Education and Training Committee

Public minutes of the 48th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 10 March 2011

Time: 10:30 am

Venue: The Council Chamber, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

Members:

Jeff Lucas (Chair)	Deep Sagar
Helen Davis	Jeff Seneviratne
John Donaghy	Robert Smith
Stephen Hutchins	Annie Turner
Stuart Mackay	Joy Tweed
Arun Midha (Items 1-13)	Diane Waller
Penny Renwick	Stephen Wordsworth

In attendance:

Osama Ammar, Acting Head of Education Development
Alison Dittmer, Policy Officer
Brendon Edmonds, Acting Education Manager
Anna van der Gaag, Chair of the Council
Abigail Gorringe, Director of Education
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Paula Lescott, Acting Education Manager
Steve Rayner, Secretary to the Committee
Marc Seale, Chief Executive
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

Part 1 – Public Agenda

Item 1 Election of Chair

1.1 In the absence of the Chair, and in accordance with paragraph 8 (2) of the Committee Standing Orders, the Committee were invited to nominate one of their number to serve as Chair at the meeting.

1.2 Jeff Lucas was nominated to serve as Chair.

Item 2 Apologies for absence

2.1 Apologies were received from Gerald Armstrong-Bednall, Mary Clark-Glass, John Harper, Gill Pearson, Eileen Thornton and Jois Stansfield.

Item 3 Approval of agenda

3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 Declaration of members' interests

4.1 There were no declarations of interest.

Item 5 Minutes of the meeting of 18 November 2010 (ETC 01/11)

5.1 The minutes were accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chair following the amendment of paragraph 7.3.5 to:

> *"7.3.5 There was a concern that students on some programmes designed for the modernising scientific careers agenda may have been under the impression that successful completion of those programmes would lead to eligibility to apply to the HPC Register."*

Item 6 Matters arising from previous meetings (ETC 02/11)

6.1 The Committee noted that the list of actions agreed at previous meetings.

Item 7 Director of Education's report (ETC 03/11)

7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department (the Department) between November 2010 and March 2011 and providing updates on ongoing projects.

7.2 The paper included six appendices for the Committee's information:

Appendix 1 - Education management information statistics

Appendix 2 - Approval process review report

Appendix 3 - Annual monitoring process review report

Appendix 4 - Major change process review report

Appendix 5 - Complaints process review report

Appendix 6 - Education provider seminar feedback report

7.3   The Committee discussed key activities for the department, during which discussion the following points were raised:

Approval process review

7.3.1   The Committee noted that HPC did not have scope to recover costs in cases where an education provider had decided to withdraw from the approval process irrespective of whether the withdrawal was before, during or after a visit.

7.3.2   Provision for cancelled or postponed visits was included within the Education Department budget.

Complaints process review

7.3.3   The Committee noted that there were three types of complaints regarding education and training processes at HPC;

- complaints about registrants who were linked to education providers;
- complaints about education programmes and providers; and
- complaints and feedback about HPC's processes.

7.3.4   The Committee noted that complaints about specific registrants were always dealt with by the fitness to practice department in the first instance. Complainants could then pursue a complaint about the education provider if they felt the nature of the complaint was reflective and/or systemic of the education provider.

7.3.5   The Committee noted that this review dealt with complaints about education programmes and education providers. The review was based on individual experiences of the process. It was not possible to identify trends due to the low number of such complaints received every year (5 to 8 complaints per year).

7.3.6   Complaints regarding education programmes had usually been through another complaints process (such as an education provider's internal complaints procedure) before reaching HPC. From information on current cases underway in other processes it was possible to predict how many cases were likely to come to HPC in any following year.

ACTION: Director of Education to provide updates on complaints regarding education providers to future meetings of the Committee as part of the Directors report.

7.3.7 The Committee discussed the possibility that education providers may not contribute fully to the feedback process; either because they are concerned that it may affect the outcome of any process; or because of a wish to move on to something else as soon as the process is complete.

7.3.8 The Committee noted that participants were given opportunities to provide feedback both during and after the approvals, annual monitoring and major change processes. There was no suggestion from questionnaires that there was a trend regarding education providers' satisfaction with the opportunity to provide feedback.

