
Approval process report

Coventry University, Podiatry, 2024-25

Executive Summary

This is a report of the process to approve a podiatry programme at Coventry University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to assess the institution and programme against our standards, to ensure those who complete the proposed programme are fit to practice.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area.
- Reviewed the programme against our programme level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Recommended all standards are met, and that the programme should be approved.
- Decided that all standards are met, and that the programme is approved

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The areas we explored focused on:
 - Quality theme 1: The visitors reviewed the admissions process and noted applicants must meet suitability requirements, including completing a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check at an enhanced level, to be eligible for the programme. Although the Pre-Placement Presentation suggested learners may begin the programme before their DBS is completed, the education provider clarified that checks are intended to be completed before enrolment. In rare late-enrolment cases, learners may start their induction without a completed DBS, but they are immediately instructed to complete it, as continuation on the programme and participation in practice-based learning, depends on satisfactory clearance. We had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met.
- The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore is approved.

Previous consideration	Not applicable. This approval process was not referred from another process.
------------------------	--

Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• whether the programme is approved
----------	--

Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:
------------	--

-
- The provider's next performance review will be in the 2026-27 academic year
-

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The approval process	4
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review.....	5
Section 2: Institution-level assessment	5
The education provider context	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
The route through stage 1	9
Admissions.....	9
Management and governance	11
Quality, monitoring, and evaluation	14
Learners.....	16
Outcomes from stage 1	19
Section 3: Programme-level assessment.....	19
Programmes considered through this assessment.....	19
Stage 2 assessment – provider submission	19
Data / intelligence considered.....	20
Quality themes identified for further exploration	20
Quality theme 1 – The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.	20
Section 4: Findings.....	21
Conditions.....	21
Overall findings on how standards are met.....	21
Section 5: Referrals.....	28
Recommendations.....	28
Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes	28
Assessment panel recommendation.....	28
Education and Training Committee decision	28
Appendix 1 – summary report	30
Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution	32

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

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.

This is a report on the approval process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the programme detailed in this report meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the programme approval / ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which 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.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The approval process

Institutions and programmes must be approved by us before they can run. The approval process is formed of two stages:

- Stage 1 – we take assurance that institution level standards are met by the institution delivering the proposed programme

- Stage 2 – we assess to be assured that programme level standards are met by each proposed programme

Through the approval process, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess whether providers and programmes meet standards based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. Our standards are split along institution and programme level lines, and we take assurance at the provider level wherever possible.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

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 design quality assurance assessments and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the 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 takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support this review:

Wendy Smith	Lead visitor, Chiropodist / podiatrist, POM Administration
Robert MacKinnon	Lead visitor, Clinical scientist (Audiology), Hearing aid dispenser
John Archibald	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: Institution-level assessment

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 28 HCPC-approved programmes across seven professions and including five postgraduate independent and supplementary programmes. It is a higher education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1997.

The proposed programme sits within the School of Health and Care. Most HCPC-approved programmes at the education provider sit within this school. However, the biomedical science programme sits in the School of Science.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 2](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
Pre-registration	Biomedical scientist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2009
	Dietitian	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2020
	Occupational therapy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1997
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2003
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2018
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2021
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2014

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks and use this information to inform our risk-based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

This data is for existing provision at the institution and does not include the proposed programme.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date	Commentary
------------	-----------	-------	------	------------

Learner number capacity	2781	2801	2024	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure is the benchmark figure, plus the number of learners the provider is proposing through the new provision.</p> <p>We explored resourcing for the programme. We were satisfied with the information provided by the education provider and had no further questions.</p>
Learner non-continuation	3%	4%	2020-21	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has dropped by 2%.</p> <p>We reviewed learners' experience on approved programmes and any</p>

				potential factors for not continuing. We were satisfied with the information provided by the education provider.
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	92%	92%	2021-22	<p>This data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has been maintained.</p> <p>We reviewed learners' experience on approved programmes and any potential for employment and / or further study. We were satisfied with the information provided by the education provider.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	2023	<p>The definition of a Gold TEF award is "Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector."</p> <p>We reviewed learners' experience of the quality of teaching. We were satisfied with the information provided by the education provider.</p>
Learner satisfaction	80%	73.5%	2024	This data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects.

				<p>The data point is below the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 2.5%.</p> <p>We reviewed the learner experience at the education provider and were satisfied with the information provided by the education provider.</p>
HCPC performance review cycle length	n/a	2026-27	Five years	The education provider last engaged with our performance review in the academic year 2021-22. They received a five-year review period. The education provider's next engagement with our performance review process is in 2026-27.

