

Education and Training Committee

Programmes previously recommended for approval subject to conditions where the visitors have recommended non-approval:

Programme name	HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practising Podiatric Surgery
Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Mode of delivery	PT (Part time)
Assessment ref	APP01864
Date of decision	11 September 2019

Panel: Stephen Wordsworth (Chair) Luke Jenkinson
Maureen Drake Sonya Lam

Decision
That the programme, which was previously recommended for approval subject to conditions, should be approved, as the conditions have been met.
Reasons
<p>Visitors recommended that the programme was not approved, as they were not satisfied that several conditions were met. The Committee considered this recommendation, alongside observations from the education provider, and from the professional body (the College of Podiatry).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition C5 – The Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met was that the learning outcome and marking criteria was too broad to allow effective demonstration and assessment of a granular set of standards (the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPEs)). In considering this position the Committee noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the provider had mapped the HCPC standards to the programme's learning outcomes • Entrants to the programme were required to be current HCPC registrants subject to the HCPC's standards of conduct and performance and ethics • It is reasonable for the education provider to set out expectations of candidates in completing their portfolio (related to this area), and for candidates to use the portfolio to provide an account of how they understand the implications of the SCPEs on their podiatric surgery practice. <p>The Committee agreed that the information provided by UoH had been</p>

proportionate and sufficient to show that the standard was met by the programme, and therefore decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard.

2. Condition E4 – The Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met, as follows:
- There is no direct observation of practice for this programme
 - The portfolio assessment method does not provide assurance to be satisfied that those currently practicing podiatric surgery meet the HCPC proficiency standard 1.11
 - A written portfolio and log book cannot adequately address clinical skills, such as hand to eye co-ordination, tissue handling, and manual dexterity
 - There is inaccurate guidance for those completing the portfolio, relating to the role played in surgery

In reaching their position, the Committee noted:

- that the intention of this assessment was to provide a mechanism to assess podiatrists currently practising podiatric surgery to access an annotation on their HCPC registration record, rather than to establish clinical competence for the first time
- Therefore, requiring observed practice as part of the programme was not required to meet the standard
- Entrance to the programme requires fellowship of the professional body, which in itself involved observed practise
- Candidates are currently practising in highly regulated environments, and evidence of this needs to be provided through the portfolio

The Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

3. Condition E.10 – The Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met was that the role criteria does not ensure that the person appointed would have experience of working on the foot and ankle, and of musculoskeletal surgery. In considering this position, the Committee noted:

- The role brief required that external examiners would be appointed to ensure specific experience and knowledge of all of the HCPC standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery.
- That from the role brief, the knowledge of the individual appointed would, by nature, cover all areas of the programme to undertake the role of an external examiner
- That it appeared that the visitors were setting more detailed requirements this area than is reasonable for assessing whether the standard is met at a threshold level.

The Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

The Committee decided that as there were no outstanding issues against the standards (for the reasons noted above), the UoH HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practising Podiatric Surgery (Part time) was approved.

Signed: Stephen Wordsworth

Panel Chair

Education and Training Committee

Programmes previously recommended for approval subject to conditions where the visitors have recommended non-approval:

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery
Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Mode of delivery	PT (Part time)
Assessment ref	APP01865
Date of decision	11 September 2019

Panel: Stephen Wordsworth (Chair) Luke Jenkinson
Maureen Drake Sonya Lam

Decision
That the programme, which was previously recommended for approval subject to conditions, should be approved, as the conditions have been met.
Reasons
<p>Visitors recommended that the programme was not approved, as they were not satisfied that several conditions were met. The Committee considered this recommendation, alongside observations from the education provider, and from the professional body (the College of Podiatry).</p> <p>1. Condition B.1- the Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year on year workforce and training numbers are not aligned • There is insufficient progress to quality assure placements, including what would happen if an audit was failed <p>In considering this position, the Committee noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visitor's outstanding issues for this standard were not related to the original condition • The issue related to insufficient progress to quality assure placements would not sit under this standard, but would rather be linked to standards under standards area D • Evidence provided by UoH corrected the misalignment of the workforce and training numbers <p>The Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the</p>

programme.

2. Condition B.10 - the Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met as follows:

- Admissions information was not appropriate to support engagement with the programme
- As membership of the professional body was not required, not all candidates would be able to log placement experience via the CoP owned PASCOM system

In considering these positions, the Committee noted:

- The visitor's outstanding issues were not related to the original condition
- In relation to the admissions information, the visitors had previously made a recommendation in this area, which would not require a provider response.
- UoH's comments that the candidates did not need to access the PASCOM system through the programme, but that it might be used to provide information and evidence around learning.

The Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

3. Condition D.2 - the Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met, as follows

- Insufficient assurance is gained through placement audits regarding the range and complexity within 'specific operations' available as practice experience
- There is a lack of clarity regarding the range of appropriate practice experiences required at each level of the programme

In considering the visitors' position, the Committee noted that

- The visitor's outstanding issues were not related to the original condition
- They did not consider that podiatric surgery required a higher level of assurance regarding the range and complexity of placements than other HCPC approved programmes
- That the information provided by UoH through the process had exceeded the level usually required to meet HCPC standards at a threshold level
- That the education provider and placement providers (with the processes in place to support learning) would be able to manage placement experience for individuals to ensure they had access to the range of placements required to support their learning needs, and to sign off competencies
- There was an inconsistency with the visitors being content that standard E.1 had been met which relates to the assessment of competence
- In their observations, UoH had provided clarity around the specific points raised by the visitors relating to the range of appropriate practice experiences required at each level of the

programme, and would update their documentation to reflect this.

With the above in mind, the Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

4. Condition D.4 - the Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met was that the placement audit tool does not allow for the judgement that practice based learning is of sufficient quality. In considering this position, the Committee noted:

- That the placement quality assurance arrangements in place were based upon the HEE Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) audit tool
- The information provided by UoH through the process had exceeded the level usually required to meet HCPC standards at a threshold level
- Under the wording of the standard, it is not necessary to see completed audits in order to approve programmes. Rather, this standard is about the process in place being reasonable to assess that the placement environment will meet the needs of learners.
- The HCPC annual monitoring process would receive information relating to the quality of practice-based learning in the future, and any issues with this could be picked up through this process.

The Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

5. Condition E.7 - the Committee noted the visitors' position in relation to this condition not being met was that there is no capacity in the system should a learner need to defer / delay their studies. In considering the visitors' position, the Committee noted:

- That trainees would be employees of a trust, and that there is no information to suggest that any deferral would not be appropriately managed by the education provider and the candidate's employer.
- It appeared that the visitors were setting more detailed requirements in this area than is reasonable for assessing whether the standard is met at a threshold level

Considering the above, and the information provided by UoH, that these situations would be reasonably managed on a case by case basis, the Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

6. Condition E.10 - As with the annotation programme the Committee decided that there was no outstanding issue against this standard, and that therefore the standard is met by the programme.

The Committee decided that as there were no outstanding issues against the standards (for the reasons noted above), the UoH Master of Podiatric Surgery (Part time) was approved.

Signed: Stephen Wordsworth

Panel Chair