

# **Education and Training Panel**

## Minutes of the meeting of the Education and Training Panel held as follows:

Date: Friday 29 August 2025

Time: 10am

**Venue:** Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)

Members: Helen Gough (Chair)

Katie Thirlaway
Carl Stychin

#### In attendance:

Saranjit Binning, Education Quality Officer Niall Gooch, Education Quality Officer Jamie Hunt, Head of Education Noah Linley-Adams, Governance Officer Patricia Morrissey, Head of Governance Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager

## 1 Welcome and apologies for absence

- 1.1 In accordance with its standing orders, the Education and Training Panel (ETP) nominated Helen Gough to Chair the meeting due to the risk of technical difficulties affecting the original Chair, Katie Thirlaway's, participation in the meeting. Reserve ETP member Carl Stychin also attended the meeting to ensure that the quorum requirements were maintained throughout the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting of the ETP. No apologies were received from ETP members.

#### 2 Declaration of conflicts of interest

- 2.1 No conflicts of interests were declared by ETP members.
- 3a Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions, with provider observations
- 3.1 There were no items for consideration.

## 3b Programmes recommended for approval at new education providers

- 3.2 The ETP considered the information relating to the approval of the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme and the MSc (preregistration) Physiotherapy programme, at Liverpool Hope University, a new education provider.
- 3.3 The ETP noted that the partner visitors had judged that the provision of both programmes was of sufficient quality to meet the relevant standards of education and training (SETs). Additionally, the new provider had demonstrated that the facilities provided were adequate to deliver education and training as proposed.
- 3.4 The ETP noted the following points:
  - The approval process had been lengthy and complex as the new education provider required significant guidance on how to meet the necessary standards.
  - The education provider had initially sought approval for the BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy (Degree Apprenticeship) programme, before adding the MSc (pre-registration) Physiotherapy programme at a later stage.
  - The visitors had sought clarification on a number of points as part of their review, but this was to be expected with a new provider.
- 3.5 The ETP noted the concerns raised by the Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP) during conversations with the Education team that highlighted the oversupply of physiotherapy programmes in Northeast England, specifically in the Manchester and Liverpool areas, and the potential impact on providing sufficient practice based learning. The ETP agreed that the CSP should be asked to provide a formal note of its concerns and recognised that practice-

- based learning capacity was an issue that was likely to be an issue for other institutions.
- 3.6 The ETP approved both programmes and noted that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2027-28 academic year. **Post-meeting note:** The performance review process should be two years from the academic year of the approval assessment, i.e. the 2026-27 academic year, not the 2027-28 report as stated in the performance review report.
- 3.7 The ETP considered the information relating to the approval of the Independent and Supplementary Prescribing programme at Solent University, a new education provider.
- 3.8 The partner visitors had judged that the provision of the programme was of sufficient quality to meet the relevant SETs. Additionally, the new provider had demonstrated that the facilities provided were adequate to deliver education and training as proposed.
- 3.9 The ETP noted that the programme had already been validated by the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) since 2023. The education provider sought HCPC approval to attract more Allied Health Professionals (AHP) onto the course, and it expected to seek further approvals as it expanded its AHP programmes in the future.
- 3.10 The ETP noted that the education provider had been very cooperative and engaged with partner visitors and the Executive during the approval process.
- 3.11 The ETP approved the programme and noted that the next engagement with the education provider would be a performance review in 2026-27. Any concerns prior to this review period would be picked up in a focused review, if required.

## 3c Programmes recommended for approval with provider observations

- 3.12 The ETP considered the information relating to the approval of the MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) programme and the MSc Physiotherapy (pre-registration) programme at Canterbury Christ Church University. Observations were also provided by the education provider.
- 3.13 The ETP noted that the education provider was very engaged and responsive to requests throughout the process. Partner visitors were satisfied with the evidence the education provider provided relating to the programme and there were no gaps in the evidence provided.
- 3.14 The ETP noted that the observations from the education provider highlighted a sector-wide issue related to the capacity to deliver practice-based learning. The ETP agreed with the Head of Education's suggestion that the review of the Standards for Education and Training and the associated communications on the new standards would provide an opportunity to provide greater clarity to education providers on the HCPC's requirements for delivering practice-based

- learning. In the meantime, the Education team would engage with the education provider on how it could develop an innovative placements model
- 3.15 The ETP approved the programme and noted that the education provider would engage with the performance review process in 2027-28.
- 4 Performance review
- 4.2 There were no items for consideration.
- 5 Focused review
- 5.2 There were no items for consideration.
- 6 Record changes no provider consent
- 6.2 There were no items for consideration.
- 7 Any other business
- 7.2 No other business was declared.
- 8 Close
- 8.2 The meeting concluded at 10.23am.