The route through stage 1

Institutions which run HCPC-approved provision have previously demonstrated that they meet institution-level standards. When an existing institution proposes a new programme, we undertake an internal review of whether we need to undertake a full partner-led review against our institution level standards, or whether we can take assurance that the proposed programme aligns with existing provision.

As part of the request to approve the proposed programme, the education provider supplied information to show alignment in the following areas.

Admissions

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Information for applicants –**
 - Applicants should normally hold an upper second-class honours degree or above, preferably in a health or science related subject. Other degree level qualifications may be considered, which will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. It is expected applicants will

have undertaken some work experience related to the relevant profession before starting the programme.

- There are a variety of sources of information for applicants who are considering studying the programme. For example, the education provider's website. This enables applicants to make an informed choice, both at an institutional and profession specific level.
- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Assessing English language, character, and health –**
 - Learners whose first language is not English are required to have International English Language Testing System (IELTS) with a score of at least seven, and with no component less than 6.5. All learners who meet the admission criteria are interviewed following a values-based recruitment process.
 - Admission to the programme is subject to a successful interview, occupational health clearance, confirmation of vaccination status and a satisfactory enhanced DBS check.
 - Applicants to the programme must have level 2 English and Maths qualifications or equivalent.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Prior learning and experience (AP(E)L) –**
 - Recognition for prior learning (RPL) or prior experiential learning (RPEL) may be granted for modules. Applicants applying for RPL or RPEL need to submit adequate evidence of learning. The Module Leader makes their decision after evaluating the evidence provided. This decision is at the discretion of the Course Director. The Progress and Awards Board ratify the decision.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider has an Access and Participation Plan (APP) which promotes a culture of widening access, progression, and success. The APP looks to:
 - increase the proportion of young, full-time, first-degree entrants from low participation neighbourhoods;
 - increase the proportion of disabled entrants; and
 - support access to HE for care leavers.
 - APPs are implemented and monitored within each school and reported to Faculty Learning and Teaching meetings.

- The education provider has Wellbeing and Disability Officers who are available to support applicants and learners. They are available on open days and throughout the programme. The education provider offers telephone appointments and visits to the campus before applicants enrol so they can familiarise themselves with the campus before starting the programme. They also run information days and a summer school for those who identify on the autistic spectrum, or those who are hearing, sight, or mobility impaired.
- Information for applicants about disclosure and reasonable adjustments is available throughout the individual's journey including during the admission process.
- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Management and governance

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Ability to deliver provision to expected threshold level of entry to the Register¹ –**
 - Qualifications are at the correct standard for threshold level for each profession as defined by Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) standards. The Course Quality Enhancement & Monitoring (CQEM) process ensures academic standards are maintained according to QAA standards.
 - The key objectives of this CQEM process include:
 - maintaining academic standards against QAA standards; and
 - meeting Professional Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) and external requirements.
 - Internal moderation processes alongside external examiner moderation and reports are a key mechanism to quality assurance. The external examiner will be invited to attend the education provider in person at least once a year to meet with learners and staff, alongside moderating assessment briefs and learner submissions.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

¹ This is focused on ensuring providers are able to deliver qualifications at or equivalent to the level(s) in SET 1, as required for the profession(s) proposed

- **Sustainability of provision –**
 - All programmes are approved by relevant professional bodies following consultation with key stakeholders and after successfully completing the internal Course Approval process.
 - The programme will be subject to professional accreditation from the Royal College of Podiatry to ensure it satisfies the requirements for professional registration.
 - Resources and facilities for teaching and learning, including appropriate practice-based learning capacity and staffing, are monitored. They are monitored and maintained by the clinical skills and estates teams. Resource quantities are reviewed according to learner demand and augmented if and where required.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Effective programme delivery –**
 - Programmes are monitored through the education provider's quality processes. This includes annual cyclic programme quality and enhancement monitoring to ensure high standards are maintained. The CQEM process underpins the development of a programme-focused approach for learners. The programme team and learners meet twice as part of the CQEM process to review the programme's performance and create an action plan for further developments.
 - The key objectives of this CQEM process are to:
 - Appraise the extent of learner's achievement against programme learning outcomes
 - Review the learner experience and quality of educational support
 - Determine alignment to the Educational and Student Experience Strategy and 2030 Group Strategy
 - Identify good practice by programme teams and highlight areas for change
 - Learners provide feedback at these meetings. Programme teams reflect on external examiner comments, and feedback from learners and the Head of School. Analysis of module evaluation data through Module Evaluation Questionnaires and PTES (Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey) data feeds into the review and action planning.
 - The external examiner attends the education provider in person at least once a year to meet with learners and staff. They moderate assessment briefs and learner submissions.
 - Academic staff will undertake peer-observations of teaching annually.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has

indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Effective staff management and development –**
 - All HCPC approved programmes are managed by a Course Director. Course Directors are HCPC registered and complete a professional declaration every two years. They have overall professional responsibility for the programmes. Strategic leadership is provided by the relevant Curriculum Lead, who also supports and manages the Course Director.
 - The Organisational Development and Academic Development teams offer a range of professional development activities for all academic staff. These include programmes such as coaching, mentoring and leadership development. Funding is available through the faculty Staff Development Fund to enable staff to gain professional qualifications.
 - The faculty ensures staff can undertake scholarly activity for 25 days / pro rata per year. This gives them the opportunity to engage in relevant continuous professional development (CPD) to maintain professional registration. Staff are supported to develop personal and professional objectives to ensure continuing professional academic development.
 - Staff management and development is overseen by the Head of School. Each member of staff participates in the developmental performance review process.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Partnerships, which are managed at the institution level –**
 - The education provider and stakeholders engage in regular partnership meetings to develop working relationships and collaborative decision-making.
 - The education provider signed the NHS Education Agreement in December 2021. This contractual agreement underpins all healthcare programmes.
 - Practice partners sign a Practice Education Agreement (PEA). This states they agree to work in partnership with the education provider to develop, deliver and evaluate healthcare programmes and provide practice-based learning.
 - All healthcare programmes are engaged with Integrated Care Systems via a range of mechanisms, including representation of the education provider across various regional subgroups. For example, Birmingham and Solihull Education Partnership Group.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has

indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Quality, monitoring, and evaluation

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Academic quality –**
 - Quality monitoring processes are designed to incorporate an action planning process built around CQEM meetings. The programme team and relevant stakeholders discuss the key activities over the last period and develop actions for enhancement. CQEM reports are discussed at the School Board. A school-level report (SQEM) and action plan are presented at the Faculty Quality in Learning and Teaching Committee (FQuiLT) which feeds into the education provider-level meeting (QuiLT).
 - Action plans inform programme, school, faculty and education provider level action. Key objectives of these processes include:
 - Maintain academic standards against the standards; and
 - Appraise the extent of learner's achievement against programme learning outcomes.
 - Each Faculty Board is responsible to the University Academic Board for the planning, development, co-ordination and quality assurance of the academic work of the faculty.
 - All teaching staff are required to engage in the teaching observation scheme. The aim of it is to support and develop staff to be imaginative, innovative and creative in ensuring their programme meets the faculty's teaching and learning strategy and the education provider's Education Strategy. The emphasis is on quality enhancement and captures examples of best practices which are shared across the education provider.
 - Learners are invited to provide feedback on their experience of teaching and learning through a system of Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs). This module feedback forms part of the overall assessment of programme health and drives enhancements.
 - External Examiners moderate and review assessment and feedback, pass and progression rates and contribute to programme development processes. All External Examiners submit annual reports and are invited to attend bi-annual Board of Examiner meetings.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Practice quality, including the establishment of safe and supporting practice learning environments –**
 - Practice Education Co-ordinators are the main contact for practice partners in supporting learners in practice-based learning. They oversee the allocation of learners to practice-based learning to ensure learners get the experience required. The Practice Education Support Unit supports and develops practice-based learning.
 - The Practice Education Group is an inter-professional forum for collaborative working across the health professions to monitor and enhance the quality and provision of practice-based learning.
 - The education provider has a variety of quality monitoring processes to ensure the quality of practice-based learning. For example, Student Practice Placement Evaluation.
 - The education provider has overall responsibility for ensuring:
 - practice educators have the programme specific understanding to deliver and assess the learning outcomes; and
 - learners and practice educators have the information they require to be prepared before going into the practice environment.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Learner involvement –**
 - The education provider has a range of mechanisms to gather learner feedback. For example, CQEM meetings. Learners provide feedback on many areas of the programmes, for example teaching and learning, programme design, and delivery. Learners also are able to input through the Student Representative system and can raise issues at regular learner fora.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Service user and carer involvement –**
 - The expertise of service users and carers is central to programme development and delivery. Service users and carers engage in a variety of programme activities, such as recruitment, and teaching. The engagement and co-ordination of this activity is underpinned by a set of frameworks.
 - The programme lead acts as an ambassador for the programmes and identifies modules where service users and carer activity happens and where new activity can be developed.

- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Learners

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Support –**
 - Learners have a range of academic support available through a variety of mechanisms. Some support is at institutional level via the Student Health and Wellbeing Service. This includes a range of resources and guidance.
 - Learners are supported in faculty by Academic / Personal Tutors from within the programme team, and by Student Success Coaches. They provide pastoral support and advice, and signpost regarding progression through their studies.
 - Support in practice-based learning is facilitated through Practice Educators and Clinical Supervisors in partnership with academic staff. Learners are directed to the Escalating Concerns Policy as part of preparation for practice-based learning.
 - Consent is gained from learners and service users through the Consent forms. These record activity to protect service users, learners and employees.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Ongoing suitability –**
 - Learners complete an Annual Self Declaration, which provides verification of having not committed a criminal offence since starting the programme.
 - Learners who declare themselves to be ill or to have had an accident which may result in fitness to practice implications, are referred to occupational health for clearance to remain on the programme. This can include reasonable adjustments being made to allow the learner to continue.
 - The Professional Suitability policy ensures there are processes in place to address ongoing suitability. The Registry lead and advise on matters such as extensions, deferrals, academic misconduct, disciplinary matters, complaints and appeals.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has

indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

- **Learning with and from other learners and professionals (IPL/E) –**
 - IPE is threaded through the programme via an integrated curriculum. This comprises of shared modules across professions alongside interdisciplinary practice-based learning. Specific content is embedded to ensure relevance to professional identity.
 - Learners take part in IPE to meet module and course learning outcomes for the programme. IPE activities and events take place across a range of healthcare programmes, including physiotherapy and nursing.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - Learners with a disability, learning difficulty or long-term illness, are provided with different options for support during their studies. For example, individual exam arrangements, and one-to-one mentoring. Wellbeing and Disability Officers provide support from pre-enrolment to completion of studies. Learners can access funding via the Education and Skills Funding Agency to support the implementation of reasonable adjustments.
 - Assessments are designed to be as accessible as possible to maximise equal opportunities for learners.
 - The faculty has an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) committee. They focus on enacting positive change locally. The education provider's Access and Participation Plan demonstrates they have a record in widening access, success and participation.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Assessment

Findings on alignment with existing provision:

- **Objectivity –**
 - Assessments are marked and moderated internally and reviewed by an external examiner.
 - Programme assessment strategies ensure assessments are aligned with programme and module learning outcomes. These are reviewed through mapping processes as part of programme reviews by external examiners and subject experts. This ensures

learners are not over-assessed, assessments are aligned with professional requirements and are fair and reliable measures of learning.

- Learners' achievement is reviewed within and across modules and compared with previous cohorts. This enables the education provider to detect any change in performance that warrants scrutiny.
- This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Progression and achievement –**
 - Learners will progress through their programme and be awarded in line with education provider's regulations.
 - Progression and achievement requirements for eligibility to the register are clearly identified in the Course Specification document and assessment briefs. These are approved at faculty and education provider level and are available to learners.
 - Educator preparation highlights the requirements for learners to successfully complete their programme of study.
 - Engagement data is available in Aula. This is a digital learning platform to enhance the education experience. It is a communication hub where learners and educators can discuss, collaborate, and access class materials.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.
- **Appeals –**
 - Learners can submit an appeal regarding the assessment process following the receipt of their results if there are relevant concerns.
 - Eligible requests are considered by the Assessments Review Group (ARG). They decide if there was information the Progression and Awards Board (PAB) was not aware of when it made its decision. The ARG can ask the PAB to reconsider its original decision.
 - The appeal process is articulated in the Student Portal and the Course Handbook.
 - This aligns with our understanding of how the education provider runs programmes. We think this as the education provider has indicated there have not been any changes to how they meet this area.

Non-alignment requiring further assessment: None.

Outcomes from stage 1

We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process due to the alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section.

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- Staffing will include a variety of roles. For example, Course Director, and Practice-based Learning Lead.
- The education provider plans to develop a podiatry teaching clinic. Specialist podiatry equipment will be bought to ensure clinical skills development to support learners and prepare them for practice-based learning. This will be complemented with existing clinical skills suites, simulation environments and technology which include, for example treatment and rehabilitation teaching spaces for clinical skills development, and a virtual reality Cave Automatic Virtual Environment (CAVE) suite for simulation of clinical scenarios, anatomy and physiology concepts to bring learning to life and to enable confidence development within a safe space.

Section 3: Programme-level assessment

Programmes considered through this assessment

Programme name	Mode of study	Profession (including modality) / entitlement	Proposed learner number, and frequency	Proposed start date
MSc Podiatry and Leadership	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist; POM – Administration, POM – Sale/Supply (CH)	20 learners, 1 cohort per year	01/05/2026

Stage 2 assessment – provider submission

The education provider was asked to demonstrate how they meet programme level standards for each programme. They supplied information about how each standard was met, including a rationale and links to supporting information via a mapping document.

Data / intelligence considered

We also considered intelligence from others (eg prof bodies, sector bodies that provided support) as follows:

- NHS England (Midlands) – they provided information about the current position of the profession in the region. We provided this information to the visitors, and they took it into consideration.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their submission. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider met our standards.

