

**unconfirmed**  
**The Health Professions Council**

Chief Executive and Registrar: Mr Marc Seale

Park House  
184 Kennington Park Road  
London SE11 4BU  
Telephone: +44 020 7840 9710  
Fax: +44 020 7840 9807  
e-mail: colin.bendall@hpc-uk.org

Notes of the 33rd meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on **Thursday 27 September 2007** at Avonmouth House, 6 Avonmouth Street, London SE1 6NX.

**Present:** Ms E Thornton (Chairman)  
Ms H Davis  
Mr J Donaghy  
Ms C Farrell  
Professor T Hazell  
Mr S Hutchins  
Professor C Lloyd  
Ms G Pearson (from item 3 onwards)  
Ms P Sabine  
Professor D Waller  
Mr N Willis

**In attendance:**  
Mr O Ammar, Education Officer  
Mr C Bendall, Secretary to the Committee  
Mr J Bracken, HPC's Solicitor  
Mr M Guthrie, Policy Manager  
Ms M Hargood, Education Officer  
Mrs J Ladds, Director of Communications  
Mr S Mars, Policy Officer  
Ms N O'Sullivan, Secretary to Council  
Mr M Potter, Customer Services Manager  
Mr G Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations  
Mrs T Samuel-Smith, Education Officer  
Mr M Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar  
Ms R Tripp, Director of Policy and Standards  
Ms C Urwin, Policy Officer  
Dr A van der Gaag, President

### **Item 1.07/68 Apologies for absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Professor K Bryan, Mrs S Drayton, Ms E Ellis, Professor J Harper, Professor J Lucas, Mr A Mount and Mrs B Stuart.
- 1.2 The Committee noted that the meeting was inquorate and that it would therefore be unable to make any decisions. Resolutions on the papers for discussion/approval would be circulated electronically to members for consideration.
- 1.3 The Chairman welcomed Mr Donaghy and Mr Willis to their first meeting of the Committee.
- 1.4 The Chairman welcomed representatives of the British Association of Counselling and Psychotherapy, the British Psychological Society and the Department of Health, who were in the public gallery. The Chairman reminded the Committee that members of the public could address the meeting only if the Chairman invited them to do so.

### **Item 2.07/69 Approval of agenda**

- 2.1 The Committee approved the agenda, subject to the following amendments:
  - considering the paper for discussion/approval on the Continuing Professional Development assessor fee and the paper for information on the Continuing Professional Development assessors' day together, as item 14;
  - considering a tabled paper for discussion/approval on Operating Department Practitioner programmes as item 16.

### **Item 3.07/70 Minutes of the Education and Training Committee meeting held on 12 June 2007**

- 3.1 The Committee agreed that the minutes of the thirty-second meeting of the Education and Training Committee should be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman, subject to an amendment that Mr Hutchins had not been in attendance and had given his apologies for absence.

### **Item 4.07/71 Matters arising**

- 4.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.

- 4.2 The Committee noted the action list as agreed at the last meeting.

#### **Item 5.07/72 Chairman's report**

- 5.1 The Committee received a verbal report from the Chairman.
- 5.2 The Committee noted that the Chairman had given a presentation to the north-west managers group of podiatrists.
- 5.3 The Chairman invited Professor Lloyd to give a progress report on the Professional Liaison Group to review the Standards of Education and Training (SETs). The Committee noted that the group included members from a range of stakeholders and that the first meeting had been held on 13 September 2007. The afternoon of 13 September had included discussion on the SETs with representatives of professional bodies.
- 5.4 The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Professional Liaison Group would consider the views of stakeholders from the education sector and questionnaires would be sent to interested parties. Two further meetings of the Group were due to be held in January and February 2008, to draft the new SETs. The Education and Training Committee was due to consider the draft in March 2008.
- 5.5 The Committee noted that professional bodies in three professions (physiotherapy, occupational therapy and radiography) had recently asked education providers to pay an annual fee for professional accreditation of programmes. This development did not directly impact on the HPC's approvals and monitoring process. However, the HPC had previously provided the list of forthcoming approval visits to professional bodies, when requested on an occasional and informal basis. The Committee noted that the Executive felt that it was no longer appropriate to do this in the three affected professions. The education provider could, if it wished, notify the professional body directly. The HPC would explain its views to the professional bodies concerned.

