
Performance review process report

University of Huddersfield, 2024-25

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of the University of Huddersfield. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission against quality themes and found that we did not need to undertake further exploration of key themes through quality activities. We did seek clarification around several points, as noted through the portfolio.
- Recommended when the institution should next be reviewed
- Decided when the institution should next be reviewed

Through this assessment, we have noted:

- The education provider should next engage with monitoring in four years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups they engaged with included practice-based learning providers, learners, service users and internal quality teams.
 - The education provider also engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - The education provider engaged with organisations such as the Office for Standards in Education, the Care Quality Commission, and the Office for Students. They considered the findings of these organisations in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.
-

Previous consideration	Not applicable. This performance review process was not referred from another process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.
Next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2028-29 academic year

Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment	4
About us	4
Our standards	4
Our regulatory approach	4
The performance review process	4
Thematic areas reviewed	5
How we make our decisions	5
The assessment panel for this review	5
Section 2: About the education provider	6
The education provider context	6
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	6
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes	9
Portfolio submission	9
Quality themes identified for further exploration	10
Section 4: Findings	10
Overall findings on performance	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection	17
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	21
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection	22
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	25
Data and reflections	27
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	28
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes	29
Assessment panel recommendation	29
Appendix 1 – summary report	31
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 performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) 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 performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

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

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

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 a review of this education provider:

Julie Weir	Lead visitor, Operating Department Practitioner
Lucy Myers	Lead visitor, Speech and Language Therapist
Ann Johnson	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 17 HCPC-approved programmes across 7 professions and including Post Registration programmes in Independent and Supplementary Prescribing and Podiatric Surgery. It is a Higher Education Provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1993.

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	Chiropodist / podiatrist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1993
	Occupational therapy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2005
	Operating Department Practitioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2013
	Paramedic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2020
	Physiotherapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1997
	Radiographer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2025
	Speech and language therapist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	2021
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing			2014
	Podiatric Surgery			2020

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 programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
------------	-----------	-------	--------------------	------------

¹ An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available [here](#)

Learner number capacity	359	497	03/04/2025	<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 was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners above the benchmark</p> <p>We explored this by considering through the review whether they had appropriate resources in place to maintain delivery of their approved provision. We concluded that they did so, and that staffing had been expanded appropriately to match expansion of cohorts. This is explored in detail in section 4 below.</p>
Learner non-continuation	7%	9%	2021-22	<p>This Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) 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 above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing below sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point,</p>

				<p>the education provider's performance has dropped by 3%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners to stay on the programmes. We considered that their mechanisms for doing so were appropriate.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	92%	91%	2021-22	<p>This HESA 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 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%.</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider supports learners into next steps. We considered that they had appropriate mechanisms for doing so.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	Gold	2023	<p>The definition of a [Gold / Silver / Bronze] TEF award is "Provision is consistently outstanding and of the highest quality found in the UK Higher Education sector."</p>

Learner satisfaction	81.7%	84.8%	2025	<p>This National Student Survey (NSS) positivity score data was sourced at the subject level. This means the data is for HCPC-related subjects</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1%</p> <p>We explored this by considering how well the education provider has reflected on learner satisfaction during the review period.</p>
HCPC performance review cycle length				<p>The education provider last went through performance review in 2021-22 and were recommended a three-year review period.</p>

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Data/intelligence considered

We did not consider any additional data or intelligence other than that noted in the table above.

Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards. We considered that this was a strong portfolio and that specific quality activities were not required, although we did seek clarification around a number of key areas.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Admissions procedures –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they had managed their admissions procedures over the review period, giving some examples of what they had done and why. They noted that central university policies are considered as the baseline from which individual Schools are expected to take a lead in their own procedures and approaches. All programmes must set out the specifics of their own approach in their programme document, and this information is also made available online.
 - The education provider reflected on some specific developments in admissions. For example, they had significantly increased learner recruitment during the review period across several programmes, including occupational therapy, physiotherapy and paramedicine. Increasing application numbers posed challenges for how to select learners appropriately particularly for the paramedic programme. This was addressed by increasing the number of recruitment days for the subject, during which selection decisions were made.
 - The education provider identified a challenge in the significant changes to qualifications offered by sixth form colleges and schools, prompting a review of their admissions requirements.
 - The education provider also reflected on their increasing recruitment to the admissions team, enabled an increase in the number of applications processed. The education provider stated that they had undertaken “careful resource planning to maintain high-quality student experiences, particularly in terms of staff-to-student ratios and placement capacity.”

