
AGENDA

Education and Training Panel – tier 1 paper approval route November 2025

Panel members: Rebekah Eglinton (Chair)
Helen Gough

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
 - Birmingham City University, MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)
 - Health Sciences University, MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre-registration) Dublin
 - Keele University, BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)
 - King's College London, Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals
 - University of Greenwich, BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science Apprenticeship
 - University of Greenwich, BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy Apprenticeship
 - University of Sheffield, Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals

2. Performance review

- a.** Review period for institutions which have been subject to the performance review process
 - Hidden Hearing Limited
 - Institute of Biomedical Science
 - University of Huddersfield

3. Focused review

- a.** Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where no further action is recommended
 - Health Sciences University

- b. Institutions/programmes subjected to the focused review process, where referral to another process is recommended
 - None
- 4. **Record changes – provider consent**
 - Birmingham City University
 - University of Essex
 - University of Greater Manchester

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

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	Birmingham City University		
Case reference	CAS-01786-H0F4W7	Lead visitors	Jennifer Caldwell and Joanne Stead (both occupational therapists)
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted: - The areas we explored focused on: - Quality activity one: The visitors noted the details of staffing, for example the programme had been allocated core staffing of two full-time occupational therapy staff. This consisted of a Course Lead, and a Lecturer. However, we were unsure of the rationale for the staffing on the programme. The education provider informed us of the mechanisms to support staff, for example, we understood staffing was reviewed at each intake. We had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met. - The programme meets 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: - A Senior Lecturer starts on 2 June. An advert for a Lecturer is waiting for approval. Module leads for joint modules include physiotherapists, speech therapists, linguists, therapeutic radiographers and dietitians. There are also a range of team members who deliver and supervise the research elements of the programme. - On campus there are skills and simulation facilities, including a home environment, kitchens, ward spaces, an operating theatre, x-ray rooms, ward spaces, and birthing suites. Learners will have access to a specialist library, IT facilities and teaching spaces, for example lecture theatres, classrooms, and small rooms for individual tutorials.			
Programmes			
Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
MSc Occupational Therapy (pre-registration)	FT (Full Time)	5 January 2026	Taught (HEI)

Education provider	Health Sciences University		
Case reference	CAS-01778-X7G6B7	Lead visitors	Jennifer Caldwell and Lucy Myers
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted: • The areas we explored focused on: ○ Quality activity 1 – we considered the overall resourcing and sustainability of the proposed programme, including the anticipated demand and how the education provider plans to support its delivery over time. In addition, we examined how Ireland specific policies had been considered and how these would be appropriately applied to the proposed programme. ○ Quality activity 2 – we explored how regularly the education provider was collaborating with practice education providers, particularly in relation to the student led clinic which the education provider was in the process of developing. ○ Quality activity 3 – 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 4 – we examined how the education provider ensured there was a sufficient number of staff to support practice-based learning. We also explored the measures in place to confirm practice educators were appropriately qualified and experienced, ensuring they were equipped to deliver supervision and support to learners during their placements. ○ Quality activity 5 – we explored how the education provider had accounted for the differences between UK and Irish qualifications when setting the entry criteria for the proposed programme. The education provider demonstrated that these variations were considered to ensure fair and appropriate access for applicants from both the UK and Ireland. Additionally, we examined the Recognised Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL) route and sought clarification on whether any distinctions existed for Irish applicants. This helped confirm that the RPEL process was inclusive and consistently applied to all applicants. • The programme meets 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 programme, however they will be appointing additional staff for the delivery of the course in Dublin.
- The education provider will be delivering the programme 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 provide clinical simulation environments, human performance laboratories and additional teaching spaces. They are also working with the education provider to develop a speech and language therapy clinic onsite.

Programmes

Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
MSc Speech and Language Therapy (pre-registration) Dublin	FT (Full time)	06/01/2026	Taught (HEI)

Education provider	Keele University		
Case reference	CAS-01749-N1Q9P8	Lead visitors	Jane Day Lucy Myers
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted: The areas we explored focused on: Quality activity 1: The visitors were unable to find information about equity, diversity, and inclusion in relation to the admissions process. The visitors received information about the education provider's policies around equality and inclusivity. The visitors therefore were unsure whose policies and processes relating to equality, diversity and inclusion are taken into consideration through the application process. The education provider confirmed that both they, and the employer, shared responsibility for upholding Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) during the admissions process. The visitors had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met. Quality activity 2: The visitors could see no reference to how feedback about the employer feeds into the programme. The visitors were unsure how the education provider makes sure the programme delivers overall quality and effectiveness on an ongoing basis. The education provider explained they survey employers twice a year as part of monitoring. Feedback related to the employer is also typically gathered through the tripartite review meetings. An internal Apprenticeship Management Group has oversight of delivery and mandates regular updates from all programmes in line with internal quality assurance. The visitors had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met. Quality activity 3: The visitors noted some modules are assessed entirely by test / examination. As the teaching is mostly delivered online, the visitors were unsure whether these assessments will also be delivered online. If so, the visitors were unsure how the education provider maintains the integrity of the assessment so learners who complete the programme can practise safely and effectively in their profession. The education provider informed us all formal examinations and tests are conducted in person during scheduled on-campus days. The visitors had no further questions in this area and considered the standard to be met. The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.			
Facilities provided			
The programme director and four lecturers are in post. All lecturers are qualified and HCPC registered. Subject matter experts from other disciplines will contribute to the programme. The business case has provision for further staff as the programme develops, and the cohort numbers grow.			