We have reported on how the provider meets standards, including the areas below, through the [Findings section](#).

Quality theme 1 – The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks.

Area for further exploration: While SET 2.4 (The admissions process must assess the suitability of applicants, including criminal conviction checks) was considered at the institutional level, the visitors received information about this as part of the programme level submission. From this, they noted the admissions process outlined the suitability requirements for applicants, including an enhanced DBS and health checks. They understood if an applicant does not meet these requirements, they are not eligible for entry onto the programme. However, the visitors noted in the Pre-Placement Presentation to learners, it stated “If you have not started your DBS you need to start this today.” This presentation took place before the first practice-based learning. The visitors considered this indicated a learner may already have been admitted to the programme prior to the DBS process being completed. They therefore were unsure how the education provider ensures an applicant is of appropriate character to train to become a health and care professional and to interact safely with service users and carers. We sought more information about this.

Quality activities agreed to explore theme further: We decided to explore this by requesting an email response from the education provider. We thought this was the most effective way to explore the theme as we decided it was a query to which we needed to clarify our understanding.

Outcomes of exploration: The education provider explained the DBS process will be implemented and hopefully completed prior to enrolment. However, they added in rare instances learners may enrol late, and the DBS document may not have been received at the point of their induction. The visitors understood in this case learners are reminded of the urgent need to complete the DBS procedure, as their

continuation on the programme requires a satisfactory enhanced DBS clearance and is a requirement for practice-based learning. The visitors were satisfied the evidence demonstrated how the education provider ensures an applicant is of appropriate character to train to become a health and care professional and to interact safely with service users and carers. They had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met.

Section 4: Findings

This section details the visitors' findings from their review through stage 2, including any requirements set, and a summary of their overall findings.

Conditions

Conditions are requirements that must be met before providers or programmes can be approved. We set conditions when there is an issue with the education provider's approach to meeting a standard. This may mean that we have evidence that standards are not met at this time, or the education provider's planned approach is not suitable.

The visitors were satisfied that no conditions were required to satisfy them that all standards are met. The visitors' findings, including why no conditions were required, are presented below.

Overall findings on how standards are met

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings against the programme-level standards. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **SET 1: Level of qualification for entry to the Register** – this standard is covered through institution-level assessment
- **SET 2: Programme admissions** –
 - Applicants considering the proposed programme at the education provider have access to multiple sources of information to support informed decision-making.
 - The visitors understood applicants typically need an upper second-class honours degree - preferably health or science-related - prior podiatry work experience, and level 2 English and Maths. Applicants who do not have English as their first language require IELTS 7.0 with no component less than 6.5. Admission includes attending an interview, occupational health clearance, vaccination confirmation, and an enhanced DBS check. As discussed in [quality theme 1](#), in instances where learners enrol late, the DBS document

may not have been received at the point of their induction. Learners are reminded of the urgent need to complete the DBS procedure, as their continuation on the programme requires a satisfactory DBS clearance and is a requirement for practice-based learning.

- Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) / Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL) may be granted within the education provider's regulations.
- The education provider has established an EDI framework which allows learners and staff to share best practices and raise concerns related to EDI.
- The visitors considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.

SET 3: Programme governance, management and leadership –

- The visitors noted the programme is designed to attract interest nationally. It uses a blended learning approach with virtual learning and national practice-based learning. Onsite practice-based learning takes place in the education provider's skills suites and simulation environments. These are complemented by external practice-based learning.
- The programme is led by a registered podiatrist as Programme Director, and it will sit within the Allied Health Professions (AHP) portfolio. It is overseen by an Associate Head of Department, who reports to the Head of Department for AHP. The Head of Department reports directly to the Academic Director for the School of Health and Care.
- Quality assurance is embedded within the education provider's institutional framework through CQEM meetings, supported by data from the Strategic Planning and Analytics Office. Action plans are developed at programme level and feed into school and education provider strategies. Learner feedback via Module Evaluation Questionnaires (MEQs) and External Examiner reports inform continuous improvement. All teaching staff participate in the Teaching Observation Scheme. The process to ensure the quality of practice-based learning includes:
 - Formal agreements with practice-based learning providers to ensure safe and appropriate learning environments;
 - Practice-based learning are mapped to HCPC requirements. Shared audits between regional education providers are explored where possible; and
 - Accidents and incidents are logged, reviewed, and addressed.
- The School of Health and Care uses practice-based learning demand and capacity forecasting to shape new programme curricula and ensure appropriate capacity for practice-based learning availability. Academics are responsible for keeping this forecasting up to date through a programme's lifecycle, working

closely with practice-based learning partners to identify and mitigate any capacity risks. The visitors noted that two Business Development Managers have been appointed specifically to expand practice-based learning capacity and support learner number growth. Practice Education Agreements (PEAs) are used to formalise relationships with practice-based learning providers. These agreements define responsibilities for both the education provider and practice-based learning providers and are put in place once a practice-based learning area is confirmed as suitable. Practice-based learning capacity is monitored by Course Directors and Placement Coordinators, with risks escalated to Curriculum Leads, and discussed regularly within the Practice Education Group (PEG).