7.3.9 The Committee agreed that it was down to education providers to engage in the feedback process if they had concerns regarding the system. To introduce another feedback mechanism to try to capture this information may also cause more confusion.

Approval visits

7.3.10 The Committee noted the variation between the number of visits and the number of programmes considered at these visits. They noted the fact that despite being a multi-professional regulator and working with education providers who offered programmes in more than one profession, the majority of visits still considered just one programme from one profession. They discussed whether it would be appropriate for HPC to promote, or insist on education providers holding multi-professional visits.

7.3.11 The Committee agreed that this would require a change in philosophy by the HPC. The setting and structure of visits had remained flexible for the convenience of education providers. This already meant that education providers chose to allow programmes to be visited together when this was appropriate.

7.4 The Committee noted the Director's report.

Item 8   Education department workplan 2011-2012 (ETC 04/11)

8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive setting out the draft Education Department work plan for 2011-12. The paper included a progress report on the work plan for 2010-11 as an appendix.

8.2 To inform the Committee's discussion, the paper also included the risk register as it relates to the Education Department and the delivery schedule for Education Department workload.

8.3 The workplan had been developed by the Executive building on discussions of the Committee during its strategy day on 18 November 2010. Those areas of work which did not appear in the 2011-12 work plan had been included in the final section - work for 2012-2013.

8.4 The Committee noted that the Department's work in 2011-2012 would be shaped by the impact of regulating new professions and the extension of regulation generally. The Committee away day in November 2011 would focus on the Committee's responsibilities regarding the regulation of new professions and the extension of regulatory powers.

ACTION: **Director of Education** to provide information on the transfer of the education regulatory function from the GSCC to the HPC to the next meeting of the Committee.

<u>Modernising Scientific Careers.</u>

8.5 The workplan does not allow for significant resources to implement any operational changes associated to the Department of Health Project - 'Modernising Scientific Careers (MSC)'. There was still uncertainty regarding the completion of the project, including around a timetable for implementation. It was noted that the initial response to the MSC project was likely to focus on a review and consultation of our standards, which would be undertaken by the Policy & Standards Department. This means that any changes and/or implementation to the HPC's education processes were likely to take place in the year after.

<u>Annual monitoring process</u>

8.6 Since the process was first launched, there has been an increase in the number of audit submissions that HPC visitors could assess in one annual monitoring assessment day. The Committee noted that this was an example of how the process was becoming more cost effective and efficient.

<u>Publications</u>

8.7 The Committee discussed the new guidance that the Executive proposed to develop around education processes. There was evidence that education providers, new professions and complainants did not have a grasp of the key underlying assumptions that underpin the HPC education processes.

8.8 The guidance was intended to be short and accessible and generic. It was not anticipated that the guidance would require revision following the opening of the register to any new professions.

8.9 The Committee approved the Education Department work plan 2011-2012.

Item 9   Application of Visitor Partners in approval and monitoring work (ETC 05/11)

9.1   The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive setting out recommendations for changes to the procedures for allocating Visitor Partners.

9.2   The paper included recommendations for amendments to the procedures for the allocation of Visitors for post registration prescribing entitlement programmes. It also recommended the rationalisation of various procedures for Partner allocation, agreed over a number of years, into a single framework.

9.3   The latest amendments had been made to reflect good practice, and because enough individuals had gained supplementary prescribing annotations on the HPC Register to allow the appropriate Visitors to be allocated.

9.4   The Committee agreed that:

- approval and monitoring work of supplementary prescribing programmes should be made by individuals with the supplementary prescribing annotation on their registration record;

- with regard to post-registration programmes for prescription only medicines and local anaesthetics, visitors should have the specific annotation linked to the programme in question and not necessarily both annotations; and

- the framework attached as Appendix 1 to paper (ETC 05/11) was approved, and should be used for the allocation of Visitor Partners for approval and monitoring work.

Item 10   Changes to approval of stand alone prescription only medicine programme major change process (ETC 06/11)

10.1   The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive which recommended amendments to the stand alone prescription only medicine (POM) programme major change process.

