
AGENDA

Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route July 2026

Panel members: Katie Thirlaway (Chair)
Carl Stychin

Enquiries: Francesca Bramley, Secretary to the Panel
secretariat@hcpc-uk.org

1. Approval

- a.** Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions
None
- b.** Programmes recommended for approval
None

2. Performance review

- a.** Review period for institutions which have been subject to the performance review process
 - Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust
 - The National School of Healthcare Science

3. Focused review

- a.** Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended
 - Buckinghamshire New University
 - Regent's University London
- b.** Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended
None

4. Record changes – provider consent

- Queen Margaret University
- Teesside University

Introduction

The Education and Training Committee 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 Education and Training Panel 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.

1. Approval

a. Programmes recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions

None

b. Programmes recommended for approval

None

2. PERFORMANCE REVIEW

a. Review period for institutions that have been subject to the performance review process

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 below, for the reasons noted. Education providers have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendations made.

The Panel is asked to consider the information in the table(s) below and to approve the recommended review period for each provider.

Education provider	Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust		
Case reference	CAS-01874-H6W6Z4	Lead visitors	Joanne Lusher, Lyn McLafferty
Review period recommended	4 years		
Reason for recommendation			
• In summary, the reason for the recommendation of a four-year monitoring period is: ○ To recognise that the education provider has demonstrated good performance against the portfolio areas, showing a focus on quality assurance and enhancement in the review period. ○ This will also allow sufficient time for their ongoing merger to be completed, and the changes and updates reflected on in this review to be implemented. A four-year ongoing monitoring period allows the education provider to collect further feedback and insights on this merger and to reflect on its development and successes. ○ This time period also recognises the work the education provider has conducted and implemented regarding their approach to data. They have introduced mechanisms and reporting systems to generate and supply the verified data required for HCPC processes. We will require the education provider to submit these to us annually. This allows us to grant a longer than two-year ongoing monitoring period.			
Referrals			
No referrals			

Education provider	National School of Healthcare Science		
Case reference	CAS-01819-C0T3M4	Lead visitors	Beverley Cherie Millar (Clinical scientist) Emmanuel Babafemi (Biomedical scientist)
Review period recommended	Two years		
Reason for recommendation			
The education provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2027-28 academic year, because, although they have submitted their internally generated data which they noted has been subjected to external scrutiny, they have informed us that they are unable to establish a regular (yearly) supply of externally verified data to us at this time due to ongoing organisational changes. Therefore, we will assess the education provider’s performance again in two years to manage any associated risks. The education provider hopes to be able to establish a regular supply of data at their next performance review in the 2027-28 academic year.			
Referrals			
Reflections on the new final year assessment			
Summary of issue: Reflections on the new final year assessment: The education provider recently introduced a new final year assessment (FYA) late 2025. We will review this at their next performance review to fully understand its impact.			

3. FOCUSED REVIEW

a. Institutions/programmes subject to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended

For each provider listed, the executive team has judged that the trigger investigated does not impact on our education standards being met. Education providers and any case contacts have not supplied observations for these recommendations, meaning they do not object to the recommendations made.

The Panel is asked to consider the information in the enclosure and to approve the recommendation that no further action is required.

Education provider	Review level	Review recommendation	Enclosure
Buckinghamshire New University	Programme(s)	No further action	3.a.i
Regent's University London	Programme(s)	No further action	3.a.ii

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

None

4. RECORD CHANGES – PROVIDER CONSENT

Education providers have provided consent to make administrative changes to programme records as listed below. Programmes in this section are either:

- closing/have closed to new cohorts; or
- opening to replace an existing programme record.

The Panel is asked to confirm the administrative changes to the list of approved programmes as set out in the table below.

Education provider	Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Last intake date	Reason for change
Queen Margaret University	BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography	FT (Full time)	01/09/2021		Programme name change
Queen Margaret University	BSc (Hons) Radiography: Diagnostic	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	01/09/2024	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	BSc (Hons) Radiography: Therapeutic	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	01/09/2021	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology	FT (Full time)	01/09/2022		Programme name change
Queen Margaret University	Master of Diagnostic Radiography (MDRad)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2022		Programme name change
Queen Margaret University	Master of Radiography: Diagnostic (MDRad)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	01/09/2021	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	Master of Radiography: Therapeutic (MTRad)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2020	01/09/2020	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	Master of Radiotherapy and Oncology (MRadOnc)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2022		Programme name change
Queen Margaret University	MSc Radiotherapy and Oncology (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2024		Programme name change
Queen Margaret University	MSc Therapeutic Radiography (Pre-registration)	FT (Full time)	01/09/2022	01/09/2023	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	Podiatric Surgery Training Programme	FT (Full time)	01/03/2017	15/01/2024	Programme closure
Queen Margaret University	Podiatric Surgery Training Programme	PT (Part time)	01/03/2017	15/01/2024	Programme closure
Teesside University	MSc Art Psychotherapy (Art Therapist Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	25/09/2023	10/12/2025	Programme closure