- The education provider noted also their ongoing process of managing what they called “placement saturation”, which they linked to the rise in admissions. Their response was to create a specific Director of Home Recruitment role part of whose job description was to manage this.
- We considered that the education provider had reflected appropriately on the challenges and opportunities that had arisen. The visitors noted in particular that the education provider was taking seriously the need to balance programme growth and resource constraints. They also considered that the involvement of the public partnership group in admissions was “a valuable resource”.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - The education provider reflected on, challenges faced by the Department of Allied Health Professions, Sports and Exercise (DAHPSE), and programme-level reflections.
 - There have been issues with financial sustainability for DAHPSE, with a shortfall in funding during the review period. A significant restructure at the education provider resulted in cost-saving changes to the way the staff teams are organised. The education provider explained that responsibilities and teaching loads had been merged for particular roles and that new workload models had been produced to support this. They also noted that new training had been rolled out to ensure that the teams still had an appropriate mix of skills and experience. This was particularly important in light of the use of the graduate teaching assistants, who had less teaching and clinical experience.
 - The education provider also noted that providing emotional and professional support for staff affected by redundancies, or potential future changes, had been part of the adaptations plan. They reflected on what they anticipated in terms of future resource needs on the programme. This was because the NHS long-term workforce plan envisaged that they would need to increase learner numbers across the DAHPSE by 20-25% within the next five years.
 - The visitors requested clarification around how the education provider was managing reductions in cohort size, and how they had reviewed staff student ratios in light of the restructure. The education provider explained that they had undertaken individual programme-level reviews to manage this. The visitors considered that performance in this area was satisfactory, because the education provider had clearly reflected appropriately on challenges and difficulties during the review period. The visitors noted that the education provider had managed the restructuring process effectively. This was especially true around the impact on staff wellbeing. The visitors also considered they had been open and straightforward in their reflection. They also considered that the education provider’s reflection on how they were aligning learner growth with local and national priorities was detailed and helpful.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**

- The education provider set out in the portfolio the organisations with which they have partnerships. These include local NHS Trusts, the Yorkshire Ambulance Service, and local government organisations such as Kirkwood and Kirklees Council. Contact with these bodies is maintained through regular meetings, with designated individuals responsible for maintaining the relationship from the education provider's side.
- They reflected on how they have developed and maintained relationships during the review period. They noted for example that various programmes' leads for practice-based learning meet regularly with key contacts at the practice educator organisations. They also noted that they have been working closely with NHS England on workforce challenges. They have increased cohort sizes on their radiography and occupational therapy provision in order to meet future workforce challenges.
- They also reflected on how they have used their [National Health Innovation Campus \(NHIC\)](#) to strengthen existing partnerships with local NHS providers. They reflected on how the objective of the NHIC is to improve their approach and application of teaching, research and innovation. The key external partner for this project was Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust.
- Over the review period, the portfolio made clear that several cohorts had expanded in size. The education provider therefore identified placement capacity as a key challenge for their partnerships. This applied to almost all their HCPC-approved programmes. They reflected on how they were managing this area and noted that they were working with "commercial partners" who have unused practice educator resource to adapt those individuals for clinic work.
- The visitors considered that they had seen positive reflections of effective working with named partner organisations. They agreed that partnerships are embedded throughout the education provider and are actively cultivated to support mutual goals. We considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly reflected on many different areas of partnership working.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Staff development –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they had used their institutional mechanisms to ensure that staff were being appropriately supported to develop their teaching skills. They have a strategic map for the next five years at the institution level. The visitors noted the education provider's explanation that 98% of its teaching staff hold postgraduate qualifications, which they state is the highest among English HEIs, while 96% have some form of teaching qualification. They also stated that staff development activities are delivered via regular appraisals.
 - The education provider reflected on how they had managed the challenge of combining lecturer and senior lecturer posts as part of the institutional restructure. They had used existing line management systems to ensure that staff understood the new aspects of their roles.

They also reflected on how they had identified staff who needed additional support or would benefit from development in their roles. The development of the NHIC was envisaged as a way to encourage staff development through contacts with other organisations.

- The visitors noted that the staff restructure had diversified the skill mix and commended the clear expectation that lecturers and senior lecturers are engaged in research and doctoral study. They considered that this was particularly commendable in light of the difficult circumstances of the restructure. We considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clear mechanisms for staff development. They had shown that, during the review period, these had been used appropriately to help staff grow in their roles and in new roles if necessary.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Academic quality –**

- The education provider reflected on several key events over the review period with regards to maintaining and improving academic quality. They noted that they have achieved TEF Gold and an Ofsted Outstanding rating. They have continued work to identify good practice in academic quality and ensure that the current level is maintained. This is being led by the University Strategic Teaching and Learning team, and the Director of Apprenticeships.
- Another important transformation noted by the education provider was the move away from having individual Schools monitor academic quality to the implementation of a system of centralised monitoring. This was a cost-saving measure decided on by senior management, but the education provider was also intending to streamline internal quality processes. The education noted that adapting to this system has been complex and that the changes are still being evaluated. Individual programmes are being asked to feedback on whether they considered that the internal quality processes have genuinely been made more streamlined and cost-effective. They also noted that there is a centralised team for ensuring appropriate alignment with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).
- The visitors considered that these achievements suggested a strong level of attention to academic quality and commended the education provider for continuing to look for ways to continue improve and develop their approach to ensuring high standards of academic quality. We considered that performance in this area was satisfactory because the education provider had reflected on changes and developments appropriately.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Quality of practice-based learning –**