10.2   At its meeting of 12 June 2007 the Committee had agreed that education provider who wished to run a POM course as a stand alone programme should complete a successful minor or major change process.

10.3   Following a review of the major change process conducted in October 2010, the Executive recommended an alteration be made to the POM major change process to bring in into line with the updated HPC standard for education and training (SET), and specifically SET 3.3:

- '*the programme must have regular monitoring and evaluation systems in place.*'

10.4 The Committee agreed that the following documents should be required from education providers when they were seeking approval of stand-alone POM programmes via the major change process:

    a) completed HPC mapping document for SET 3.3;

    b) monitoring and evaluation processes; and

    if there is a difference in the academic level of the stand alone programme to the approved podiatry programme the education provider is also required to submit the following;

    c) assessment and learning outcomes for the stand alone programme.

Item 11   Service user involvement in the design and delivery of education and training programmes (ETC 07/11)

11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive regarding service user involvement in design and delivery of education and training programmes.

11.2 The area of work had been discussed by the Committee at its meetings on 10 March 2010, 8 June 2010 and 16 September 2010.

11.3 The paper drew together the previous discussions of the Committee, focussing on HPC's potential role in supporting service user involvement in pre-registration education and training. It also included recommendations for further work.

11.4 The Committee noted other organisation-wide work on service user involvement being undertaken by HPC, including research taking place as part of the FTP department's analysis of the expectations of complainants, and a review planned by the Communications team.

11.5 The Executive had also fed into a CHRE project on the range of Public and Patient Involvement initiatives being undertaken by health regulators. An outcome of this project would be an analysis of best practise, which in turn would help inform the HPC's approach.

11.6 The Committee held a discussion on the issues in the paper and the Executives recommendations, during which the following points were made:

    11.6.1 The detailed investigation of the concept of service user involvement clearly displayed the Committee's determination to take the issue seriously.

11.6.2 Service user involvement was regarded as best practice by society. The issue of whether there was evidence that service user involvement enhanced public protection was secondary to the principle that citizens have a right to be involved in the design and development of processes.

11.6.3 The brief for research was crucial in developing evidence of how service user involvement enhanced public protection.

11.6.4 New professional groups, such as social workers, already worked to involve service users within their processes and this would need to be reconciled against HPC's procedures.

11.6.5 Citizen involvement in the design and delivery of services was an accepted norm in public health in Wales.

11.6.6 Many programmes approved by the HPC already included an element of service user involvement in some way. Although they were not required to do so, some had already provided evidence of this as part of the approval process.

11.6.7 Examples of excellence would be available from education providers which would inform the Committee's thinking and the development of policy in this area.

11.7 The Committee agreed that research into service user involvement should be externally commissioned in the 2011/2012 financial year. The scope of the research should follow proposals in section five, and the timeframe in appendix 2, of paper ETC 07/11.

11.8 The outcomes of the research would then inform a subsequent discussion by the Committee, which might include deciding to consult on an additional standard or changes to the guidance.

11.9 The Committee agreed that a position statement on service user involvement should be prepared by the Executive. It should outline the Committee's commitment to service user involvement in the development and delivery of education and training programmes as well as their intended direction of travel in this area.

Item 12   Ownership of the outline curriculum framework for independent and supplementary prescribing (ETC 08/11)

12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive regarding a request by the Department of Health (DH) for the HPC to take ownership of the curriculum framework for independent and supplementary prescribing.

12.2 The DH was developing the curriculum framework as part of the project to extend independent prescribing rights to chiropodists/podiatrists and

physiotherapists. The Committee had received regular updates on the project, most recently at its meeting of 18 November 2010.

12.3 The Committee noted that, whilst the administration of a curriculum framework could fit in with the HPC's responsibility to protect the public, responsibility for developing curricula lay with the professional bodies.

12.4 The Committee was concerned that, whilst the professional bodies concerned with independent and supplementary prescribing may not have an objection to HPC administering the curriculum framework, the hosting of a curriculum framework may compromise HPC's relationship with professional bodies in other professions. This issue was particular to HPC as a multi-professional regulator.