There are Clinical Skills Houses both on campus and at University Hospital North Midlands Clinical Education Centre. The campus simulation suite includes adapted living spaces, and consultation rooms. There are on-site library facilities, clinical suites, and learner services.

Many teaching resources and support mechanisms are in place. Specific professional resources for the proposed programme are in place.

All teaching and support resources will be in place for the Standing Validation Panel of the education provider in March 2025. All physical resources will be available for teaching, skills, and simulation by the start of programme.

Programmes

Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	Work-based learning	26 January 2026	Apprenticeship

Education provider	King's College London		
Case reference	CAS-01757-M9V7V9	Lead visitors	Nick Haddington Rosie Furner
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted: The programme meets all the relevant HCPC education standards and therefore should be approved.			

Facilities provided			
Outcomes from stage 1 We decided to progress to stage 2 of the process without further review through stage 1, due to the clear alignment of the new provision within existing institutional structures, as noted through the previous section Education and training delivered by this institution is underpinned by the provision of the following key facilities: • The education provider has detailed how they have several campuses in central London, offering a wide array of learner services and specialist teaching facilities. These include well-equipped libraries, IT support, dedicated disability services, computer rooms, simulation suites, and teaching spaces. Students also benefit from access to advanced learning tools such as SimConverse and Oxford Medical Services VR scenarios, enhancing the educational experience through immersive simulation technologies. • The education provider has detailed how they shall ensure that all necessary resources are in place for the programme's start date. This includes the Faculty Senior Strategic Team having already approved the programme and its requirements. They detailed how resource planning and allocation are conducted 6–12 months ahead of delivery, and bookings have been made accordingly. They have stated that the module is fully resourced, and any updates, such as changes to the admissions process, will be supported by additional resources, which will be available when recruitment begins in May 2025.			
Programmes			
Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
Prescribing for Healthcare Professionals	PT (Part time)	05/01/2026	• Taught (HEI)

Education provider	University of Greenwich		
Case reference	CAS-01755-P2H7T4	Lead visitors	Sue Boardman Peter Abel
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted: - The areas we explored focused on: - Confirming that the education provider meets 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 proposed programme will have access to teaching space for lectures and seminars and the technology to support a blended learning approach. - The proposed programme will have access to the Greenwich Learning and Simulation Centre to allow students access to 'state of the art' simulation facilities to enhance and support their learning			
Programmes			
Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
- BSc (Hons) Speech & Language Therapy Apprenticeship - FT (Full time) Apprenticeship - BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science Apprenticeship - FT (Full time)Apprenticeship	Apprenticeship	01/02/2026 01/02/2026	Apprenticeship

Education provider	University of Sheffield		
Case reference	CAS-01718-M3D2G7	Lead visitors	Nicholas Haddington Rosie Furner
Quality of provision			
Through this assessment, we have noted : - The areas we explored focused on: - Quality activity 1 - Ensuring learning outcomes are appropriately mapped to the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) competency framework. We noted different documents had different sets of learning outcomes. The education provider updated all documents demonstrating that the programme reflects the standards outlined in the RPS competency framework. - Quality activity 2 - Ensuring content of the Allied Health Professions Federation (AHPF) Outline Curriculum Framework (OCF) is reflected in the programme, as a key curriculum reference point for the development of HCPC registrants as independent prescribers. We noted there was no evidence that the AHPF OCF had been used to support the delivery or was reflected in the programme curriculum. The education provider submitted evidence which demonstrated the framework is embedded into module materials and handbooks, with learners and practice educators directed to it for clarity on profession-specific prescribing rights and links to relevant professional bodies. - The programme meets 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: - In relation to staffing resources, the education provider noted their established NMC prescriber teaching team will now be supplemented by two HCPC prescribers from the ACP teaching team. - Prescribing education will continue to utilise established university campus teaching rooms and virtual learning environments. - Current learning materials will be enhanced with HCPC-specific content in line with regulatory body requirements.			
Programmes			
Programme name	Mode of study	First intake date	Nature of provision
Independent and Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	PT (Part time)	01/01/2026	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	Hidden Hearing Limited		
Case reference	CAS-01554-M9F3J4	Lead visitors	Claire Langman, Robert MacKinnon
Review period recommended	Two years		
Reason for recommendation			
The education provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2026-27 academic year, because: • The education provider engages with a range of stakeholders with quality assurance and enhancement in mind. • The education provider considers sector and professional development in a structured way. • Through this review, the education provider started the work to provide data points equitable to those we receive from HESA and NSS. They supplied data points for some cohorts that had been externally verified. We will continue to take forward this work, in order to establish a regular supply of data. • 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			
The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment:			

- The education provider should reflect on the implementation of their plans to enhance interprofessional education through their next engagement with our performance review process.
- The education provider should reflect on the implementation of their plans to enhance service user and carer involvement through their next engagement with our performance review process.