- The education provider reflected on how they had used relevant professional body standards for the programmes they deliver to establish a framework for an audit of practice-based learning quality. They explained that they had received poor feedback from learners about specific placements on the paramedic programme during the

review period. As a result, the education provider implemented actions to engage with the practice-based learning providers and to learners, to seek suggestions for improvement and development. They had also undertaken internal reflections on what could be improved in their monitoring of practice-based learning providers, and they were satisfied that the practice-based learning providers had themselves made relevant improvements.

- The education provider also reflected on an exercise they had undertaken to refresh the principles behind their provision of practice-based learning and ensure they were still fit for purpose. The principles are as follows: close collaboration, an openness to innovation and flexible practice-based learning, respect for expertise, and effective use of data. These are not new principles, but the education provider was seeking to ensure that all staff understood them and had an opportunity to discuss them. The education provider offered training to help all staff embed the principles in their work.
- The education provider also reflected on how they had responded to concerns about practice-based learning, including where alerts from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had been received. They offered an example of where the CQC had flagged a possible issue with learner safety at a hospital Trust. The education provider undertook their own investigation of the concerns, and some learners were moved to different practice-based learning placements.
- The visitors considered that the portfolio contained clear evidence of the education provider identifying issues through their established systems, reflecting on them appropriately, and taking action. We considered performance in this area was good because they could reflect on challenges and adapt their systems to make necessary change.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Learner support –**
 - The education provider reflected on the recent centralisation of learner support services, moving from School-based support to university-level provision of pastoral / academic support. They acknowledged that this had been undertaken primarily as a cost-saving measure. However, they did note also that individual programmes retain their own mechanisms for day-to-day support for learners, with staff acting as a first point of call for learners with difficulties.
 - The education provider also reflected on how the identified that staff at the programme levels had less awareness of the support services available for learners as a result of the centralisation of systems. Even though there was a Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) system in place for programmes, at the programme level teaching teams had been encouraged to improve their knowledge of what was available so that learners could be appropriately and effectively signposted. The visitors noted that the education provider would be explicitly reflecting on how well the centralisation model was working during the next few years.
 - The visitors considered that this was strong evidence that learners had access to appropriate networks of support and that the education

provider was willing and able to reflect on the best way to support learners. They noted that “all students are allocated a personal academic tutor alongside various targeted support services”, and that “Initiatives supporting students throughout their university journey were described.” The visitors also acknowledged that some risk had been created around learner support, but that appropriate mitigation was in place, including a toolkit for staff.

- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Interprofessional education –**

- The education provider reflected on several challenges and opportunities around interprofessional education (IPE) in the review period. For example, they noted that the increasing complexity of their allied health professions (AHP) provision posed scheduling problems for bringing learners on different programmes together. They addressed this by developing new shared modules, particularly focused on professional practice, which were studied by all learners on particular programmes. They specifically distinguished in the portfolio between true IPE and shared teaching, which is an important distinction.
- The education provider also reflected on how they had developed IPE in conjunction with ensuring that all learners met the revised standards of proficiency (SOPs). What this meant in practice was that they brought learners from different programmes together for workshops and skills days around professionalism, personal wellbeing and resilience.
- They also reflected on how they had used service users to deliver IPE, specifically by encouraging service users to discuss their experiences of accessing multiple different professional services. Learners were then encouraged to use these insights in their own study and practice.
- The visitors asked for some clarification around how the education provider had evaluated certain IPE sessions. Specifically, they wanted to understand in more detail how the interprofessional learning in the research modules developed learner’s ability to work outside their own profession. They also wanted more information about what plans and resources were in places to support further IPE development.
- In a virtual meeting the education provider elaborated on their gathering of feedback from participants. They noted that learners had had opportunities to record in writing their feedback and that this was reviewed by the programme team and discussed with learners subsequently. The visitors also sought clarification about how well the workshops and similar activities were actually bringing together learners from different professional backgrounds. The education provider explained how they used of the case study discussions in which learners were brought together. In their overall feedback, the visitors considered that while IPE was still to some degree a work in progress, the education provider had reflected strongly on what further actions they are planning to implement. We considered that performance in this area was good because the education provider had demonstrated that they could look at how well they were delivering IPE in a straightforward and open way.

- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider reflected on several areas of service user and carer (SUC) involvement during the review period. They noted, for example, that SUCs had been involved from the start in the development of the new speech and language therapy programme which was which started in 2021. The level of PPG involvement in this process has been used as a best practice case study in both internal and external settings.
 - They also reflected on a new integrated payment policy developed by and for the PPG. This had been introduced efficiently, and useful feedback had been received. A challenge noted by the education provider was a significant reduction in requests to the PPG for input into teaching and learning activities within the HCPC provision. This was due to the institutional funding challenges noted above. They addressed this by asking individual programme leads to plan involvement more carefully so that costs could be considered sooner, and to integrate involvement across programmes where possible, to avoid duplication.
 - Based on the education provider's reflections, the visitors considered that service users and carers were sustainably integrated into all programmes. They noted that service users and carers were "well embedded" into all areas of the HCPC provision. They noted also that "lots of examples" were given of how this had been ensured. In discussion with the visitors, the education provider also noted that after some consideration of low levels of learner feedback, they had streamlined the process to increase response rates. This had been a success. Overall, we considered that the education provider performance in this area was good because the education provider had offered clear and wide-ranging reflection, alongside evidence of what they were doing.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Equality, diversity and inclusion –**
 - The education provider stated that the visitors who completed the review of the previous performance review had noted EDI as an area of strength. They noted that they have a suite of institutional policies governing EDI. There are specific approaches for different groups.
 - They reflected on a "differential attainment" project, which had sought to provide useful data on different achievement rates among different groups, and to understand the reasons for this. This project was given a Times Higher Education Outstanding Contribution to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion award. The education provider also received an Athena Swan Bronze award for their work on expanding sex equality across their provision. They did note that they were working to make their EDI initiatives more quantifiable, i.e. they are seeking to find concrete ways in which their success can be judged.

- They reflected on how they can close the persisting “attainment gap” between learners from different backgrounds, through gaining more detailed data and more expansive feedback from learners.
- The visitors considered that the EDI work undertaken by the education provider was strong, and that they had a good range of activities. They also considered that the education provider’s recognition of the difficulties of effectively evaluating EDI work was evidence of careful attention to this area. We considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had been open and straightforward about the challenges they were working through and had shown that their EDI work was high quality.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Horizon scanning –**
 - The main overarching theme of the reflection in this area was how the education provider was managing financial pressures, including funding reductions from central authorities and rising costs. During the review period the education provider was working to a 2018-25 strategy map, setting overall priorities for individual programmes and Schools, and they have also rolled out a 2025-32 strategy map.
 - For the HCPC provision, specific future challenges identified include the ongoing rollout of new programmes, including diagnostic radiography. Also, there were new non-HCPC approved healthcare provision which might nevertheless have an impact on HCPC programmes.
 - They noted also the uncertainty about the future of NHS England, and which bodies, if any, would pick up the threads of the work previously undertaken by NHSE. Another area of challenge for the future they reflected on was the changing nature of NHS rehabilitative care. The move from hospital to community settings was reducing learner opportunities to be exposed to rehabilitation learning in practice-based learning settings. This will be addressed through seeking out new placement opportunities in the community.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider had considered a good range of possible future challenges. They particularly noticed the detail in the education provider’s consideration of artificial intelligence. They also suggest We considered performance in this area was good because we had seen clear evidence that the education provider had defined processes for considering future challenges and opportunities.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Embedding the revised Standards of Proficiency (SOPs) –**

- The education provider noted they had reflected on how best to integrate the revised SOPs into their programme and gave examples of how this had been completed.
- For example, with regard to the increased emphasis on leadership, they explained that they had amended certain modules, including one that was designed to improve teamwork. Changes were made to assessment, and to the learning outcomes.
- Regarding the safeguarding of registrants' mental health, the education provider noted that they did not need to make significant revisions to the teaching or assessment of the programme. They worked with their occupational health and university disability advisors to amend the curriculum. However, their reflection did note that they made changes to how their programme supports learners with persistent health conditions affecting mental health and wellbeing.
- The education provider reflected on their SOPs integration in some other parts of the curriculum. With regard to promoting public health, they noted that they have developed a specific curriculum to encourage all learners in health professions to consider public health. Another example, in connection with EDI, is the introduction of informal "drop in" sessions to discuss how practitioners need to reflect on how their own biases might affect their work. Learners are also encouraged to develop their personal reflection on EDI issues using specific models.
- The visitors considered that the overall strategy for integrating the revised SOPs had been appropriate. Their view was that the integration had been "carefully considered, in detail". They did request some additional clarification in this area, as the initial reflection was limited. The education provider expanded on their portfolio, noting that they had used their annual review process to consider how to meet the revised SOPs. Their conclusion was that they were already meeting the revised SOPs in those two specific areas, as both leadership and a self-critical mental health focus had been part of the programme for some time.
- In addition to individual programme-level work, programme leads were invited to identify opportunities for collective development. One key area identified for enhancement was resilience, particularly in relation to SOP 3, which focuses on maintaining health and wellbeing and seeking support when needed. This was explored through a RAG rating exercise, which was included within the portfolio, which highlighted the potential for developing interprofessional learning opportunities to address this theme across the AHP provision.
- The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had a clear pathway for reviewing the revised SOPs and how they should be integrated into the curriculum.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Embedding the revised HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics across professions –**

