

---

## Performance review process report

New College Durham, Review Period 2018 - 2021

---

### Executive summary

Process stage – post-decision publication

- A 3-year monitoring period was advised by the visitors following their review. This provider shall next go through Performance Review in academic year 2024-25.
- The Education and Training Committee (Panel) agreed this recommendation.
- Visitors identified both some areas of good practice and some areas that required further investigation via quality activity.
- The areas requiring further investigation included: programme expansion, virtual placements, contingency planning, external examiners and service user and carer involvement.
- The visitors considered that the provider's response to the quality activities was good and that they did not have any further concerns or areas for further exploration.
- Areas of good practice identified by the visitors included the provider's openness and transparency about challenges related to COVID-19, their strong engagement with the professional body, and their proactive approach to driving quality improvements.

---

**Previous consideration** Not applicable.

**Decision** The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide when the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be.

**Next steps** Subject to the Panel's decision, the provider's next performance review will be in the 2025-26 academic year

---

## Included within this report

Section 1: About this assessment .....	3
About us .....	3
Our standards .....	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The performance review process.....	3
Thematic areas reviewed.....	4
How we make our decisions .....	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: About the education provider.....	5
The education provider context .....	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider .....	5
Institution performance data .....	5
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes .....	6
Portfolio submission.....	6
Quality themes identified for further exploration .....	6
Quality theme 2 – Evaluation of new virtual placements .....	7
Quality theme 3 – Contingency planning for placement loss.....	8
Quality theme 4 – Pressure on external examiner .....	8
Quality theme 5 – Service user and carer feedback.....	9
Section 4: Summary of findings.....	10
Overall findings on performance .....	10
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection .....	10
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	11
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection .....	12
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	13
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions .....	14
Data and reflections .....	15
Section 5: Issues identified for further review.....	15
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution .....	17

## Section 1: About this assessment

### About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

### Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

### Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

### The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

### **Thematic areas reviewed**

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

### **How we make our decisions**

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

### **The assessment panel for this review**

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

David Newsham	Lead visitor, Orthoptist
Colin Jennings	Lead visitor, Clinical Scientist
Hayley Hall	Service User Expert Advisor
Niall Gooch	Education Quality Officer

## Section 2: About the education provider

### The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers 3 HCPC-approved programmes across one profession. It is a Higher Education provider and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 1996.

### Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level		Approved since
<b>Pre-registration</b>	Chiroprapist / podiatrist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate	1996
	Prescription Only Medicine – Administration			1996
<b>Post-registration</b>	Prescription Only Medicine – Sale / Supply			2010

### Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes.

Data Point	Bench-mark	Value	Date	Commentary
Total intended learner numbers compared to total enrolment numbers	40	40	2022	This is a reassuring figure suggesting that the provider are recruiting appropriately and filling the required places.
Learners – Aggregation of percentage not continuing	N/A	N/A		As the provider only has one programme with a small enrolment this data point was not able to be calculated in the normal way.
Graduates – Aggregation of percentage in employment / further study	94%	98%	2019-2020	This figure suggests a strong level of learner engagement, satisfaction and development.

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	Silver		June 2018	This suggests that, while there may be room for improvement, the teaching at the provider is generally of a very strong level.
National Student Survey (NSS) overall satisfaction score (Q27)	74.6%	89.0%	2022	The provider is outperforming its target here. This again suggests a very impressive level of engagement and help being available for learners.
HPCP performance review cycle length				N / A as this is the first time the provider has been through performance review.

### Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

#### Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

#### Quality themes identified for further exploration

We reviewed the information provided, and worked with the education provider on our understanding of their portfolio. Based on our understanding, we defined and undertook the following quality assurance activities linked to the quality themes referenced below. This allowed us to consider whether the education provider was performing well against our standards.