- The Programme Director is a full-time Assistant Professor with experience delivering and leading pre-registration podiatry curricula within education providers. A second full-time Assistant Professor joined the education provider in July 2025. Specialist expertise is supplemented through guest lecturers. For example, a local Consultant Podiatric Surgeon has agreed to deliver sessions on surgical foot management. Teaching will also draw on multidisciplinary expertise from across the School of Health and Care. Staffing levels are maintained in line with required staff-to-student ratios.
- The visitors recognised the Programme Director is a Fellow of Advance HE, a Chartered Scientist, and serves on several Royal College of Podiatry committees, including the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (as vice chair), and the Committee of Education. The newest team member brings clinical expertise as a podiatrist, independent prescriber, and first contact practitioner, alongside prior academic experience from another education provider. As the academic team expands, all new staff will hold an MSc, be HCPC-registered podiatrists, and possess the educational and clinical experience required to deliver the programme effectively.
- The Programme Director monitors teaching and learning resources, and facilities, and escalates any risks as required. Digital learning materials are delivered through the education provider's virtual learning platform, Aula. This provides a repository for teaching materials, links to Engageli virtual classrooms, directed study resources, assessment submission points, and is a communication platform between academics and learners. The education provider provides a wide range of resources for learners and educators. For example, general and specialist teaching classrooms, specialised learning environments such as an audio-visual laboratory, and health simulation spaces. All classrooms are equipped with projection systems and a networked computer. There are four

Academic Liaison Librarians who deliver information skills sessions in collaboration with course tutors. Additional academic tutorials are available weekly in person or virtually. Support services operate all year round, both on campus and remotely. These include success coaches, careers services, and health and wellbeing teams. Library support and resources are available both online and on campus, for example books, e-books and online journals. The library has services to support those with additional needs including specialist equipment, a study room that can only be booked by students with a disability and also adjustments to services. Staff are supported by Educational Technologists to ensure accessible learning. Learners attend campus up to five days per theory module, and remaining study is delivered virtually. The education provider provides accommodation opportunities for distance learners attending campus.

- The visitors noted learners have access to institutional support through the education provider's Health and Wellbeing service, which offers a range of resources and guidance. Within the School, learners are supported by the programme team and, where appropriate, Student Success Coaches, who provide additional pastoral support, signposting, and advice on academic progress. During practice-based learning, support is jointly provided by Practice Educators or Clinical Supervisors in collaboration with academic staff.
- Equality and diversity are core priorities for the education provider. It is committed to providing a fair, inclusive, and supportive environment in which learners can thrive.
- The School of Health and Care promotes a culture of openness, honesty, and accountability. Learners are encouraged to speak up about malpractice or wrongdoing encountered during practice-based learning. The visitors recognised as part of their preparation for practice-based learning, learners are directed to the Escalating Concerns Policy to ensure they know how to raise issues appropriately.
- The visitors considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 4: Programme design and delivery –**
 - The programme is mapped to the HCPC standards of proficiency (SOPs). The visitors noted the SOPs mapping document sets out in which module and learning outcome each SOP is taught with the Module Specifications including information about learning outcomes. This evidence demonstrated to the visitors the SOPs would be met.
 - The visitors noted the programme teaches the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPEs) and the expectations of professional behaviour throughout. For example, the first module

Becoming a Professional Practitioner teaches ethical and legal responsibilities. This is to ensure learners understand the principles of confidentiality and data protection, and how to apply them in professional and digital contexts.