- The review of the Allied Health Professions (AHP) provision in light of the revised Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (SCPEs) was led by the Acting Director of Academic Quality and Professional Governance. This work aligned with SET 4.4, around relevance to current practice, ensuring mechanisms were in place to keep the curriculum current. They explained how a combined top-down and bottom-up approach was adopted to assess where the provision continued to meet the SCPEs and to identify any gaps requiring attention. Profession-specific changes were addressed at the programme level, as detailed in individual reflections, while broader opportunities for curriculum enhancement were also explored.
- The visitors considered that the education provider reflection on their process for implementing the revised SCPEs was effectively explained. They observed that during induction across all AHP courses, the Standards of Proficiency for Education (SCPEs) are a central focus. They noted that each programme has completed a detailed mapping exercise to identify where the SCPEs are addressed throughout the programme. These documents were collated by the school quality team and included in validation materials.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider provided a detailed analysis of their embedding of the revised SCPEs. They had clearly reflected in depth on what was required across the HCPC-approved programmes.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Impact of workforce planning –**
 - In their portfolio the education provider referred back to the 'Resourcing and financial stability' section, which set out the challenges around funding and the requirement to increase learner numbers by up to 25% on all HCPC-approved programmes. The education provider noted that they have been considering the NHS Long Term plan, and what this will mean for the scaling-up of their programmes.
 - This scaling-up is likely to require significant growth in staff numbers, resources and consideration of learner support. They reflected on this in detail through the 'Resourcing and financial stability' section. Their long-term strategic plan for 2025-32 takes into account the likely expansion of the AHP provision.
 - The education provider also reflected on how they will update their placement modelling and allocation processes over the next few years to take account of this expected growth in relevant areas. They noted, for example, that they have developing their clinic space, and increasing their collaborations with key partners such as Calderdale and Huddersfield Foundation Trust and Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust. They also have the National Health Innovation Campus available to support the provision of high-quality placements.
 - The visitors considered that the reflection in this area was "considered in detail". Overall, we considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had clearly considered how to adapt to the changing landscape of NHS workforce planning, which is by far the main strategic consideration around their AHP provision.

- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - The reflection focused on two key themes: further development of simulation, use of artificial intelligence (AI).
 - The education provider noted that across the AHP courses, technology has been and will continue to be extensively integrated into teaching, learning, and assessment practices. They stated that the development of innovative learning environments reflects a commitment to contemporary education. [Lecture Capture](#) (a system which records audio and visual content for learners to revisit after class) ensures all teaching sessions are accessible, while platforms like Microsoft Teams enable realistic simulations of clinical environments.
 - The visitors noted the education provider reflection of a range of interactive and online tools are used to enhance engagement and learning. Discipline-specific innovations include Speech and Language Therapy students learning acoustic analysis techniques, and Operating Department Practice exploring the use of VR headsets to enrich teaching and learning experiences. They also noted their reflections on challenges in keeping learners and staff fully updated on the best way to make use of simulation, and introduced more training address these gaps.
 - Maintaining and developing skill levels was also identified as a challenge around the use of AI. The key reflection around AI is on how to maintain academic integrity given the fast developments in this area, and how to make sure that AI applications for clinical practice are being appropriately considered.
 - The visitors considered that the reflection in this area was strong. They noted the developments in simulation-based learning across the AHP programmes. They also thought it was appropriate that the education provider had recognised the constraints under which they were operating, and that AI held opportunities as well as threats.
 - The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had shown the ability and willingness to review their use of technology during the 2022-24 period.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Apprenticeships in England –**
 - The education provider delivers five apprenticeship programmes, the earliest of which began in September 2019, and they have another coming on stream from September 2026. Their reflection was focused on successes and challenges in the delivery of these programmes.
 - Challenges included timetabling difficulties which made it hard for all learners to complete the required clinical hours – this was addressed through more frequent and focused communication between practice educators and programme staff.
 - The education provider reflected that, overall, the programmes have been a success and that their structure has enabled learners to integrate practical and theory components effectively. They noted that

the number of partner employers has continued to increase steadily, and that feedback from employers suggests their apprentices have performed well.