##### Quality theme 1 – Programme expansion planning

**Area for further exploration:** The visitors understood from the portfolio that the podiatry programme had expanded its programme cohort size, by 35% between the 2019-20 and 2021-22 cohorts..... They are also plan for further expansion of the cohort size and also plans to introduce an apprenticeship programme. The portfolio did not explain, however, what had been done to adapt the programme staff and the facilities for this growth, and what would be done in the future. They considered that it would be appropriate to explore the matter further so that they could be confident in the programme's ability to meet the challenges associated with increases in learner numbers.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We sought clarification on this point via additional information to allow the provider to elaborate on the previous information they had sent. We agreed this approach with the provider as they considered that the visitors' exploration could easily be facilitated by submitting additional narrative and evidence.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider stated that in order to accommodate increased numbers, they delivered more teaching and learning space at their main site, and they have also expanded their clinical facilities. The response also explained their longer-term plan to build a whole new clinical facility. They mentioned an expansion in the use of NHS Trust placements to accommodate future learner numbers. Regarding the planned apprenticeship, they stated that this would have minimal effects on overall enrolment, and that it would not require further expansion of clinical placements. In terms of staffing, the provider stated that even when the planned cohort growth had taken place they would still have sufficient staff available, within expected professional ratios.

Considering the additional information submitted, the visitors considered that the issues related to programme expansion had been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. They considered that performance in this area was good.

#### Quality theme 2 – Evaluation of new virtual placements

**Area for further exploration:** The expansion of virtual learning was a continuing theme throughout the portfolio. This increase was partly a response to COVID-19, partly due to pressure on placement capacity and partly an organic development stemming from technological advance. The provider stated that in future they would be relying more heavily on virtual practice based learning. However, the visitors could not see in the portfolio or the accompanying evidence whether the provider had evaluated their use of virtual placements.

The visitors decided to explore this evaluation so that they could determine whether the provider were evaluating placements appropriately. If the provider were not evaluating placements appropriately, it could affect their ability to deliver effective practice-based learning and the visitors would not be confident in their ability to manage increases in cohort size. to ensure that if they were expanded this was done in an appropriate way.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We sought clarification on this point via additional information to allow the provider to elaborate on the previous information they had sent. We agreed this approach with the provider as they considered that the visitors' exploration could easily be facilitated by submitting additional narrative and evidence.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider clarified that the post-COVID-19 virtual placement pilot mentioned in the portfolio – funded by Health Education England (HEE) and undertaken in collaboration with a local NHS Trust – was ongoing into the 2022-23 academic year and so had not been definitively evaluated as yet. However they did indicate that ongoing feedback was being gathered and that this would be used to make a final decision about the future of virtual placements at the provider.

The visitors considered that this addressed their concerns and they did not need to explore further. The understanding they gained from this response about an ongoing project did feed into their recommendation for the next review period ([see section 6 below](#)).

### Quality theme 3 – Contingency planning for placement loss

**Area for further exploration:** The visitors understood from the portfolio and from accompanying evidence that the provider was aware of some difficulties in the placement capacity situation. This reflected a national situation as well as local difficulties. While the provider was clearly working hard to develop more placements, it was not clear to the visitors what measures were in place if several placements became unavailable. Without knowing this the visitors could not gain a full understanding of how the provider was managing its placements effectively, and so they wished to explore the contingency planning further.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We sought clarification on this point via additional information to allow the provider to elaborate on the previous information they had sent. We agreed this approach with the provider as they considered that the visitors' exploration could easily be facilitated by submitting additional narrative and evidence.

**Outcomes of exploration:** In their response the provider clarified that in the wake of the pandemic, the availability of placements has returned to the normal pre-COVID-19 level. They note they have worked with various stakeholders – among them Health Education England (HEE) and local NHS managers – to maintain capacity and develop their placement model with a focus on the “emerging role”, i.e. to ensure that learners are prepared for the ongoing changes in the profession. Placement expansion and sustainability are also the subjects of an ongoing project at the provider funded by HEE

The visitors were satisfied with this response and did not consider that any further exploration was needed. The information provided about an ongoing project did feed into their recommendation for the next review period ([see section 6 below](#)).

### Quality theme 4 – Pressure on external examiner

**Area for further exploration:** The visitors understood from the submission that the external examiner appointed in 2019 had flagged high workload for herself as an issue. This was a potential concern as it might affect the external examiner's ability to provide appropriate and effective oversight of programme quality. However, they could not see anywhere in the portfolio whether the provider had taken any steps to mitigate the risks associated with high workload for external examiners, and wished to explore this further in order to be sure that the current level of appropriate scrutiny would continue.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We sought clarification on this point via additional information to allow the provider to elaborate on the previous information they had sent. We agreed this approach with the provider as they



considered that the visitors' exploration could easily be facilitated by submitting additional narrative and evidence.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The response from the provider noted two key considerations in this area: firstly, that their approach to external examiners is partly the responsibility of their validating body the Open University, and secondly that their own Higher Education Quality & Development Unit (HEQDU) also contributes. The HEQDU and the programme team are currently working together to ensure that the amount of work being sent to external examiners at any one time is manageable, and it is hoped that this ongoing co-operation will mitigate any problems arising from heavy workload.

