

**Agenda Item 12**

**Enclosure 4**

**Paper ETC 4/02**

**Shadow Health Professions Council**

**Education and Training Committee**

---

**NOTES OF THE C.P.S.M. EDUCATIONALISTS FORUM  
MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2001**

**From the Secretary**

**FOR INFORMATION**

## TO BE CONFIRMED

**NOTES** of a meeting of the Educationalists Forum held on Wednesday 7 November 2001 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

### PRESENT :

Dr. Peter Burley, Deputy Registrar, CPSM – Chairing

### Members appointed to the Council and Boards :-

#### Members appointed to the Council and Boards :-

Prof. Jackie Campbell\* (Arts Therapists Board),  
Prof. Judith Hitchen\* (Radiographers Board),  
Prof. Anne de Looy\* (Dietitians Board),  
Prof. Mary Watkins\* (Paramedics Board),  
Prof. Don Watson\* (Orthoptists Board).

- \* Appointed by the Council after consultation with the Secretary of State for Education and Employment and the Scottish Executive.

#### Chairmen and Secretaries of the five joint validation bodies :-

Ms Ruth Heames and Ms Remy Reyes (OT JVC),  
Ms Mary Embleton (Radiographers JVC),  
Ms Margaret Curr, (Physiotherapists Joint Validation Committee),  
and Mr. Don Lorimer (Chiropractors Joint Quality Advisory Committee).

#### Other relevant Board and Committee Chairmen :-

Ms Helen Allen (MLT Board),  
Mrs Gail Stephenson (Orthoptists Board).

#### Other Bodies :-

Ms Ruth Howkins (QAA),  
Ms Eve Jagusiewicz (UUK),  
Ms Rosemarie Simpson (H&CPEF)  
Prof. Hugh Barr (CAIPE),  
Ms Gi Cheesman (DoH), and  
Dr. Anne McKee (LTSN).

#### Members and Officers at the Shadow Health Professions Council :-

Mr. Marc Seale (Registrar Designate)

#### CPSM Staff

Ms Niamh O'Sullivan	)	-	Assistant Registrar
Mr. Gerald Milch	)	-	" "

1. **INTRODUCTION, WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS AND REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP**

1.1 The Deputy Registrar introduced and welcomed those attending for the first time.

1.2 It was reported that Prof. Geoff Meads had resigned from the Physiotherapists Board. Prof. John Harper had agreed to let his name go forward for nomination.

1.3 Universities UK's (UUK) Health Committee and Health Professions Committee had merged and the one committee was chaired by Prof. Martin Harris.

1.4 Gi Cheesman was representing DoH for this meeting, but this function should pass to Sandy Goulding in the future.

1.5 The Forum welcomed Mr. Marc Seale, Registrar and Chief Executive Designate, HPC.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from : Ms Patricia Ambrose, Prof. Norma Brook, Ms Kathy Burgess, Ms Jenny Carey, Prof. Linda Challis, Prof. Peter Dangerfield, Mr. Paul Frowen, Mr. Alan Hutchinson, Mrs Catherine Lawrence, Mrs. Mary Macdonald, Miss Gill Pearson, Prof. Mike Pittilo, Dr. Derek Pollard, Dr. Gaye Powell, Prof. David Rogers, Mrs Sandra Sexton, Mr. Paul Shenton, Dr. Margaret Sills, Ms Sylvia Stirling, Mr. Paul Turner, Mr. Alan Walker, Prof. Diane Waller, and Mrs Catherine Wells.

3. **NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** (held on 23 May 2001).

Received.

4. **MATTERS ARISING**

4.1 **Subject Benchmarking**

It was noted that the Subject Benchmarks – as seen and discussed at previous meetings – had been formally published on 13 August 2001. The covering letter was noted for information.

4.2 **Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)**

Dr. Anne McKee reported that the LTSN Learning Festivals would in fact be an ongoing process, not just limited to 2002. This meant there would be opportunities to hold Festivals in a number of English regions – not just at Bristol as discussed at the last meeting.

(The LTSN Newsletter is appended to these notes).

5. UP-DATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE (SHADOW) HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL (S.H.P.C.)