- The visitors noted that the education provider had developed apprenticeship provision rapidly. They also considered that the Ofsted outstanding judgement indicates that the education provider was handling apprenticeships effectively. Overall, we considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had reflected thoroughly on how well their apprenticeships were performing during the review period.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider noted that they refer to Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) standards and guidance in all their programme design and planning. Programmes all undergo annual reviews, and these reviews incorporate requirements to meet relevant professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) standards.
 - They noted that they have not undertaken major reviews of their programmes. This means they have limited ability to reflect on how they assess their provision against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (UKQCHE).
 - The visitors noted that the education provider had a clear process for ensuring that there was appropriate alignment between their programmes and the UKQCHE. We considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had reflected as thoroughly as possible on their approach to the UKQCHE.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Office for Students (OfS) –**
 - The key reflection for this area concerned the changes made in 2022 to the OfS General Ongoing Conditions of Registrations (GOCR). The education provider undertook an institutional review process to ensure their ongoing compliance with these regulations. The outcome of their reflection was that more than fifty new or revised requirements were considered by their programmes.
 - The education provider gave examples of these changes, such as enhancements for access for international learners, more detailed

explanations of assessment for learners, and a clearer approach to data protection around learners' work.

- They also noted that there is an action plan in place to continue monitoring of compliance with OfS requirements and to prepare for any future amendments to the GOCR.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good because the education provider had clearly taken steps to incorporate updated OfS guidance into its provision and reflected on the best way to do this. They understood from the portfolio that the education provider had appropriately met the OfS requirements.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - The education provider stated that they had not had direct non-routine interactions with other regulators or professional bodies in the review period. They did however reflect generally on how they work with such organisations.
 - They noted that work with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) is managed by designated individuals who liaise directly with each body, but that restructuring has posed challenges around continuity of work.
 - Previously the work was supported at the school level by the Human and Health Sciences quality team, but the recent restructure has led to the formation of the External Review and Curriculum Data team within the Quality Assurance and Enhancement team. The education provider's reflection on this is that the shift offers an opportunity to standardise PSRB-related processes and enhance institutional learning. They suggested that by using centrally held data and analysing feedback themes, they will be able better inform teaching, learning, and assessment practices, fostering the development of best practice across its provision.
 - The visitors noted in this area that as part of restructure and centralising of university services, new central office to support engagement with PSRBs has been created. They considered that this would effectively promote engagement with PSRBs. We therefore considered the education provider had submitted useful and effective reflection because it enabled us to understand the trends and developments with the education provider's relationship with other regulators and professional bodies.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**

- The education provider noted that all their HCPC-approved programmes had reviewed and developed their curriculums during the review period. They had reflected on what changes still needed to be made and how these should be put in place.
- For example, in the physiotherapy programmes, the undergraduate provision had its placement modules restructured following learner feedback on the assessment load. On another programme, a large single observational placement was replaced by smaller placements with more content. The education provider noted that they have received good feedback from learners and practice educators concerning both these changes.
- On the operating department practitioner (ODP) programme, certain assessments have been redesigned to ensure that learners going into practice-based learning have the knowledge they need for clinical modules.
- For the paramedic programme, the key curriculum development in the review period has been the integration of the new SOPs, discussed above.
- For the prescribing programme, the education provider notes that there was a full programme review in 2021, to ensure compliance with the amended Competency Framework from the Royal Pharmaceutical Society.
- The visitors noted that all professional areas had reported on curriculum reviews and developments undertaken during the monitoring period. These changes were largely influenced by evolving PSRB and university structures. They considered that teams engaged meaningfully with the review processes, leading to programme enhancements.
- The visitors considered performance in this area was good, because the education provider had used action plans to ensure that individual programmes were being appropriately developed, during the review period.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

- **Capacity of practice-based learning (programme / profession level) –**

- The education provider reflected on how their central support of practice placement capacity is deployed. Across the AHP courses, operational support for practice placements is provided by the Practice Placement Unit, which coordinates and allocates placements in collaboration with placement coordinators to ensure students gain the necessary range of experiences. The education provider state that in the current monitoring period, there have been ongoing discussions around placement availability in relation to cohort growth and resource capacity.
- They also noted that annual monitoring with professional bodies provides external assurance of placement quality and capacity. Reflections from course leads and the Head of Practice Education

highlight challenges such as unpredictable NHS-related cancellations, despite sufficient capacity on paper. The placement unit and academic teams continue to respond with creative and high-quality solutions.