Education provider	Institute of Biomedical Science		
Case reference	CAS-01548-Q2D3Q8	Lead visitors	Colin Jennings, Emmanuel Babafemi
Review period recommended	Two years		
Reason for recommendation			
Through this assessment, we have noted:			
• The areas we explored focused on: ○ Horizon scanning – contingencies if funding for practice educators was withdrawn. We are satisfied that contingencies are in place following the withdrawal of NHSE funding and the Government’s decision to abolish NHSE from 2027. ○ Service user and carer involvement –issues were highlighted, and changes were made to policies due to the recommendation/influences of the service user group • The following are areas of best practice: ○ The IBMS Funding of Practice Educator Roles in the UK and Crown Dependencies to help communicate with and deliver professional development services to Biomedical Scientists in their area. ○ The IBMS Registration Portfolio via digital platform OneFile has improved consistency and allows greater quality assurance of all portfolios. • The following areas should be referred to another HCPC process for assessment: ○ The education provider is developing an online application system to integrate with their new CRM and digital portfolio platforms by 2025. We noted the new system is intended to ease administrative workload, improve applicant support, and enable better data collection for equitable access analysis. As it is still in the development stage, we have referred to the education provider’s next performance review in the 2026-27 academic year. ○ The education provider noted that they will actively seek and systematically record feedback from individuals who have recently completed Routes 4 and 5 portfolio assessments. We understood this will help to identify any barriers to undertaking these routes and enhance the learner experience for colleagues already working in clinical pathology laboratories. As this is yet to take place, we have referred to the education provider’s next performance review in 2026-27 academic year. • The provider should next engage with monitoring in two years, the 2026-27 academic year, because:			

- The education provider does not have established data points which continues to pose a risk and therefore means regular monitoring is required. They however continue to work with the HCPC to develop a regular supply of data in future submission. We are satisfied that the education provider continues to perform well across all other areas.

Referrals

The development of a new online application system

Summary of issue: The education provider reflected on the risk identified in the submission of applications via email and attachments posing challenges in tracking volumes, prioritising assessments, and collecting data to uphold equality, diversity, and inclusion standards. To address this, the education provider noted they were developing an online application system to integrate with the new CRM and digital portfolio platforms by 2025. We understood this streamlined process will ease administrative workload, improve applicant support, and enable better data collection for equitable access analysis.

As the online system is still in the development stage, the visitors have referred this to the education provider's next performance review in the 2026-27 academic year. The visitors considered this would give the education provider sufficient time to have reflected on any impact the new system has had in addressing the issues / risks identified.

Feedback from learners on routes 4 and 5

Summary of issue: In their reflection around strategic approach to feedback from learners, the education provider noted that they will actively seek and systematically record feedback from individuals who have recently completed Routes 4 and 5 portfolio assessments. We understood this will help to identify any barriers to undertaking these routes and enhance the learner experience for colleagues already working in clinical pathology laboratories. As this is yet to take place, we have referred to the education provider's next performance review in 2026/27 academic year.

Education provider	University of Huddersfield		
Case reference	CAS-01600-Q1P1Y5	Lead visitors	Julie Weir, Lead visitor, Operating Department Practitioner Lucy Myers, Lead visitor, Speech and Language Therapist
Review period recommended	Five years		
Reason for recommendation			
• The education provider should next engage with monitoring in five years, the 2029-30 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 practice-based learning providers, learners, service users and internal quality teams. ○ The education provider engaged with professional bodies. They considered professional body findings in improving their provision. ○ The education provider engaged with organisations such as the Office for Standards in Education, the Care Quality Commission, and the Office for Students. They considered the findings of these organisations 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.

Education provider	Review level	Review recommendation	Enclosure
Health Sciences University	Programme(s)	No further action	3a

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
Birmingham City University	Non-medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals	FT (Full time)	01/09/2007	01/09/2007	Programme closure
Birmingham City University	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Undergraduate)	FT (Full time)	01/02/2014	01/02/2014	Programme closure
Birmingham City University	Non-Medical Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Undergraduate) (Conversion)	PT (Part time)	01/02/2014	01/01/2021	Programme closure
Birmingham City University	Principles of Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Post Graduate)	FT (Full time)	01/02/2014	01/02/2014	Programme closure
Birmingham City University	Principles of Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals (Post Graduate) (Conversion)	PT (Part time)	01/02/2014	01/01/2021	Programme closure
Birmingham City University	Principles of Prescribing for Health Care Professionals	FT (Full time)	01/10/2010	01/10/2010	Programme closure
University of Essex	BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	03/10/2022		Programme records correction
University of Essex	BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy (Degree Apprenticeship)	FT (Full time)	03/10/2022		Programme records correction
University of Greater Manchester	BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science	FT (Full time)	01/09/2022		Programme records correction