- The programme aims reflect the philosophy of the profession. They ensure learners develop the skills, values, and knowledge required for effective practice.
- The Programme Director sits on the Royal College of Podiatry (RCPod) Committee of Education and is the vice chair of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee. They take knowledge from these committees to ensure the programme is contemporary. The visitors recognised all academic staff are HCPC-registered podiatrists with clinical and educational experience.
- Practice-based learning blocks are timed so theoretical learning supports the development of clinical skills. Skills sessions, simulation, and case-based learning help learners apply theory before beginning practice-based learning.
- The visitors noted the programme employs a variety of learning and teaching methods. For example, interprofessional education, learner-led group work, debate, simulation workshops, virtual teaching and practical skills sessions. The programme has a blended model of teaching. In blocks of practice-based learning, learners complete simulation tasks and skills activities within other modules. A large amount of teaching is delivered virtually using the virtual platform Engageli. Learners can study remotely whilst being connected to their cohort and lecturers. Learners have access to Aula for all modules and the course community. Aula contains teaching materials, links to Engageli classrooms, directed study resources, assessment submission points, and is a communication platform between academics and learners.
- The curriculum of the proposed programme is designed to promote learning across health and care disciplines. Learners collaborate through activities such as group work and debate. Learning is supported through varied teaching methods, personal tutor support, and blended delivery.
- Learners work with increasingly complex clinical scenarios, including case studies, simulations, and interactions with service users and carers. Reflective practice is woven throughout the programme. The visitors understood research-focused modules such as Evaluating Evidence Within Health and Care in year 1 and The Evidence Based Practitioner: Professional Project in year 2 strengthen critical thinking and the ability to develop evidence-informed solutions. These two modules provide the principles and skills for evidence-based practice. Evidence-based practice is embedded across the curriculum through engagement with current research, clinical guidelines, and up-to-date

professional literature, so learners apply contemporary evidence in clinical decision-making.

- The visitors considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 5: Practice-based learning –**
 - The visitors recognised practice-based learning is a core element of the programme to prepare learners for future practice. Learners must complete all practice-based learning hours, pass all core assessments, and undertake additional mandatory training such as life support and patient handling.
 - The visitors noted learners complete four practice-based learning modules totalling over 1,000 hours of practice-based learning across staged blocks: two blocks of six weeks each in year 1, followed by one seven-week block and one block of eight weeks in year 2. The first practice-based learning block begins on campus using the education provider's specialist clinical teaching spaces and equipment. Subsequent external practice-based learning progressively develops knowledge and skills. Placement 1 focuses on foundational clinical skills. Placement 2 introduces real-world practice, so learners gain confidence. In Placement 3, they integrate and apply advanced podiatric and musculoskeletal knowledge. On Placement 4, learners refine their skills in nail surgery, complex case management, and leadership, becoming more autonomous.
 - The School of Health and Care has established quality processes to approve, monitor, and enhance practice-based learning. The visitors recognised formal agreements are in place between the education provider and practice providers. These agreements outline shared responsibilities to ensure safe, high-quality learning environments. The education provider carries out an audit to confirm each practice-based learning setting can host learners. Before approving new practice-based learning areas, Care Quality Commission (CQC) reports are reviewed to identify any quality concerns. Where practice providers work with multiple education providers, shared audits are used where possible.
 - The visitors identified learners and practice-based learning staff report any incidents during practice-based learning. Academic staff review and support learners, and log incidents on the School register. This log is reviewed to identify themes that may require follow-up actions. At the end of each practice-based learning, learners complete an evaluation. Feedback is collated into organisational reports shared with partners, and issues are followed up using formal record-keeping processes. Learners are directed to the school's Freedom to Speak Up and Escalating Concerns Standard to promote openness and accountability. Learners raise concerns first within the practice-based learning area, or with

academic staff if they are unable. All concerns raised are logged by the education provider.

- The Practice Education Group (PEG) is a cross-professional group that oversees practice education quality, chaired by the Lead for Practice Education. Strategic partnership groups operate between the school and practice-based learning providers. Meetings between the two groups support collaborative working, review quality indicators such as CQC outcomes and incident patterns, and strengthen the governance of practice-based learning.
- Staff-to-student ratios are maintained so no more than six learners are supervised by one member of staff in practice-based learning.
- All Practice Educators in podiatry clinical settings are HCPC-registered podiatrists with at least two years of post-registration clinical experience. The visitors recognised that where appropriate, such as in leadership or multidisciplinary practice-based learning, Practice Educators from other registered health professions may also support learning.
- The visitors considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.
- **SET 6: Assessment –**
 - The visitors noted the education provider's assessment strategy in which module and learning outcomes assessed each SOP and learning outcome. This was evidenced through the HCPC SOPs mapping document. They were satisfied with this evidence. Module Specifications include information about how the programme assesses each learning outcome.
 - The HCPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) are fully embedded to ensure learners develop the professional behaviours required for safe and ethical podiatry practice. Summative assessment of the SCPEs is integrated throughout the programme. The visitors recognised in the first-year module Becoming a Professional Practitioner, and the second-year module Leading for the Future as a Health and Care Professional, learners complete summative assessments such as a professional development plan, reflective writing, and a portfolio of vignettes demonstrating leadership behaviours. Practice-based learning modules require completion of portfolios containing tasks linked to SCPE-related behaviours.
 - The visitors understood a range of assessment methods is used across the programme to align with the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and which are appropriate to, and effective at, measuring the learning outcomes. Assessments include an Objective Structured Practical Examination (OSPE) to evaluate practical application of anatomy and physiology, and a portfolio.
 - The overall assessment strategy aligns with the education provider's Group Assessment Strategy and the School of Health

and Care Curriculum Pillars. The visitors noted it includes both formative and summative approaches, incorporates real-world scenarios, to ensure learners can apply theoretical knowledge in professional practice.