12.5 The Committee noted that accepting responsibility for this curriculum framework could potentially create a precedent for taking responsibility for curriculum frameworks in the future.

12.6 The Committee agreed that; whilst it seemed sensible on the surface for HPC to accept responsibility for the curriculum framework, it would be vital to gain the views of its registrant's professional bodies before making any decision.

12.7 The Committee noted that there was some ambiguity in the request from the DH as the letter referred interchangeably to curriculum framework and outline curriculum. The Committee was concerned about the implication of taking ownership of an outline curriculum as this was likely to be more prescriptive about content and input focused.

12.8 The Committee agreed that the Executive should:

- write to the project board, explaining that the Committee was considering the DH's request, but that it could not yet reach a formal view on whether to accept the framework for the reasons stated in paragraphs 12.3 to 12.7;

- request clarity from the project board on the initial letter, particularly on whether HPC was being asked to administer a curriculum framework or the curriculum itself;

- ask the project board whether it would be possible to present a copy of the draft curriculum framework to the Committee;

- write to the heads of the professional bodies of HPC's registrant populations to consult on the impact of HPC hosting the framework; and

- return to the Committee in June with the results of above three points and a copy of the draft framework for discussion, and to make a recommendation to the Council on the project board's request.

ACTION: Policy Manager to deliver the Committees recommendations as outlined in paragraph 12.8.

Item 13   English language proficiency (ETC 09/11)

13.1   The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding changes to list of approved tests accepted for the purposes of satisfying the Council's English language requirements.

13.2   The paper recommended changes to the list to ensure that tests accepted were equivalent to the appropriate International English Language Testing System (IELTS) level. The changes had been identified following a review of the qualifications by the Executive.

13.3   The Committee agreed that it was extremely important that the HPC required its registrants to have a command of spoken English, as detailed in the standards of proficiency.

13.4   The Committee agreed:

(i)   to cease (effective from 1 April 2011) accepting the following tests/ qualifications:

- Cambridge IGCSE First Language English – 0500;

- Cambridge IGCSE Second Language English – 0510;

- TOEFL paper-based test;

- TOEFL electronic test;

(ii) to accept (effective from 1 April 2011) the following tests/qualifications:

- Cambridge IGCSE First Language English – 0522, at grade C or above; and

- Cambridge IGCSE Second Language English – 0511, at grade C or above.

(iii) that applicants who commenced the IGSCE programmes or sat the TOEFL paper-based test prior to 1 April 2011 would still be able to access the register with these English language tests/qualifications.

ACTION: Director of Policy & Standards and Head of Registrations to deliver the Committees recommendations as outlined in paragraph 13.4

ACTION: Director of Education to communicate these changes to education providers at the earliest opportunity

Item 14   Updating the guidance on 'health and character' (ETC 10/11)

14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive providing the text of a consultation on changes to the guidance the HPC publishes around its health requirements for registration.

14.2 Changes to the guidance had been made following the Council's decision on 7 July 2010 to remove the requirement to provide a health reference for entry to the Register. The changes also reflected the Committee's decision on 18 November 2010 that self referral cases should be considered in the first instance by the Fitness to Practise Committee.

14.3 The Committee recommended that the Council should approve the consultation document.

Item 15   Consultation response analysis on proposed changes to the generic standards of proficiency (ETC 11/11)

15.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding proposed changes the generic standards of proficiency.

15.2 At its meeting on 7 July 2010 the Council decided to consult on a range of proposed changes to the generic standards of proficiency. The changes had been recommended by a review group established by the Council in September 2009. The consultation was carried out between 28 July and 20 October 2010.

15.3 The paper set out the process of the consultation, an analysis of responses received, and conclusions. The paper also included the Executive's recommendations for amendments to the generic standards of proficiency.

15.4 The Committee noted that a number of responses to the consultation suggested that a standard should be added to encompass the concept of leadership. The Committee noted that, whilst this may be relevant to the context of some professions, it was not a threshold standard for all of the professions on the Register.