**Action: AC (by 4 December 2007)**

#### **Item 6.07/73 Education manager's report**

- 6.1 The Committee received a report on the work of the Education - Approvals and Monitoring Department.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-10-18	a	ETC	MIN	Notes Education and Training Committee 27 September 2007 public meeting	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

- 6.2 The Committee noted that the report covered June-September 2007, when the number of approval visits had been relatively low. The Committee noted that in the 2006-7 academic year, 141 programmes had been visited and 138 approved (or due to be approved at the Education and Training Panel on 27 September 2007). Three programmes had not yet been approved, although some of these commenced later in the 2007-8 academic year and one had been subject to a second approvals visit. The Committee noted that the annual monitoring process had also operated successfully.
- 6.3 The Committee noted that, following the most recent round of Partner reappointments, there were now shortfalls for Visitors in several professions. These would be addressed by recruitment to fill the vacancies.
- 6.4 The Committee noted that work for the 2007-8 academic year included approval visits to the paramedic programmes run by the IHCD and programmes run by the Association of Clinical Scientists and the Institute of Biomedical Science. The Committee noted that the Department was also planning for the future, including preparing a new format of Visitors' report.
- 6.5 The Committee noted that the paper included an appendix on the major and minor change process and calculated the cost of the process on the basis of the fee paid to the Visitors. The Committee noted that part of the cost of a meeting of the Education and Training Panel related to considering the outcome of the process.
- 6.6 The Committee noted that the report viewed approval visits that did not result in conditions as not being cost-effective. The Committee asked that the Executive bear in mind that visits had additional positive outcomes that were of value even if no conditions were set, such as improving the perception and understanding of HPC approval and monitoring processes.
- 6.7 The Committee noted that the annual monitoring assessment days would be re-formatted, to ensure that Visitors from different professions discussed any common issues across programmes at the same education provider.

**Item 7.07/74 Applied Psychologists: Threshold level of qualification for entry to the Register**

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. A letter from the British Psychological Society, responding to the proposed threshold level, was tabled.
- 7.2 The Committee noted that, each time the HPC regulated a new profession, it was necessary to amend standard one of the standards of education and training to add the threshold level of qualification for entry to the Register. In accordance with the Health Professions Order 2001, the Council was required to consult on any proposed change to the standards. The Committee noted that the threshold level was the minimum requirement and that individuals with a higher level of qualification could also apply for registration.
- 7.3 The Committee noted that the paper was being brought forward as it was anticipated that the applied psychologists part of the Register would open in 2008. The Committee noted that it was intended that the HPC should consult on the draft standards of proficiency for the profession and the draft standards of education and training at the same time.
- 7.4 The Committee noted that the paper outlined the current entry routes for each of the disciplines of applied psychology and discussed an appropriate threshold level of qualification (doctoral level or master level) for entry to the proposed part of the Register. The paper proposed that the threshold should be 'masters degree for applied psychology or equivalent (with further training and experience, as appropriate)' as the masters degree level formed part of the training in the majority of applied psychology disciplines. The wording in brackets was suggested in order to acknowledge that successful completion of a masters degree was not currently sufficient in order to become chartered with the British Psychological Society.
- 7.5 The Committee noted that in July 2007, the British Psychological Society had been asked to discuss the proposals with the HPC. At that time, the Society had felt unable to respond, but had now submitted a detailed response. A letter from the Society, which had been tabled, argued that the level proposed would not ensure the same level of public protection as that provided by the Society's voluntary register, which required knowledge and skills consistent with doctorate level descriptors.

- 7.6 The Committee noted that stakeholders, including members of the Professional Liaison Group drafting the Standards of Proficiency and an e-mail reference group, had also considered the proposal. Responses from these stakeholders had suggested that a doctoral level qualification could be appropriate for clinical, counselling and educational psychology, whilst the other disciplines within the profession could have a master's level. Another suggestion was that it would be appropriate to set a doctoral level qualification for clinical psychology, as this matched the Quality Assurance Agency's benchmark level.
- 7.7 The Committee noted that, in the profession of clinical science, applicants for registration had to obtain a master's degree and a certificate of attainment from the Association of Clinical Scientists. It would be possible for the threshold level for applied psychologists to be set in a similar way, i.e. requiring a master's degree and then a qualification from the British Psychological Society. The latter qualification would require approval by the HPC. The Committee felt that, as far as possible, the professions regulated (or to be regulated) by the HPC should be treated in a similar way for the purposes of threshold entry to the Register.
- 7.8 The Committee felt that the consultation document should not propose a threshold level. Instead, the Committee felt that it would be more appropriate for the document to explain the different options but that it should not make any recommendations at this stage. The Committee felt that the HPC should consider views from stakeholders before a final decision was made. The Committee felt that the consultation document should also consider any potential risks to public protection.
- 7.9 The Committee noted that the consultation period would be for a minimum period of three months, in accordance with guidance issued by the Cabinet Office.
- 7.10 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, asking them to agree to the amendments to the consultation document discussed above.

**Item 8.07/75 Review of the standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners**

- 8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 8.2 The Committee noted that on 19 June 2007 a meeting had been held to review the profession-specific standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners. The meeting had been

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-10-18	a	ETC	MIN	Notes Education and Training Committee 27 September 2007 public meeting	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

attended by members of the Committee and representatives of professional bodies and associations. The changes discussed at the meeting were set out in a draft consultation document included in the paper.