The visitors did not have any further concerns in this area and considered that performance could still be regarded as strong.

#### Quality theme 5 – Service user and carer feedback

**Area for further exploration:** The service user expert advisor (SUEA), in their review of the portfolio, raised a concern about whether the provider was obtaining sufficient feedback from an appropriate breadth of service users and carers. There was considerable detail about the provider's own podiatry clinic at Bishop Auckland but it did not appear that feedback from service users and carers in other practice based learning settings was used. It was also unclear to the SUEA how, if at all, service users and carers were involved in delivery of the programme – in admissions, teaching, assessment and other areas. The visitors considered that they would like to explore this area to ensure a full and accurate understanding of service user and carer involvement.

**Quality activities agreed to explore theme further:** We sought clarification on this point via additional information to allow the provider to elaborate on the previous information they had sent. We agreed this approach with the provider as they considered that the visitors' exploration could easily be facilitated by submitting additional narrative and evidence.

**Outcomes of exploration:** The provider clarified in their response the kind of feedback they gained from service users and carers. This includes "real time" feedback from patients leaving the consulting room, the collection of which is gradually being restarted after the COVID-19 disruption. It also involves contacting partner Trusts to get feedback on learner performance and service user experience in placement.

In terms of direct service user input to the podiatry programme, the response noted that service users and carers are invited to give talks about living with various conditions, and are also involved in assessment of clinical exercises, and the admissions process. Their opinions were also sought about programme development during a recent review.

The visitors considered that this answered their queries effectively and that they did not need to explore the area any further.

## Section 4: Summary of findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

### Overall findings on performance

#### Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

#### Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**  
Each programme at the provider must go through a regular internal review process, which is designed to help them identify challenges and problems. They have recently overcome difficulties with the national recruitment picture for podiatry, and their programme remains robust, recruiting to strength and even considering expansion. Their enrolment is up by 35%. There has been considerable recent investment in new equipment and teaching spaces. The visitors considered that performance in this area was strong, although they are seeking clarification around staffing needs.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**  
There is collaboration between the provider and a wide range of relevant bodies, for example the Royal College of Podiatry and Health Education England (HEE). The COVID-19 pandemic created challenges for the provider in this area but these have been met and overcome through virtual meetings. The success of the collaboration with HEE in particular has been demonstrated by three separate grants from that organisation being obtained. The visitors consider that performance in this area was good.
- **Academic and placement quality –**  
The provider identified the pandemic as the key challenge that had been faced in the area of maintaining academic and placement quality. It disrupted practice-based learning and other teaching and learning activities and some learners struggled to adapt to remote sessions. However, the provider worked quickly to provide support to learners who need, for example, better internet connections, and to develop protocols for safe practice placements. The feedback provided by both learners and external examiners shows that the measures taken in this area have been effective. The visitors considered that performance had been good.
- **Interprofessional education –**  
The provider note that this is an area where improvements and developments have been suggested by both internal and external reviews, and they have been seeking to create new opportunities for interprofessional education (IPE). They have sought to make links with other professional programmes who might not previously have worked with the podiatry programmes, such as social workers and sport scientists. Nursing and health learners have also worked with podiatry learners. The programme was awarded a grant to develop multi-disciplinary team working, and this has been used effectively. There is good feedback from service users and carers about this “Heart and

Sole” initiative. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.

- **Service users and carers –**

The provider has an attached clinic where learners can practise and this is the predominant source of service user and carer engagement. The COVID-19 pandemic did interfere with the operations of this clinic to a significant degree – for example, in lengthening waiting times and delaying procedures – but the return to normality has improved the situation. Feedback from those treated at the clinic suggested that satisfaction levels remained high overall, and that learner involvement with those treated at the clinic was a strength. However, as noted through the [quality activity section above](#), the visitors wished to clarify the nature and extent of service user and carer involvement with the programme’s teaching and learning activities as a whole. They were satisfied with the provider response to this quality activity.

