AGENDA

Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route October 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

- Health Sciences University, MSc Dietetics (pre-registration) Dublin
- Health Sciences University, MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) Dublin

2. Performance review

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

- Queen Margaret University

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

None

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

For each programme listed, partner visitors have judged that conditions must be met before approval can be granted. These conditions relate to one or more of our education standards being met. 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 enclosure(s) and to approve the programme(s) subject to the recommended conditions being met.

- None

b. Programmes recommended for approval

For each programme listed, partner visitors have judged that:

- the provision is of sufficient quality to meet relevant education standards; and
- the provider has demonstrated that facilities provided are adequate to deliver education and training as proposed.

Therefore, they are recommending that the programmes are approved, subject to satisfactory monitoring. 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 each programme as recommended.

Education provider	Health Sciences University		
Case reference	CAS-02014-R2Y1F5	**Lead visitors**	Susan Lennie & Julie-Anne Lowe
Quality of provision			

Through this assessment, we have noted:
 	
• The areas we explored focused on:
  ○ Quality activity 1 – we recognised the programme is delivered in Dublin and we considered the overall resourcing and sustainability of the proposed programmes, including the anticipated demand and how the education provider plans to support its delivery over time.
  ○ Quality activity 2 – we sought assurance that there would be sufficient appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to support the delivery of the programme.
  ○ Quality activity 3 – we were unclear on how the education provider and the Portobello Institute understood the responsibilities of all involved and would work together to deliver the programmes effectively. This included how the UK based education provider would deliver the proposed programmes and manage them and there was a sufficient number of staff to support practice-based learning.
  ○ Quality activity 4 - we considered the education provider approach to placement capacity and examined the processes in place to ensure sufficient availability of placements for learners. The education provider outlined how placement capacity was planned, monitored, and maintained over time to support the delivery of practice-based learning and meet			

programme requirements. In addition to this we also considered how the proposed programme may impact other programmes within the region.
    - Quality activity 5 – we explored how learners progressed through their placements given they were assessed at level 6. The education provider confirmed this was normal practice across all programmes and provided details of progression.
    - Quality activity 6 – we received confirmation on the academic criteria for admissions and the need for applicants to only demonstrate knowledge in Biochemistry and not Chemistry.
    - Quality activity 7 – we explored the physical resources that would be available to support the delivery of the programmes and available for learners to access.
- The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:
    - There are plans to develop an on-site clinic to deliver services to the local community, which could create additional placement opportunities for learners. However, there was limited information available regarding the proposed staffing and resourcing of the clinic, including arrangements for learner supervision, support and practice education. Visitors also noted that the proposed on-site clinic would not be used for placements until it had successfully been quality assurance. Initially, we will have a conversation with the education provider to establish the anticipated timeframe for the development of the clinic. Once these arrangements and timescales are clear, a focused review will be undertaken to determine whether the clinic is suitable for use as a placement setting.

The programmes meet all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.

Facilities provided

Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities:

- The education provider currently have staff to deliver the proposed programmes, however they will be appointing additional staff for the delivery of both programmes in Dublin.
- The education provider will be delivering the programmes in partnership with the Portobello Institute in Dublin. The Portobello Institute are based in the centre of Dublin and have two buildings, which offer offices, classrooms, a library, an on-site clinic, clinical skills laboratories and learner rest rooms. The location of the buildings also provides good transport links, which provides learners and staff with easy access.
- The Portobello Institute are also developing another campus where they plan to deliver the proposed programmes. The education provider will want to see evidence of the new location having appropriate resources in place prior to approving the programmes for delivery. We will need to seek assurance that the new location has been developed and has the appropriate resources to deliver the proposed programmes. The education provider has confirmed that if the new location is not ready by November 2026, the programmes will not commence.

Programmes			
Programme name	**Mode of study**	**First intake date**	**Nature of provision**
MSc Dietetics (pre-registration) Dublin	FT (Full time)	05/10/2026	Taught (HEI)
MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration) Dublin	FT (Full time)	05/10/2026	Taught (HEI)

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	Queen Margaret University		
Case reference	CAS-01816-B4Q0B7	**Lead visitors**	John Donaghy, Fleur Kitsell
Review period recommended	Five years		
Reason for recommendation			
• The education provider should next engage with monitoring in 5 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, senior leadership, practice educators and quality teams.			

They also demonstrated strong engagement with external examiners. We considered that this indicated that there were no risks to the delivery of good quality provision.

- The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision
- The education provider engaged with the Nursing and Midwifery Council, the Office for Students, the College of Paramedics, the Royal Pharmaceutical Society, and the British Association of Art Therapists, among others. 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.

Referrals

N / A

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.

- None

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

For each provider listed, the executive team has judged that the trigger investigated should be referred to another process for consideration. 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 information in the enclosure(s) and to approve the recommended referral to another process as set out in the table below.

- 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.

- None