

---

## Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route (September 2023)

**Members:** Helen Gough (Chair)  
Katie Thirlaway

**Enquiries:** Vesna Maglov, Secretary to Committee  
[vesna.maglov@hcpc-uk.org](mailto:vesna.maglov@hcpc-uk.org)

ETC makes all decisions on programme approval and on other operational education matters. Decisions are categorised into three ‘tiers’, which are categorised based on risk, whether recommended outcomes are challenged by providers, and / or whether there is a significant negative impact for the provider and / or learners. Meetings of the ETP are reserved for items which require a higher level of oversight or discussion before a decision can be made.

This agenda is for tier 1 papers-based decisions only. These decisions are by nature low risk. Decisions are made at this tier in a specific set of limited circumstances, most importantly when education providers have not provided any comments on the outcome through ‘observations’ and therefore this is no disagreement about the recommendation put forward by lead visitors or the executive.

Each section of the agenda has an explanation of the recommended process outcome, with information which enables the Panel to make a decision.

<b>Agenda item</b>		<b>Enc</b>
<b>1. Approval</b>		
<b>a. Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions</b>		N/A
<b>None</b>		
<b>b. Programmes recommended for approval</b>		N/A
<b>None</b>		
<b>2. Performance review</b>		
<b>a. Review period for institutions which have been subject to the performance review process</b>		N/A

For each provider listed, partner visitors have judged that the provision is of sufficient quality to continue to meet relevant education standards. They are recommending review periods as follows, for the reasons noted in the table. Education providers have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendation made.

The Panel is asked to consider information in the table below, and decide on the review period for each provider.

<b>Education provider</b>	<b>Case reference</b>	<b>Lead visitors</b>	<b>Review period recommendation</b>	<b>Reason for recommendation</b>	<b>Referrals</b>
Edge Hill University	CAS-01231-K3Y7C2	Alexander Harmer  Matthew Catterall	Five years	We were satisfied with the ongoing performance of the education provider. Data points showed they are performing as expected with regards to learner	None

				satisfaction, continuation, and outcomes. They have demonstrated they can appropriately respond to challenges and shown insightful reflections regarding their performance during the review period. The visitors agreed there is a low risk to their performance moving forward and therefore recommend the maximum review period.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
Leeds Beckett University	CAS-01236-K6X9J2		Five years	<p>The education provider has adequately addressed issues raised by the visitors and supported their response with a range of thorough and comprehensive reflections.</p> <p>The visitors considered the education provider low risk and where they are showing risk, for example in practice-based capacity, they have a risk register in place and governance structure to manage this, providing good assurance. Therefore, the</p>	<p>Outcome of the newly established Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group</p> <p><b>Summary of issue:</b> We noted that in the 2022/23 academic year, a Preparation and Support for Practice Placements working group was established to highlight best practice across both Schools in relation to the quality of practice-based learning. As it is early days, and the visitors would like to review reflection</p>

				<p>visitors were content to recommend a 5-year review period.</p>	<p>on how this group is progressing through the next performance review.</p> <p>Measure put in place to reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, cost of meals on campus and the newly introduced free shuttle.</p> <p><b>Summary of issue:</b> As part of their horizon scanning, the education provider recognises the ongoing concerns about the cost-of-living crisis. As of the 2022/23 academic year (and therefore outside this review), the education provider is putting in place measures that reduce accommodation costs for halls of residence, reduces the cost of meals on campus and introducing a free shuttle. As it is early days, the visitors would like the education provider to reflect upon how these measures worked through the next performance review.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

Education provider	Case reference	Lead visitors	Review period recommendation	Reason for recommendation	Referrals
--------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------

Robert Gordon University	CAS-01245-M2Q1R6	Fleur Kitsell Joanne Stead	Five years	<p>They are performing well across all portfolio area. They engaged well with the process. Both their initial portfolio submission, and their responses to the quality activities and requests for clarification, were full and frank.</p> <p>There is good strategic oversight of the HCPC provision, and they have demonstrated that all programmes are performing well, for example in securing appropriate staff and sufficient placement capacity.</p> <p>There are no ongoing issues or processes which pose risks that we will need to review specifically before 2027-28.</p>	None
--------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------	------------	---	------

### 3. Focused review

- a. Institutions / programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended      N/A
- None

**b. Institutions / programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended**

N/A

None

**4. Records change – provider consent**

For each programme listed, the education provider has provided consent to close the programme / amend programme records.  
Programmes are either:

- Closing / have closed to new cohorts (where the last intake date is complete)
- Opening to replace an existing programme record (where the last intake date is not complete)

N/A

None