15.5 The Committee felt that it was not possible to add a standard on leadership to the generic standards that would be equally meaningful across all the professions HPC regulated, and at all stages of career development within these professions.

15.6 The Committee noted that it would also be difficult for all educators to evaluate a standard on leadership in a placement setting.

15.7 The Committee agreed that a standard for leadership would be more appropriately considered as part of profession specific standards where appropriate.

15.8 The Committee acknowledged that the standards were not intended to be hierarchical in order, but suggested that they read more logically with standard 14 before standard 13 and standard 6 before standard 5.

15.9 The Committee recommended that the Council should approve:

- that a standard requiring registrants to be able to demonstrate appropriate leadership should not be added to the proposed generic standards of proficiency;
- that the standard 6 should appear before standard 5 and standard 14 should appear before standard 13;
- that the other amendments to the proposed generic standards on page 27 of the paper ETC 11/11 should be approved; and
- that the text of the consultation responses document (subject to minor editing amendments) should be published on the HPC website.

ACTION: **Policy Officer** to submit the Committees recommendations outlined in paragraph 15.8 to the next meeting of the Council.

Item 16   Withdrawal of approval from historic programmes (ETC 12/11)

16.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive providing a list of approved education programmes that are recorded as closed. These programmes either have no students, or have students but are no longer recruiting additional cohorts.

16.2 At its meeting on 27 September 2007 the Committee agreed the process for withdrawal of approval from closed programmes to ensure that education providers could not re-establish training programmes which led to HPC registration.

16.3 The Committee agreed:

- that the programmes listed in appendix 1 of paper ETC 12/11, which have submitted their consent, have their ongoing approval status withdrawn; and
- that the programmes listed in appendix 2 of paper ETC 12/11, which have not submitted their consent, receive notice of the Committee's intent to withdraw approval.

ACTION: **Director of Education** to write to the providers of programmes listed in appendix 2 of paper ETC 12/11 with the Committee's intentions.

Item 17   Practitioner Psychologists - list of approved programmes (ETC 13/11)

17.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding revisions to the published list of practitioner psychologist programmes approved by the HPC.

17.2 The paper provided proposed changes to the list of approved programmes resulting from information received from education providers and from the British Psychological Society on intake dates not already identified. The Committee had considered similar changes to the list on 16 September 2010 and 18 November 2010.

17.3 The Committee accepted the amendments to the currently approved programmes outlined in Appendix 1 of paper ETC 13/11; and the amendments to the historically approved programmes outlined in Appendix 2 of paper ETC 13/11.

Item 18   Changes to HAD approved programme first intake dates. (ETC 14/11)

18.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding revisions to the published list of hearing aid dispenser programmes approved by the HPC.

18.2 The Committee approved lists of currently and historically approved programmes at its meeting of 10 March 2010. Following a subsequent inconsistency in the data provided by the Hearing Aid Council the Executive had contacted all education providers to clarify their first intake dates

18.3 The paper included a rationale for proposed changes, and a list of approved programmes with amended first intake dates.

18.4 The Committee accepted the amendments to the currently approved programmes outlined in Appendix 1 of paper ETC 14/11.

Item 19   Hearing aid dispensers revised schedule of visits (ETC 15/11)

19.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval regarding the schedule of visits to approved hearing aid dispenser programmes over the academic years 2010/2011 and 2011/2012. The Committee approved the current schedule of visits at its meetings on 8 June 2010 and 16 September 2010. The schedule had been agreed following an audit of hearing aid dispenser programmes.

19.2 The paper include changes to the schedule to take account of a programme which had been scrutinised a second time by visitors. On notifying the education providers of the visit schedule it became apparent that the visitors had not had access to all the available documentation for this programme. The visitors were then asked to review the updated submission and make a second recommendation to Committee.

19.3 The Committee was invited to discuss, and reach agreement, on whether to accept the visitors report and approve the revised visit schedule.

19.4 The Committee noted that in determining whether to approve a programme, the Committee must reach its decision on the basis of the evidence put before it, in the form of the visitors' report and any observations on the report made by the education provider.

