Education and Training Panel

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

Date: Wednesday 30 September 2026

Time: 2pm

Venue: Videoconference (Microsoft Teams)

Members: Helen Gough (Chair)
Rebekah Eglinton

In attendance:
Francesca Bramley, Governance Manager
Niall Gooch, Senior Education Quality Officer
Temilolu Odunaike, Education Quality Officer
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Anita Watson, Education Manager

DRAFT

1 Welcome and apologies for absence

1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting of the Education and Training Panel (ETP). No apologies were received from Panel members.

2 Declaration of conflicts of interest

2.1 No conflicts of interests were declared.

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 There were no items for consideration.

4 Performance review

4a Review period for institutions which have been subject to the performance review process, with provider observations

4.1 The Panel received a report on the performance review of the Academy for Healthcare Science. Partner visitors had concluded that the provider continued to meet the relevant education standards and recommended a two-year review period, with the next review taking place in the 2027-28 academic year. The provider had submitted observations on the report and recommendation.

4.2 The Education Quality Officer advised that the review process had progressed smoothly and that the provider had not challenged the outcome of the review or the recommended review period. The provider’s observations largely related to the wording of the report and how aspects of its organisation and activities had been described. Matters raised included references to partnerships, interprofessional education, the use of AI-driven tools, the description of the organisation as a professional body, commentary relating to data points and references to the provider’s registers and digitalisation work.

4.3 The Panel discussed the provider's observations and sought assurance that the report accurately reflected the evidence considered during the review. Members noted that several observations related to the terminology used within HCPC reporting processes, including references to professional bodies and established data points. The Panel was advised that the report reflected both the evidence submitted during the review and the terminology ordinarily used within the HCPC's performance review process. Members noted that maintaining consistency across reports was an important consideration.

DRAFT

4.4 Members noted that a number of the observations appeared to arise from differing interpretations of terminology and reporting conventions rather than disagreement with the findings of the review. Assurance was provided that regular engagement arrangements were already in place between the HCPC and the provider and that further discussions would take place to support mutual understanding of roles, responsibilities and terminology.

4.5 The Panel discussed the provider's comments regarding the reference to a lack of established data points. Members acknowledged the provider's concern that this wording could imply a deficiency in performance when, in practice, some data returns were not available due to the nature of the organisation. The Panel noted that this issue was not unique to this provider and applied more broadly to a number of non-higher education institution (HEI) providers.

4.6 The Panel discussed the provider's comments regarding established data points and recognised that similar issues may arise for other providers that are not subject to standard HEI data returns. The Panel concluded that any review of the terminology used in this area should be considered across the performance review process as a whole rather than through amendments to an individual report.

Action: The Panel Chair would raise with the Chair of Education and Training Committee the broader issue of terminology relating to data points for organisations where standard HEI data returns are not applicable, for further consideration with the Head of Education.

4.7 Members considered whether any amendments should be made to the report in response to the provider's observations. The Panel noted the importance of maintaining consistency and standardisation across performance review reporting. While members recognised the rationale behind some of the provider's comments, they were satisfied that no amendments to the report were required.

4.8 The Panel agreed to:

- approve the recommended review period of two years, with the next performance review to take place in the 2027-28 academic year; and
- maintain the wording of the report without amendment in response to the provider's observations.

5a Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended, with observations

5.1 There were no items for consideration.

5b Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended, with observations

5.2 There were no items for consideration

6 Record changes – no provider consent

6.1 There were no items for consideration.

7 Any other business

7.1 No other business was declared.

8 Close

8.1 The meeting concluded at 2.25pm

DRAFT