- 8.3 The Committee suggested that a bullet point in the draft standard 3a.1 should read 'understand relevant physiological parameters and how to interpret changes from normal' rather than '...from the normal.'
- 8.4 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider whether to ratify the paper.

**Item 9.07/76 Amendments to the standards of proficiency for chiropodists and podiatrists: Consultation**

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 9.2 The Committee noted that, at its meeting on 28 March 2007, it had recommended that a consultation should be held on whether the standards of proficiency for chiropodists and podiatrists which related to prescription only medicines and local anaesthetics entitlements should cease to be optional. The Council had ratified this recommendation on 31 May 2007.
- 9.3 The Committee noted that the draft consultation document was attached to the paper. The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider whether to ratify the paper.

**Item 10.07/77 Post registration qualifications**

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 10.2 The Committee noted that in October 2005, the Council had agreed to establish a Professional Liaison Group to consider issues relating to post-registration qualifications. This work had been postponed due to the Foster review and the subsequent publication of the white paper 'Trust, Assurance and Safety: The regulation of health professionals in the 21<sup>st</sup> century'. The HPC's response to the white paper had indicated that the HPC would develop criteria for annotating the Register to indicate post-registration qualifications.

- 10.3 The Committee noted that the paper proposed a discussion meeting with stakeholders in February 2008, to consider whether the HPC should annotate the Register and the indicative criteria. The Committee suggested that the Executive should contact the professional bodies before the discussion meeting, to seek views on the kind of qualifications which might be annotated.
- 10.4 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.

**Item 11.07/78 Student fitness to practise - update**

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 11.2 The Committee noted that, in December 2006, it had discussed whether it was appropriate to register students. The Committee had felt that the case had not yet been made and student registration would be disproportionate to the risks posed. The paper proposed that the Executive should arrange a discussion meeting to consider the issue in more detail and should bring a paper to the next meeting of the Committee on 4 December 2007. In addition, the Executive would continue to participate in the project by the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence.
- 11.3 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.
- 11.4 The Committee noted that a recent report by the Disability Rights Commission had proposed that registration of healthcare professionals should not include any health requirements for registrants. However, the report had mentioned the HPC's approach to health and disability issues as a model of good practice.

**Item 12.07/79 Withdrawal of approval from historic programmes**

- 12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 12.2 The Committee noted that the Executive had compiled a definitive list of approved programmes, including programmes which were recorded as 'closed' (there were no students or the programmes were no longer recruiting additional cohorts). As all of the programmes were approved, there was a risk that an education provider might re-establish a programme as leading to



eligibility to register with the HPC. The paper suggested that it was prudent to withdraw approval from closed programmes to prevent this situation arising.

- 12.3 The Committee noted that the paper proposed that the Executive should write to education providers, asking them to confirm the dates on which a programme had commenced and closed. The Executive would also seek the education provider's consent for the HPC to withdraw approval of the programme. If the programme was still running, the Education and Training Committee would be asked to consider how to proceed.
- 12.4 The Committee noted that withdrawal of approval would not affect registrants who had successfully completed a programme. The HPC would publish records of programmes which had been historically approved and which lead to registration.
- 12.5 The Committee suggested that requests from education providers for withdrawal of approval should be initially considered by meetings of the Education and Training Panel, prior to ratification by the Education and Training Committee.
- 12.6 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.

**Item 13.07/80 Speech and Language Therapy, Manchester Metropolitan University: Approved programme correction**

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 13.2 The Committee noted that, on 12-13 June 2007, an approval visit had been held to Manchester Metropolitan University to assess the BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy and BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology programmes. At the visit it had become apparent that a part-time route through the programme was available. The Visitors' Report had reflected both full-time and part-time modes of study for both programmes. The Education and Training Panel on 2 August 2007 had approved the programmes.
- 13.3 The Committee noted that the education provider had subsequently indicated that it did not feel advertisement of a part-time route on the approved list was appropriate, as it was not a formal pathway through the programme. Instead, in exceptional circumstances such as illness, a student already enrolled on the programmes might complete the full-time

pathway over a longer period, with reduced attendance. The education provider had requested that the Committee withdraw approval from the part-time routes through both programmes and remove them from the approved programme list.

- 13.4 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.

**Item 14.07/81 Continuing Professional Development assessor fees: Proposal**

- 14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval and a paper for information from the Executive.
- 14.2 The Committee noted that the Executive was developing the process for considering Continuing Professional Development (CPD) profiles. The paper for information described a mock assessment day held on 27 June 2007, during which a group of registration assessors had considered mock CPD assessments. The day had helped the Executive to determine how long each assessment would take and how the process might operate.
- 14.3 The Committee noted that, as far as possible, CPD profiles would be considered by multi-professional groups of assessors working together, to help to ensure consistency in decisions. When there were smaller numbers of profiles to be assessed, these would be sent out to assessors for consideration.
- 14.4 The Committee noted that the paper proposed that CPD assessors should receive an assessor fee of £20 per profile, to ensure that costs were fixed. The Committee noted that the Finance and Resources Committee would consider the proposed fee.
- 14.5 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.