- **Equality and diversity –**

The provider showed that they undertake careful and comprehensive monitoring of equality and diversity. They have identified areas where more outreach may be needed, for example in broadening the ethnic and gender composition of learners. However, the female-heavy and white British-dominated nature of podiatry is a national phenomenon. There is considerable age and ability diversity in learners at the provider. More broadly, the monitoring and reflection on EDI-related matters is clearly a strength and the visitors considered the provider to be performing well.

- **Horizon scanning –**

The provider identified some of the possible issues facing them, notably national shortages of podiatrists and the sex and ethnic imbalance of the profession. They noted ways in which they are planning to address these areas, for example by broadening recruitment and continuously improving the embedding of podiatrists with multi-disciplinary teams. The visitors considered that the provider had clearly undertaken significant reflection on upcoming challenges and opportunities, and that they were taking seriously the need to identify relevant issues. They therefore concluded that the provider were working well in this area.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors considered that the provider had a strong commitment to driving quality improvement through their encouragement to staff to identify areas of improvement.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**

As with other providers, the disruption to teaching and learning activities and practice-based learning was significant. Some of the challenges faced included isolation for staff and learners, inability to reliably access remote learning, and added stress on staff and learners. However, the provider was

able to adapt quickly and has provided examples of feedback from staff and learners expressing gratitude for support and development. Secure placements were developed quickly and additional support was given to those struggling with remote learning. Equipment loans were given, and collaboration undertaken with external and internal quality assessors to ensure a fair environment. Overall the visitors considered that performance had been strong.

- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**

The main focus of technological development in the review period was mitigation of the effects of the pandemic, as noted above. The “virtual placement initiative” was an innovative attempt to create an immersive and effective remote practice-based learning experience for learners, and won a prize from the Royal College of Podiatry. Protocols for virtual tutorials were also established and learners are still allowed to attend in that way if desired. Laptops and cameras have been made available on long-term loans, and patients are still seen remotely for practice-based learning where necessary and appropriate. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.

- **Apprenticeships –**

The provider have been developing an apprenticeship, in response to initiatives within the podiatry profession and inquiries received by potential learners. Development is at an advanced stage with the first learners expected to be enrolled in September 2023. They have clearly consulted and researched widely to establish the demand and appropriateness of apprenticeships for their local and professional context. The visitors considered that this was a sign of good responsiveness. However, as noted in the quality activity above, they did wish to explore how the provider would meet new staffing and capacity requirements.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors were impressed with the depth and honesty of the provider’s reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of their response to COVID-19.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**

The provider noted that the UK Quality Code Benchmark statement for Podiatry has now been archived and was no longer used as a relevant quality measure. The provider now maps to the relevant standards produced by the HCPC and the Royal College of Podiatry. They note also that “the BSc (Hons) Podiatry programme produced mapping documents for the revised QAA quality codes (2018) in all 12 themes and this work was completed in 2019. No actions were required following this activity.” The visitors considered that this was appropriate and that performance was good in this area.

- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**  
The provider submitted a list of all its practice partners and the relevant bodies which gave quality oversight for them. There was a clear process in place to monitor quality of such settings and to take action where quality declined. Placements no longer deemed adequate by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) would be suspended and learners diverted to other settings. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**  
The provider submitted a detailed reflection on their engagement with NSS outcomes during the review period. Learner feedback via NSS has highlighted some issues, such as organisation and management and fairness of assessment. However the provider have taken detailed steps to address any weaknesses and shown that NSS scores in the relevant areas generally recovered after these steps had been taken. There were also categories where NSS scores were sustained at a high level, including quality of teaching. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**  
The provider gave a detailed reflection on the Office for Students (OFS) “B conditions”, which have been their particular focus in the review period. These conditions deal with Quality and Standards and the depth of their engagement reassured the visitors that the provider takes the standards seriously. The examples given of how the provider meets the conditions were relevant and well-chosen, in the visitors’ judgment. For example, there was an explanation of assessment moderation and a description of the programme’s approach to accreditation of prior learning. Performance in this area was good.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**  
Evidence was provided of a good ongoing relationship with the Royal College of Podiatrists (RCPod), through various standing committees, including the provider’s approach to meeting conditions set by the RCPod during a recent revalidation. Additionally the provider noted strong feedback received by their validating body, the Open University, from the validation reviews conducted during this review period. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors noted that the provider’s engagement with its responsibilities around professional and validating bodies was timely, thorough and constructive.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Curriculum development –**  
The provider’s approach to curriculum identified several areas in which they are developing their offer: better accommodation for learners with neurodiversity and related additional needs, more complex casework in practice based learning, and a move into the independent sector rather than

relying on NHS placements. They have also identified ongoing challenges for the profession as a whole which they are coping with: a reduction in placement availability across the board, and growing use of technology, which requires them to reassess their delivery. The visitors considered that the provider's reflection showed good performance in this area.

- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**  
The provider gave a number of examples of ways in which they had responded to changed guidance from the Royal College of Podiatrists (RCPod). For example they noted that they liaised with the RCPod over temporary reductions in required hours during the COVID-19 pandemic, and over the new aspects of the programme after a revised version of the programme was developed. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**  
The main challenge to capacity maintenance identified was the COVID-19 pandemic. The provider reported that the Professional Clinical Lead along with the Placement Officer worked together to identify the obstacles to obtaining enough placement settings and hours, and to overcome those obstacles. Close co-operation with local partners and fast identification of the needs of the provider's own clinic were crucial in this respect. Personal protective equipment (PPE) was obtained quickly enabling as much time and space to be used as possible. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors considered that the provider was particularly engaged with the Royal College of Podiatrists, and had a strong working relationship.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

**Findings of the assessment panel:**

- **Learners –**  
The provider has a wide range of mechanisms for gaining learner feedback. Alongside the National Student Survey (NSS), feedback is also sought at the end of each module and at set points within modules. There are also student representatives for each cohort, who have regular meetings with programme staff. Action is determined and carried out as necessary by programme staff and a central committee of New College Durham. For example, learners reported dissatisfaction with the availability of some library resource and this was addressed. Learners are also able to challenge assessment and an example was given of when this had been done successfully. The visitors considered that performance was good.
- **Practice placement educators –**  
Practice educators are regularly monitored by their host Trusts, who have an established mechanism for feeding back to the provider. Individual settings are audited twice a year and there are quarterly meetings between practice

educators and relevant academic staff. Learner feedback on their experience in practice is encouraged and there are many opportunities for learners to discuss their experiences. The visitors considered that performance in this area was good, with many channels to identify and address problems.

- **External examiners –**

The portfolio described a constructive relationship between the podiatry programme and the external examiner. They gave examples of criticisms made by the external examiner, along with suggested solutions, which encouraged confidence that there was a mutually frank and open relationship in place. Examples were also given of programme improvements made as a result of the external examiner's input and remarks.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

**Areas of good and best practice identified through this review:** The visitors noted the provider's strong commitment to taking action when feedback from various sources highlighted problems in their procedures.

#### Data and reflections

**Findings of the assessment panel:** The visitors did not consider that any of the data points they considered required significant further investigation. They used the available data to feed in to their assessment, but as it did not give cause for concern or contradict any of the evidence or narrative submitted by the provider, they did not highlight anything in particular.

**Risks identified which may impact on performance:** None.

**Outstanding issues for follow up:** None.

#### Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process.

#### Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

##### **Assessment panel recommendation**

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2024-25 academic year

**Reason for this recommendation:** The provider is performing well overall and there are no serious concerns around any aspect of performance. However, the visitors did note that the provider has two ongoing projects addressing important parts of their programme – [development of placements](#) and [placement capacity](#) – and is developing a new apprenticeship. They considered that it would be important for the HCPC to consider the outcomes of those twin projects and the apprenticeship development when they are more advanced, and that the interval to 2024-25 would give the provider sufficient time to have embedded the changes before the HCPC considers the new arrangements in another performance review cycle.

### **Education and Training Committee decision**

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that the education provider's next engagement with the performance review process should be in the 2024-25 academic year

**Reason for this decision:** The committee agreed with the findings of the visitors during this review and were satisfied with the recommended review period.



Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

<b>Name</b>	<b>Mode of study</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Modality</b>	<b>Annotation</b>	<b>First intake date</b>
BSc (Hons) Podiatry	FT (Full time)	Chiropodist / podiatrist		POM - Administration; POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/09/2017
Certificate in Local Anaesthesia	PT (Part time)			POM - Administration	01/09/2017
Prescription Only Medicine Certificate	PT (Part time)			POM - sale / supply (CH)	01/09/2017