

Education and Training Committee Panel

Programmes in respect of which approval/ongoing approval is recommended subject to conditions, where the education provider has made observations on the visitors' report

Programme name	Master of Podiatric Surgery
Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Mode of delivery	PT (Part time)
Assessment ref	APP01865
Date of decision	30 January 2019

Panel: Stephen Wordsworth (Chair) Penny Joyce
Luke Jenkinson Joanna Mussen

Decision:

Having reviewed the visitors report and the education providers observations on the report, the Panel agreed to amend the visitors' conditions as follows;

1. Changes should be made to condition A.3 to read

Condition: 'The education provider must further define the accreditation of prior (experiential) learning mechanisms applicable to the programme and how this information is made available to potential applicants and assessors.'

Reason: From a review of the documentation, the visitors were directed to the generic university APEL policy. In discussion with the programme team, the visitors were told that trainees would be able to gain accreditation for prior learning on this programme. For instance, if they had completed 300 hours in the placement setting they could receive 120 credits which would be equivalent to part 1 of the existing programme delivered by the College of Podiatry. The visitors noted that applicants prior learning and experience would be assessed using the learning outcomes for the programme.

However, the visitors also noted there was a lack of clarity around how the programme level and module level learning outcomes ensure individuals completing the programme meet the standards for

podiatrists practising podiatric surgery (as detailed in conditions relating to standards C.1, E.1 and E.4)

Based on these findings, the visitors could not determine, how consistent judgements would be applied to assess that an applicant's prior learning or experience meets the required standards and ensures that the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery are met via this process to ensure safe and effective practice. In particular, the visitors could not determine the assessment criteria to be used by both applicants and assessors to consider how any evidence provided meets different learnings outcomes.

Additionally, the visitors could not determine what the process is for applying the policy regarding applications with APEL considerations. For instance, the visitors could not determine who would make an assessment that the prior learning of an applicant met the required standard or whether they were qualified and experienced to make that judgement.

Therefore, the visitors require further evidence to demonstrate what the process is regarding the application of the APEL policy, by what assessment criteria prior learning and experience is measured and assessed to decide how learning outcomes are met, and how this information is made available to prospective applicants and assessors.'

2. Condition B.11 should be removed
3. Condition B.13 should be removed

Reasons

1. The Panel considered that the amendments made better articulate the visitors requirements for further definition of how evidence is assessed through assessment criteria and how the process will work in detail.
2. Based on the observations received from the provider, the Panel were content to remove this condition.
3. Based on the observations received from the provider, the Panel were content to remove this condition.

Signed: Stephen Wordsworth, Panel Chair

Education and Training Committee Panel

Programmes in respect of which approval/ongoing approval is recommended subject to conditions, where the education provider has made observations on the visitors' report

Programme name	HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practicing Podiatric Surgery
Education provider	University of Huddersfield
Mode of delivery	PT (Part time)
Assessment ref	APP01864
Date of decision	30 January 2019

Panel: Stephen Wordsworth (Chair) Penny Joyce
Luke Jenkinson Joanna Mussen

Decision:

Having reviewed the visitors report and the education providers observations on the report, the Panel agreed to amend the visitors' conditions as follows;

1. Changes should be made to condition A.1 to read;

Condition: The education provider must provide further evidence of how it intends to communicate the programme costs trainees will incur whilst studying on the programme, which enables them to make an informed choice about taking up a place on the programme.

2. Condition B.11 should be removed.

3. Changes should be made to the reasoning of condition C.1 to read;

'Reason: From their review of the programme specification, the visitors understood that there are four programme learning outcomes and the standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery were grouped together under learning outcome 3. From the documentation and discussions at the visit, the visitors understood that trainees are expected to be able to demonstrate they meet all of the learning outcomes by the time they complete the programme. The visitors noted that there is one

assessment task for the programme, which is to complete the portfolio; they also noted that the assessment criteria refers to the programme learning outcomes. However, the visitors were not provided with a completed portfolio which details how the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery, contained within learning outcome 3, would be contained within the portfolio. The visitors noted whilst an example of the portfolio was discussed during the visit when reviewing the VLE, along with evidence of a portfolio set sheet, they remained unclear how the portfolio is used to ensure trainees and assessors can clearly see where the standards and the wider learning outcomes would need to be demonstrated throughout the portfolio.

As such, the visitors require documentation, such as detailed portfolio assessment content, which clearly articulates how trainees who successfully complete the programme cover the learning outcomes, which deliver the standards for podiatrists practicing podiatric surgery. ‘

4. A new condition for standard E.4 should be added as follows;

‘Condition: The education provider must submit further evidence which demonstrates how the assessment method ensures an objective and consistent measure of the learning outcomes is carried out.

Reason: The visitors noted that the education provider was still developing the VLE and portfolio during discussions held at the visit. As articulated in the reasoning for the condition against standard C.1, this meant the visitors remained unclear how the learning outcomes ensure individuals will meet the required standards upon completion of the programme.

In addition, the visitors were also unable to determine how the portfolio is structured to ensure it provided an objective and consistent assessment method to measure the learning outcomes. In particular, the visitors note the assessment criteria currently used are the learning outcomes. Although the learning outcomes, which are also the Standards for podiatrists practising podiatric surgery, describe what learners are expected to know, understand and be able to demonstrate, the visitors were unclear what indicators or criteria is used to assess that the learning outcomes are achieved. As such, the visitors were unable to determine how this approach ensures objective and reliable assessments of portfolios are carried out by assessors. The visitors therefore require further evidence which demonstrates how the assessment of the portfolio will be structured which ensures learning outcomes are measured in an objective and reliable way.’

Reasons

1. The Panel considered that the amendments clarified the visitors requirements
2. Based on the observations received from the provider the Panel were content

to remove this condition.

3. The Panel agreed that the amendments to reflect the additional information received from the education provider and to clarify the visitors' position in relation to the substantive issue of the condition.
4. The Panel agreed to make this requirement for further evidence a separate condition, rather than including it in condition C.1, in order to provide more clarity to the education provider.

Signed: Stephen Wordsworth, Panel Chair