
AGENDA

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

Panel members: Helen Gough (Chair)
Rebekah Eglinton

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
 - University of Bradford
 - University of Cumbria

3. Focused review

- a.** Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended
None
- b.** Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended
None

4. Record changes – provider consent

- Audika Hearing Care Limited, Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence
- Audika Hearing Care Limited, Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence (Apprenticeship)
- Hidden Hearing Limited, Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence
- Hidden Hearing Limited, Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence (Apprenticeship)
- University of Plymouth, MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)

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	University of Bradford		
Case reference	CAS-01822-L7K6M4	Lead visitors	Claire Langman & Duane Mellor
Review period recommended	Five years		
Reason for recommendation			
• The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2030-31 academic year. • Internal stakeholder engagement ○ The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were learners, service users, practice educators, partner organisations, external examiners. • External input into quality assurance and enhancement ○ The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision ○ The education provider engaged with other relevant professional or system regulator(s) (eg NMC, OfS). ○ The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way • Data supply ○ Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period			

- What the data is telling us: - From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change
Referrals
N/A

Education provider	University of Cumbria		
Case reference	CAS-01823-T9K9W4	Lead visitors	John Donaghy Jane Day
Review period recommended	Five years		
Reason for recommendation			
• The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2030-31 academic year, because: ○ The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. Specific groups engaged by the education provider were service users, practice educators, learners, programme staff and institutional quality assurance teams. ○ The education provider engaged with all the relevant professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. ○ The education provider engaged with relevant professional and system regulator(s), including the Nursing & Midwifery Council, the Office for Students, the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education and the Quality Assurance Agency. They considered the findings of other regulators in improving their provision. ○ The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. ○ Data for the education provider is available through key external sources. Regular supply of this data will enable us to actively monitor changes to key performance areas within the review period.			

○ From data points considered and reflections through the process, the education provider considers data in their quality assurance and enhancement processes and acts on data to inform positive change. • The education provider noted several ongoing enhancement projects which will impact on their provision during the coming academic years. We will need to review the impact of this when the provider can reflect on implementation, which will be in the 2030-31 academic year.
Referrals
N/A

3. FOCUSED REVIEW

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

None

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
Audika Hearing Care Limited	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence	WBL (Work based learning)	14/07/2025		Education provider name change
Audika Hearing Care Limited	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence (Apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	14/07/2025		Education provider name change
Hidden Hearing Limited	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence	WBL (Work based learning)	01/10/2013	07/10/2024	Education provider name change
Hidden Hearing Limited	Award in Hearing Aid Dispensing Competence (Apprenticeship)	WBL (Work based learning)	29/06/2024	07/10/2024	Education provider name change
University of Plymouth	MSc Podiatry (Pre-registration)	PT (Part time)	01/01/2021	01/01/2021	Programme closure