- The reflection noted that placement development is an ongoing process. External opportunities are expanded through partnerships with local trusts and internal options such as research, leadership placements, and simulation-based learning in new facilities.
- The education provider submitted a detailed reflection on the challenges faced by individual programmes, especially linked to the growth of cohorts in these programmes as part of ongoing workforce demand, as discussed earlier in this report. The common thread in all these reflections was that programmes were making effective use of programme monitoring and reviews to report challenges with capacity and develop solutions, in co-operation with the Practice Placement Unit (PPU).
- The visitors were appreciative of the education provider's openness about the pressures on capacity. They considered that some of the programmes had undertaken innovative approaches, for example the paramedic's programme. They described these innovations as "particularly impressive". They noted too that Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy programmes have also innovated effectively in placement design and capacity maintenance. They were less sure about Speech and Language Therapy and Operating Department Practice and asked for some clarification from the education provider around the strategic approach that was being taken. The education provider noted that senior team members were reviewing the actions being taken.
- We considered that performance in this area was good, because the education provider had reflected appropriately on their mechanisms for maintaining capacity, and had implemented improvements.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Learner safety in paramedic practice-based learning –**
 - In their reflection, the education provider clearly specified what they took to be the key challenges around this area. These were as follows: learner reluctance to report unacceptable behaviour, a lack of understanding of what might constitute unacceptable behaviour, and a culture in some paramedic settings of disdain for norms of professionalism.
 - The education provider reflected on how they are changing their approach to preparation of paramedic learners for placement. They linked this to the relevant standards of education and training (SETs), notably those involving the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs) support for learners, and guidance for whistleblowing. Specifically, the education provider noted that they are strongly emphasising to all new paramedic learners the detail of what proper professional conduct looks like in practice. Additionally, they are ensuring that all reporting mechanisms are clearly understood and that learners who raise concerns will be appropriately supported and listened to. The education provider described this as a high priority.

They have also ensured that all paramedic learners have regular meetings with programme staff and that the tripartite meetings, with learners, programme staff and practice educators, are regular and open.

- The education provider also explained that they are developing a specific pathway for reporting concerns related to sexual safety – an important action given the background of the HCPC initiative to assess learner safety in the paramedic context.
- The visitors considered that the education provider had undertaken “specific actions described to address concerns in this area with ongoing action planned to evaluate and further develop initiatives to address these concerns.” They were confident in the education provider’s steps in this area over the review period. We consider the education provider is performing well in this area, because they are clearly taking steps to review and redevelop their procedures for keeping learners safe in placements.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Strategic approach to feedback –**
 - The education provider reflected on how they ensured a coherent approach to feedback across all their provision. They noted that the University Teaching and Learning Committee (UTLC) is responsible for collating feedback from many different stakeholders. These include professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) reports, external examiner reports, and learner satisfaction data such as the National Student Survey (NSS) and the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).
 - Information from the UTLC is communicated down to the school level and all programmes are required to respond in detail, directly to the UTLC. Programme development plans must be submitted annually, and these plans must take into account specific feedback.
 - The education provider noted that over the review period, this process has led to changes in programme design, academic quality, and adjustments to alignment with relevant professional body standards.
 - The visitors considered that there were effective processes to act on feedback from all sources and that there were appropriate mechanisms for feeding this information into internal quality assurance reviews and processes. We consider performance in this area was good, because the education provider clearly has defined mechanisms for senior leaders to make sure that feedback is appropriately acted upon.

- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Learners –**
 - The education provider reflected on the feedback received from learners, especially around practice-based learning. They divide the mechanisms in central feedback mechanisms and informal mechanisms. They were able to supply data about both the completion rate of their PARE (Practice Assessment Record and Evaluation) survey, and the actual answers provided in PARE.
 - Examples of issues addressed during the review period were learner concerns about timeliness of placement allocation notification, assessment load, and a lack of understanding of incident reporting. Other concerns included inconsistent National Student Survey (NSS) results and a perceived “survey fatigue” among learners. Regarding the NSS data, the education provider sought more detail from learners about why they had given lower NSS scores. Regarding “survey fatigue”, they amended feedback surveys to make them more bespoke and give learners more opportunity to expand on their personal experience, rather than offering generic questions.
 - The education provider noted that they had put in place a review of their placement allocation process, involving relevant stakeholders such as the practice education providers. Regarding other issues, these were being dealt with by the programme staff through internal review processes.
 - The visitors considered that they had seen appropriate detail in the reflection on “the challenges of balancing the need for learner feedback at lots of different levels and the need not to over burden learners with feedback requests”. They noted that the implementation of mid module feedback demonstrates a commitment to encouraging meaningful feedback with supports learner focussed educational enhancement.
 - The visitors considered that the education provider was performing well in this area, because it was clear that they were able to review the feedback received from learners, and make appropriate changes through define channels.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Practice educators –**
 - The key theme in the reflections in this area was how the education provider had responded to requests from practice educators on various programmes for more detailed guidance on assessment, moderation and delivery of core programme content. The education provider also reflected on how they had strengthened relationships with practice-based learning providers, through more in-person meetings and invitations for programme staff to visit practice educators, and vice versa. They also developed a training course for practice educators to improve their skills in supervising learners.
 - The education provider gave examples of how they had responded to these requests. This includes how they have ensured that all virtual learning resources were appropriately updated and aligned with programme requirements. They had an ongoing review of how the

necessary information about aspects of the programme was provided to practice educators. They also issued an invitation to practice educators to visit the National Health Innovation Campus (NHIC) to build relationships with programme staff and to more clearly understand the aims of the AHP provision at the education provider.