19.5 The Committee noted that the visitors' report was only a recommendation and the Committee could depart from that recommendation where it was satisfied that it was appropriate to do so.

19.6 The Committee noted that it must reach its own decision and give reasons for that decision. If the Committee wished to amend the report, it should give reasons for each amendment.

19.7 The Committee's decision in respect of the BSc (Hons) Audiology (full time) delivered by De Montfort University was:

- That the Visitors' report should be accepted and that an approval visit should be scheduled for the academic year 2011/12 to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

19.8 The reason the Committee gave for approving the visitors report was as follows:

- An approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/12 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

19.9 The Committee approved the revised schedule of visits.

Item 20   Transfer of regulatory functions from the GSCC to HPC (ETC 16/11)

20.1 The Committee received a verbal update from the Chief Executive and the Chair of the Council regarding the regulation of social workers in England project.

20.2 At the Council meeting on 14 October 2010, the Council agreed that there would be a standing item on every Council and Committee agenda, whereby the Executive would update the meeting on the progress of the project. As the project was developing rapidly, a verbal report on progress would be made to each meeting.

20.3 The update included the following issues, which the committee were invited to discuss:-

The Social Work Regulation Oversight Group/The Social Work Reform Board;

20.3.1 The Council Chair would provide a full briefing on the work of the Oversight Group and the Reform Board to the next meeting of the Committee.

Legislative timetable;

20.3.2 The Health and Social Care Bill had received its second reading on 31st January and had now entered the Committee stage. It was anticipated that the Bill would receive Royal Assent in the autumn of this year, with the transfer of the Register from the GSCC to the HPC taking place in April 2012.

20.3.3 The Committee noted that the Bill contained a proposal to give HPC the powers to establish voluntary registers for unregulated professions or related professions, including students seeking to enter a regulated or unregulated or related occupation.

20.3.4 At its meeting of 9 February 2010 the Council agreed in principle that the establishment of voluntary registers should be actively pursued by the HPC provided they meet the needs of public protection.

20.3.5 The process would consist of three stages:

- Council approval of the principle of voluntary regulation (complete);
- the establishment of the process by which HPC will establish voluntary registers (first year); and
- the passage of the first professions through the programme (second year).

20.3.6 The Committee noted that the Command paper: 'Enabling Excellence' had established the Government's intention that that the HPC should explore with Government the scope for putting in place a system of voluntary registration for the adult social care workforce, with a view to opening a Register for Social Care Workers in 2013.

20.3.7 The Command paper also recommended that, as an established and experienced regulator, HPC should create a statutory register for practitioners supplying unlicensed herbal medicines.

20.3.8 The Committee noted that concerns existed that, whilst the establishment of a register for suppliers of herbal medicines would protect the public, statutory regulation could be seen as giving credibility to those practitioners.

20.3.9 The Committee would receive a full briefing on the recent legislative activity, including the Council's decisions, and the work planned by the Executive, at its meeting of 9 June 2011.

20.3.10 The Committee noted that, as the changes were part of a Bill, which would be subject to Committee and then parliamentary debate, it was subject to possible changes right up until the moment the Bill was enacted.

<u>Transition project;</u>

20.3.11 The Committee noted that all operational processes relating to the transfer of the Register were in train.

20.3.12 The Committee would consider its responsibilities in relation to the transfer of the register in full at its meetings on 17 November 2011 and in early 2012.

Items to note

The Committee noted the following papers:

Item 21   Threshold level of qualification - practice notes (ETC 17/11)

Item 22   Professional indemnity insurance (ETC 18/11)

Item 23   Health and character declarations (ETC 19/11)

Item 24   Reports from committee representatives at external meetings (ETC 20/11)

Item 25   Panel decisions - December 2010 to March 2011 (ETC 21/11)

Item 26   Committee and Panel meeting dates 2011 and 2012 (ETC 22/11)

Item 27   Date and time of next meeting

27.1 10.30 am - Thursday 9 June 2011

Item 28   Any other business

28.1 There was no further business.

Chair ……………………..………..

Date ……………………..………..