**Item 15.07/82 Committee self-evaluation**

- 15.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 15.2 The Committee noted that, on 12 June 2007, it had agreed that members should individually complete the self-evaluation form and return their comments for collation. The paper contained the collated responses.

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-10-18	a	ETC	MIN	Notes Education and Training Committee 27 September 2007 public meeting	Draft DD: None	Public RD: None

- 15.3 The Committee noted that the Council awayday on 3-4 October 2007 would include further discussion on the issues identified in the self-evaluation forms.

**Item 16.07/83 Operating Department Practitioners approved qualifications**

- 16.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 16.2 The Committee noted that, on 13 October 2004, it had agreed to accept several 'historic' qualifications for Operating Department Practitioners (ODP), which had been approved by the Association of Operating Department Practitioners before the profession had been regulated by the HPC. However, the Committee had only been asked to approve the qualifications on a time-limited basis (in one case until the end of the grandparenting period). This approach was inconsistent with the HPC's approach to all the other professions which it regulated. The paper proposed that the previous decision should be revoked and approval of the qualifications maintained until that approval was formally withdrawn.
- 16.3 The Committee noted that an electronic resolution would be circulated to members, to ask them to consider ratifying the paper.

**Item 17.07/84 Process for considering complaints about educational programmes**

- 17.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 17.2 The Committee noted details of progress in developing a process for considering complaints about educational programmes. The Executive intended to present its findings and recommendations to the next meeting of the Committee on 4 December 2007.

**Item 18.07/85 Definitive list of approved programmes**

- 18.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 18.2 The Committee noted that the Executive was working to ensure that the list of approved programmes was accurate and available to a wide range of users.

- 18.3 The Committee noted that some of the sources used to compile the list were incomplete and that, if members were aware of any information which should be changed, they should contact the Executive.

**Item 19.07/86 Reports from Education and Training Committee representatives at external meetings**

- 19.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 19.2 The Committee noted the report.

**Item 20.07/87 Standing Orders**

- 20.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 20.2 The Committee noted its standing orders. The Committee asked that the requirement for a quorum should be amended, so that a certain number of lay members were not required as part of the quorum. The Committee noted that it was no longer appropriate for the standing orders to differentiate between registrant and lay members.

**Item 21.07/88 Committee membership**

- 21.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 21.2 The Committee noted that the Council on 9 July 2007 had agreed that Mr Donaghy and Mr Willis should be appointed to the Committee.

**Item 22.07/89 Dates of Committee and Panel meetings 2008-9**

- 22.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 22.2 The Committee noted the dates of Committee and Panel meetings in 2008-9, which had been agreed by the Chairman.

**Item 23.07/90 Minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 12 June 2007**

- 23.1 The Committee noted the minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 12 June 2007.

**Item 24.07/91 Minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 5 July 2007**

- 24.1 The Committee noted the minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 5 July 2007.

**Item 25.07/92 Minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 2 August 2007**

- 25.1 The Committee noted the minutes of the Education and Training Panel held on 2 August 2007.

**Item 26.07/93 Skills for Health and HPC: Summary**

- 26.1 The Committee received a paper for information from the Executive, summarising ways in which HPC was involved with projects and groups within Skills for Health. The Committee noted that some stakeholders had mistakenly gained the impression that HPC endorsed the projects and groups, when in fact HPC had only contributed information or observed meetings.

**Item 27.07/94 Health and character declarations**

- 27.1 The Committee received a paper for information from the Executive, giving statistics on health and character declarations made by registrants on application for renewal, readmission and admission to the Register.

**Item 28.07/95 Any other business**

- 28.1 There was no other business.

**Item 29.07/96 Date and time of next meeting**

- 29.1 The next meeting of the Committee would be held at 10.30 am on Tuesday 4 December 2007.

- 29.2 Subsequent meetings would be held at 10.30 am on:

Wednesday 26 March 2008  
Tuesday 10 June 2008  
Thursday 25 September 2008  
Tuesday 2 December 2008  
Thursday 26 March 2009  
Thursday 11 June 2009

**Chairman**

**Date**

Unconfirmed

<b>Date</b> 2007-10-18	<b>Ver.</b> a	<b>Dept/Cmte</b> ETC	<b>Doc Type</b> MIN	<b>Title</b> Notes Education and Training Committee 27 September 2007 public meeting	<b>Status</b> Draft DD: None	<b>Int. Aud.</b> Public RD: None
---------------------------	------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--