provided
Nottingham Trent University	CAS-01507-W4H4K1	Jennifer Caldwell and Julie-Anne Lowe	Through this assessment, we have noted the programme(s) meet all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.	<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <p>The education provider has staff in place who will support the delivery and management of the programme. Two occupational therapy posts are built into the budget for the first year the cohort runs, and they will be in place before the programme starts. Further posts are built into the following year's budget for the start of the undergraduate programme.</p> <p>The education provider is undertaking a project to construct specialist kitchen space for simulation and activities of daily living experiential learning. They are also purchasing specialist</p>

				<p>equipment to support skills teaching for occupational therapists. Learners will be based in the Health and Allied Professions Centre, a purpose-built facility for the education of healthcare learners. This includes flexible learning spaces, simulation rooms reflecting hospital, home and primary care settings and a virtual reality suite.</p> <p>Capital project has a budget deadline and will be completed by July 2024. Clinical skills equipment will be purchased and will be in place prior to the programme start date.</p> <p>Many resources are in place. Additional staffing resource to support the programmes will be appointed to start in the new financial year from August 2024.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

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

2. Performance review

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

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

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

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Cardiff University	CAS-01404-D8F0J3	Jane Day Julie Weir	Five years	<p>Reason for next engagement recommendation</p> <p>The education provider engages a range of internal stakeholders, including learners, service users, carers, practice educators, partner organizations, and external examiners, to ensure quality assurance and enhancement. Externally, they collaborate with five professional bodies, including the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC), incorporating their findings and sector developments to improve their provision. The provider also utilizes data from external sources to monitor key performance areas, using insights from these data to inform and implement positive changes in their quality assurance processes.</p>	There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.
Goldsmiths, University of London	CAS-01365-X9D4Q7	Elain Streeter Lucy Myers	Three years	To reflect the work the education provider has put into this review but also to reflect the work that needs to be undertaken for their ongoing development including their	How IPE informs future practise – referred to performance review

				<p>transformation programme and comprehensive curriculum review.</p> <p>This also allows sufficient time for them to reflect and develop on the areas we have referred to in their next performance review.</p>	<p>Ongoing developments and evidences of SOPs – digital skills and new technology – referred to performance review</p>
Institute for Arts in Therapy and Education	CAS-01405-G9N8J1	Rosie Axon Rachel Bell	Two years	<p>In summary, the reasons for the recommendation of a two year monitoring period is to allow for their EDI project to come to a close and be introduced (2024-25). The next review will then coincide with this having been in place one year and we shall be able to gain an insight into its progress and request reflections from the institution.</p> <p>We also do not have established data points in place for the education provider that allow for longer than two year ongoing monitoring periods. We are open to working with the education provider over the review period to embed new data practices that allow for longer than two year periods.</p>	<p>Referrals to next scheduled performance review</p> <p>The development and implementation of a new EDI plan.</p> <p>Summary of issue: As part of this review, we have asked the education provider to reflect on their approach to EDI and any developments that have taken place during the review period. The education provider has explained that they have a new EDI plan that remains a work in progress and is due for implementation in the academic year 2024-25. We are, therefore, referring this matter to their next PR. We recommend that this be</p>

					reflected on and assessed as part of the education provider's next performance review.
Outreach Rescue Medic Skills	CAS- 01395- G9B6W4	Paul Bates Matthew Catterall	2025-26 academic year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no direct engagement with other regulators or the professional body, which means there is no oversight of the provision from other similar bodies • The education provider has not established regular data supplies with us, meaning the maximum period for our review is two years 	None

3. Focused review

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

For each provider listed, the executive has judged that the trigger investigated does not impact on our education standards being met. Education providers and any case contact have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendation made.

The Panel is asked to consider information in the enclosure, decide whether any action is required, and if so what that action should be.

Education provider	Review level	Review recommendation
Goldsmiths, University of London	Programme(s)	We have concluded that no further action is required

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

None

4. Records change – provider consent

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

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

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

Education provider	Programme name	Mode of study	First intake	Last intake
The University of Bolton	Degree Apprenticeship for Operating Department Practitioners - Level 6	FLX (Flexible)	01/01/2019	