

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 6 November 2025

Time: 2pm

Venue: HCPC Offices, Kennington, London

Members: Katie Thirlaway (Chair)
Rebekah Eglinton
Helen Gough
Carl Stychin
Helen White

Apologies: None

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Executive Director of Corporate Affairs (by Microsoft Teams)
Francesca Bramley, Governance Manager
Alice Gair, Council Apprentice
Rachael Gledhill, Head of Policy and Standards (by Microsoft Teams)
Helen Grantham, Council member
Richard Houghton, Head of Registration
Jamie Hunt, Head of Education
Noah Linley-Adams, Governance Officer
John McEvoy, Council member

1 Welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The chair welcomed those present to the meeting, who were invited to introduce themselves in turn.

2 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 There were no apologies from Committee members, however apologies had been received from Dabbi Taylor, Student Representative and Andrew Smith, Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Education, Registration and Regulatory Standards.

3 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

4 Declaration of members' interests in relation to agenda items

- 4.1 No interests were declared.

5 Minutes of the Education and Training Committee meeting held in public on 10 September 2025

- 5.1 The Committee approved the minutes as an accurate record of its meeting held in public on 10 September 2025.

6 Matters arising

- 6.1 The Committee noted the matters arising from its previous meetings.

7 Registration Performance Report

- 7.1 The Head of Registration presented the performance report, which outlined performance for the period from August to September 2025. An update on quality assurance activities would be included in the report submitted to the Committee meeting in March 2026.

- 7.2 The following areas were highlighted:

- The monthly performance median target of 10 working days for UK applications and readmission applications had been consistently achieved throughout the reporting period, which had included the summer 'peak' in applications.
- The monthly performance median target of 60 working days for international applications had been consistently met during the reporting

period and there had been a significant decrease in the time taken to process international applications from 44 days in July 2025 to 27 days in September 2025. In response to lower application volumes, the team's capacity was being scaled down through the flexible resourcing model and application volumes would remain under close review.

- The Registration team were working in partnership with Tribunal Services to schedule and facilitate appeal panel hearings. The service standard KPI target had not been met in August or September 2025 due to increased volumes of appeals following the spike in international applications earlier in 2025. As application volumes had subsequently decreased, the number of appeals was also expected to reduce over time. Two hearings had also been cancelled due to panel chair and registrant panel member unavailability which was a cause for concern, acknowledging individual circumstances were subject to change. Additional Council members had recently completed registration appeal panel chair training to seek to increase the number of appeal panel hearings taking place.
- The median processing time for UK registration applications was between two and three working days during the reporting period, which was significantly below the ten day KPI target. The higher application volumes during the summer peak had been well managed, which evidenced the positive impact of the new registration operating model and the online application process.
- The 90% KPI target for responding to UK and international calls had been consistently exceeded during the reporting period. Postal correspondence volumes remained low and within the KPI response limit. It was clarified that the data collection for the postal correspondence KPI was not labour-intensive.
- The Registration team continued to support planned changes to the international assessment process to replace the 'further information' element of applications, which generated significant two-way communication to resolve queries, with a mapping exercise providing a clear audit trail of evidence against the standards of proficiency.

7.3 The Committee noted the potential adverse impact of plagiarism investigations on timeliness in cases where no plagiarism was found and the application was resumed. This was an area of ongoing evaluation and the risk was being managed by the team through close monitoring of all cases of suspected plagiarism. The removal of further information from the application process would also seek to mitigate this risk, alongside communications to deter applicants from submitting fraudulent applications.

8 Education Performance Report

8.1 The Head of Education outlined the performance measures across the operational processes in the Education team and current performance against these.

- 8.2 The percentage of active assessments over service level had decreased from 35% to 20%, although this was primarily due to opening new cases since the last report resulting in a higher proportion of new cases on the caseload.
- 8.3 Performance against the KPI for timeliness of programme approval had been rated as red during the reporting period. This drop in performance was due to concluding a backlog of assessments ahead of the start of the 2025-26 academic year, including assessments that took longer than the expected service levels.
- 8.4 Performance against the spot check outcomes KPI had significantly improved following a previous dip in performance resulting from the introduction of new spot checks that in May 2025. In response to a question, the Head of Education clarified that the Education team had worked with the Quality Assurance team to agree the selection process and the number of spot checks that were undertaken. There were approximately ten categorised process points that were checked against the agreed criteria, each of which had clearly-defined thresholds for being met, not met or partially met. Regular feedback was provided to drive up compliance and continuous improvement.
- 8.5 20 focused review assessments had recently been opened due to changes to externally supplied data points, of which approximately five were expected to require a full assessment. This meant the total focused review caseload was 38.
- 8.6 Work was under way to review the education KPIs to ensure they were fit for purpose and provided a meaningful reflection of performance, particularly in view of the continuing trend of increased complexity in assessments.
- 8.7 The Head of Education was also reviewing how the standards of education and training (SETs) review would impact on the Education team's work and the associated resource requirements.
- 8.8 The Committee sought reflections from the Executive on the stakeholder feedback that had been received during the reporting period, particularly in relation to the satisfaction rating for partners that appeared to have decreased over the previous three years. The Head of Education advised that the overall numbers were small which could potentially lead to fluctuations and that this could be investigated further through reviewing the underlying data.
- Action:** The Head of Education would review the feedback received from partners relating to HCPC staff being compassionate in their interactions and feed back his reflections to the Committee.
- 8.9 In relation to professional pipelines, most professions had increased capacity in the previous 12 months and were predicted to increase capacity further if proposed programmes gained approval. New programmes were being developed across all professions except clinical scientists, orthoptists and prosthetists/orthotists. The Committee discussed the risk of programme capacity exceeding registrant employment opportunities. The Head of Education advised that the Insight and Analytics team were already engaged in

plans to triangulate the HCPC's programme capacity, pass list information and registration data to enable further analysis by region, profession and education provider level to seek to provide further insights.

- 8.10 The Committee reflected on the HCPC's regulatory role in ensuring there were job roles for learners on completion of HCPC approved education programmes. The Head of Education clarified that it was not within the HCPC's remit to protect existing programme provision from new providers and that the focus was to work with stakeholders including NHS England and professional bodies to provide data-informed insights.
- 8.11 The Committee noted that education providers were required to confirm their programme capacity every five years as part of the performance review process and the HCPC's programme capacity data did not fully reflect the actual number of learners or current capacity at any given time. The overall programme capacity appeared to be considerably higher than the number of new registrants joining the Register and the extent of this variance differed for each professional group. The HCPC held high level data on the percentage attrition and student outcomes for programmes and there were plans to obtain student-level data for each individual programme to improve the quality of the HCPC's data.

9 Committee forward plan 2026

- 9.1 The Committee noted the forward plan for 2026. It was noted that a large number of items had been scheduled to be considered by the Committee at its meeting in March 2026 and the Committee Chair requested that the forward plan be reviewed to seek to more evenly balance the volume of Committee business across the year.

Action: The Governance Manager would seek to defer agenda items due to be considered at the March 2026 Committee meeting where feasible.

10 Resolution to move the meeting to private session

- 10.1 The Committee resolved that the remainder of the meeting would be held in private, because the matters being discussed related to matters which, in the opinion of the Chair, were confidential or the public disclosure of which would prejudice the effective discharge of the Committee's or Council's functions.
- 10.2 The meeting was briefly adjourned.