- The visitors considered the education provider was performing well because they had shown clear evidence of seeking, and acting upon, feedback from practice educators. They noted they had seen several developments which had arisen from practice educator feedback.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - The education provider reflected on the key themes in feedback received from their external examiners. Their programmes were praised for:
 - commitment of staff to the student/learner experience and support provided to students/learners.
 - personalised approach to providing feedback.
 - detail of the feedback provided to support feed forward for students/learners.
 - variety of assessment methods across the courses.
 - The education provider reflected on how they had used this feedback to celebrate the work of staff and to make them feel included and appreciated, as part of retaining good staff.
 - The education provider noted that significant financial pressures were having an impact on resources for programmes. They therefore reflected that they would have to pay close attention to external examiner feedback to ensure high quality and therefore maintain senior leadership's confidence in the HCPC-approved programmes.
 - The visitors noted that specific actions that had been taken in response to external examiner feedback were mentioned in the portfolio. They considered this was evidence of good performance, because the education provider was clearly able to appropriately identify issues raised in external examiner feedback, and take action to amend / improve the programme delivery or content.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Areas of good and best practice identified through this review: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - The education provider noted financial pressures as a key reason why learners decide they can no longer continue their studies. They make

available support such as hardship funds, and dedicated staff members.

- Continuation and withdrawal data are monitored and scrutinised annually via the annual programme review process. This group identifies emerging trends and, if necessary, puts in place interventions to address any issues and shares good practice between programmes.
- We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - The education provider noted that although they are slightly below benchmark, their score is on an upward trajectory. They did not have a clear idea of why this was, but in general they noted they have a strong culture of professional support and have amended assessments to ensure congruence with current professional practice.
 - The education provider aims to build on their completion rates. They stated the broadening of their portfolio allows for more IPE. The education provider considers this will support learners both on the programme and once they are in the workplace.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - The education provider noted their score was strong overall, and that they have been working on improving the learner experience and learner engagement with their programmes. This is reflected in the score being higher than NSS learner satisfaction data received in previous years. equitable with the subject benchmark and therefore conclude that they have performed well.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider did not highlight any specific concerns in this area. They provided strong programme level data in several area of the portfolio, so we were confident that they were gathering and analysing such data to drive improvements.
 - We were satisfied with how the education provider is performing in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

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

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

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

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

- The education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year

Reason for next engagement recommendation

- Internal stakeholder engagement
 - The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were practice-based learning providers, learners, service users and internal quality teams.
- External input into quality assurance and enhancement
 - The education provider confirmed they engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.
 - They work with organisations such as the Office for Standards in Education, the Care Quality Commission, and the Office for Students. They considered the findings of these organisations in improving their provision.
 - The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.
- Data supply
 - Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.
- What the data is telling us:
 - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.

Education 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 education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2028-29 academic year.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommended monitoring period, for the reasons noted through the report.

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 the next steps for the provider. The lead visitors confirm this is an accurate summary of their recommendation (including their reasons) and any referrals.

Education provider	University of Huddersfield		
Case reference	CAS-01600-Q1P1Y5	Lead visitors	Julie Weir, Lead visitor, Operating Department Practitioner Lucy Myers, Lead visitor, Speech and Language Therapist
Review period recommended	Four years		
Reason for recommendation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The education provider should next engage with monitoring in four years, the 2028-29 academic year, because:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were practice-based learning providers, learners, service users and internal quality teams.The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision.The education provider engaged with organisations such as the Office for Standards in Education, the Care Quality Commission, and the Office for Students. They considered the findings of these organisations in improving their provision.The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way.Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change.			
Referrals			
N / A			

Appendix 2 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of Study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	Radiographer	Diagnostic Radiography		22/09/2025
BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography (Degree Apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Radiographer	Diagnostic Radiography		22/09/2026
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy	FT (Full time)	Occupational Therapist			01/09/2005
BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Occupational Therapist			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice	FT (Full time)	Operating Department Practitioner			01/09/2013
BSc (Hons) Operating Department Practice (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	Operating Department Practitioner			01/09/2019
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science (Degree apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Paramedic			01/09/2020

BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy	FT (Full time)	Physiotherapist			01/09/1997
BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	Physiotherapist			01/09/2021
BSc (Hons) Podiatry	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist/Podiatrist			01/09/1993
BSc (Hons) Podiatry	PT (Part time)	Chiropodist/Podiatrist			01/09/2003
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy	FT (Full time)	Speech and Language Therapist			01/09/2021
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing	PT (Part time)			Independent Prescribing, Supplementary Prescribing	01/02/2014
Master of Podiatric Surgery	PT (Part time)			Podiatric Surgery	01/09/2020
Master of Podiatric Surgery (degree apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)			Podiatric Surgery	01/09/2020
MSc Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	Paramedic			01/01/2020
Podiatry (Degree) Apprenticeship	WBL (Work Based Learning)	Chiropodist/Podiatrist		POM-administration POM-sale/supply (CH)	01/09/2019