- The visitors considered the relevant standards within this SET area met.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Section 5: Referrals

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval, focused review, or performance review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

Recommendations

We include recommendations when standards are met at or just above threshold level, and where there is a risk to that standard being met in the future. They do not need to be met before programmes can be approved, but they should be considered by education providers when developing their programmes.

The visitors did not set any recommendations.

Section 6: Decision on approval process outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- All standards are met, and therefore the programme should be approved

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The programme is approved

Reason for this decision: The Panel accepted the visitor's recommendation that the programme should receive approval.

Appendix 1 – summary report

If the education provider does not provide observations, only this summary report (rather than the whole report) will be provided to the Education and Training Committee (Panel) to enable their decision on approval. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation, and the nature, quality and facilities of the provision.

Education provider	Coventry University		
Case reference	CAS-01726-T7K6B8	Lead visitors	Wendy Smith and Robert MacKinnon
Quality of provision			
<p>Through this assessment, we have noted:</p> <p>The areas we explored focused on:</p> <p>Quality theme 1: The visitors reviewed the admissions process and noted applicants must meet suitability requirements, including completing a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check at an enhanced level, to be eligible for the programme. Although the Pre-Placement Presentation suggested learners may begin the programme before their DBS is completed, the education provider clarified that checks are intended to be completed before enrolment. In rare late-enrolment cases, learners may start their induction without a completed DBS, but they are immediately instructed to complete it, as continuation on the programme and participation in practice-based learning, depends on satisfactory clearance. We had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met.</p> <p>The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore is approved.</p>			
Facilities provided			
<p>Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:</p> <p>Staffing will include a variety of roles. For example, Course Director, and Practice-based Learning Lead.</p> <p>The education provider plans to develop a podiatry teaching clinic. Specialist podiatry equipment will be bought to ensure clinical skills development to support learners and prepare them for practice-based learning. This will be complemented with existing clinical skills suites, simulation environments and technology which include, for example treatment and rehabilitation teaching spaces for</p>			

clinical skills development, and a virtual reality Cave Automatic Virtual Environment (CAVE) suite for simulation of clinical scenarios, anatomy and physiology concepts to bring learning to life and to enable confidence development within a safe space.

Programmes			
Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
MSc Podiatry and Leadership	FT (Full time)	01/05/2026	Taught (HEI)

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science	FT (Full time)	Biomedical scientist			01/09/2009
BSc (Hons) Dietetics	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/09/2020
Dietitian Degree Apprenticeship (MSc Dietetics & Leadership)	WBL (Work based learning)	Dietitian			19/01/2026
MSc Dietetics and Leadership	FT (Full time)	Dietitian			01/09/2021
MSc Dietetics and Leadership, Integrated degree apprenticeship	WBL (Work based learning)	Dietitian			01/08/2021
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/09/1997
MSc Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational therapist			01/01/2021
MSc Occupational Therapy Integrated Degree Apprenticeship	WBL (Work based learning)	Occupational therapist			01/01/2022
Occupational Therapist Degree Apprenticeship (BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy)	WBL (Work based learning)	Occupational therapist			15/09/2025
Occupational Therapist Degree Apprenticeship (MSc Occupational Therapy)	WBL (Work based learning)	Occupational therapist			19/01/2026
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2019
Diploma of Higher Education Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating department practitioner			01/09/2003
Operating Department Practitioner Degree Apprenticeship (BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice)	WBL (Work based learning)	Operating department practitioner			15/09/2025
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2018
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	PT (Part time)	Paramedic			01/08/2018
Foundation Degree Paramedic Science	PT (Part time)	Paramedic			01/01/2016
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/05/2013

BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	WBL (Work based learning)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2019
MSc Physiotherapy and Leadership	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
MSc Physiotherapy and Leadership	WBL (Work based learning)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2020
Physiotherapist Degree Apprenticeship (BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy)	WBL (Work based learning)	Physiotherapist			15/09/2025
Physiotherapist Degree Apprenticeship (MSc Physiotherapy & Leadership)	WBL (Work based learning)	Physiotherapist			15/09/2025
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic radiographer		01/09/2021
Conversion Course From Supplementary to Independent Non-Medical Prescribing (Non-Accredited)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/12/2014
Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2016
Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (Level 3)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2016
Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing	01/10/2016
Practice Certificate in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing (M Level)	PT (Part time)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/10/2016