- 5.1.1 Dr. Peter Burley reported that the consultation to set up " Professional Advisory Committees " (the title itself being part of the consultation) had educational implications, as set out below and that the SHPC had agreed to establish a shadow Education and Training Committee (ETC) – at present with only Shadow Council members and alternates – to be convened by Christine Farrell (lay member). The consultation on PACs was scheduled to take place on a date to be confirmed. The ETC would need to establish how it obtained its uni-professional advice and handled the volume of work currently handled via 12 separate Boards (five of them with Joint Validation arrangements). This would involve establishing the respective remits of the ETC and the PACs.
- 5.1.2 Margaret Curr reported that the OT and Physiotherapists Boards' Joint Validation Committees (JVC) had met together to discuss matters of mutual interest and the way forward. This had led to an intention to hold a meeting of all JVCs' Chairs and Vice-Chairs in January 2002.
- 5.1.3 The Forum regretted that none of the six members or alternates of the SHPC invited to the Forum had been able to attend. The Forum asked the following concerns to be communicated to the Shadow Council :
- the timescale for decisions was now very short and this had implications for potential co-opted members' availability on both ETC and PACs,
  - the communications and consultations to date appeared to have lacked some clarity and inclusiveness,
  - SHPC (and ETC) members (and those on PACs in due course) needed to be aware of the volume and complexity of the educational approval work at CPSM and the range of other stakeholders with whom they would have to co-operate and align their work,
  - existing CPSM members' experience was that only appropriately prepared and expert members would be able to sustain this work,
  - the appointed educational members at CPSM introduced an expert but non-registrant educationalist in-pur to decision making. Only two such members existed in terms of UUK nominees on HPC. Realistically, just these two people could not carry the work of up to 20 current CPSM members. This led to a concern that the registrant educationalist members of HPC might have an undue influence if they constituted the main resource available to (S)HPC, and

- laying the whole burden of all (S)HPC work in the statutory committees on SHPC members and alternates alone could overburden them to such an extent that important work was deferred and delayed (as had happened at GMC with disciplinary work when only GMC Council members were allowed to undertake it) if it was carried over past April 2002 into the eventual new working structures in the long term.

5.1.4 It was agreed that these concerns be drawn to SHPC's attention and that some provision be made, probably after the remit of the PACs was better known, to transmit the experience and expertise of CPSM educationalist members to (S)HPC.

5.1.5 Christine Farrell would be put on the Forum's circulation list and invited to the next meeting as Shadow ETC convenor.

5.2 The Deputy Registrar reported that the HPC Implementation Group had not met on 6 November 2001, but discussions at previous meetings were reflected in the paper at 5.3 below with particular reference to the need to avoid any hiatus in educational approval work.

5.3 The Forum noted CPSM's paper on educational approval transitional procedures. This would only have currency until such time as the Shadow ETC or the PACs issued their own guidance.

## 6. CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM DoH, OAA, AND THE NATIONAL TRAINING ORGANISATION

6.1 Since the last meeting several publications had been issued which formed a context for educational work at CPSM / HPC. They were not for consultation, but were noted as follows :-

### 6.2 Bristol Royal Infirmary Enquiry

The Forum noted the Secretary of State of Health's press release and Statement to the House of Commons on the findings of the Bristol Royal Infirmary Inquiry together with relevant extracts from the report.

### 6.3 DoH Allied Health Professions' Bulletins

The Forum noted the Bulletins published since May 2001. Members were also alerted to the Human Resources Bulletins to be found on the DoH web-site ([www.doh.gov.uk](http://www.doh.gov.uk)).

### 6.4 Healthwork UK's " Sector Workforce Development Plan "

Particular attention was drawn to the mapping exercise in Chapter II. The future location of the functions of Health-work UK was still under review.

## 6.5 Shifting the Balance of Power within the NHS : Securing Delivery

6.5.1 The Forum noted this important follow-up to the NHS Plan which showed the organisational framework and policy objectives within which future Quality Assurance and workforce planning initiatives would operate. A number of the new structures and arrangements were still awaiting clarification, such as the relationship between Strategic Health Authorities and the Workforce Development Confederations.

6.5.2 The Forum hoped that a sufficient number of experienced and knowledgeable DoH / NHS staff would make the transition to new structures.

6.5.3 The implementation of the new structures would be shown on the DoH web-site in due course.

## 6.6 QAA Codes of Practice : " Placement Learning " and " Recruitment and Admissions "

The Forum noted the final versions of these Codes published in July and September 2001. Ruth Howkins stressed that they were general codes supporting the detail of work in each sector.

## 6.7 DoH Internal Information

---

Noted, and that Maggie Pearson was now Head of the Education and Training Division and had the lead responsibility for the NHS University there as well.

## 7. FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

7.1 The Forum noted the HEFCE / SCOP / QAA / UUK consultation paper of July 2001, with particular reference to para 33 exempting DoH funded provision from its scope. (NB. not all PSM provision was DoH funded, so a minority of PSM provision did still fall within the scope of the consultation). The consultation process had now been completed and draft proposals arising from it would be presented shortly starting with proposals for Subject Review. The consultation and proposals were for England only but with equivalent models for the other UK countries. The same underlying principles would apply UK-wide, but tailored to meet each Home Country's needs.

7.2 The Forum noted correspondence between CPSM and QAA and between HEFCE and the Council of Deans and Heads of UK University Faculties for Nursing, Midwifery and Healthvisiting around the implications of para 33. It was accepted that while a uniform UK-wide system of QA was desirable, in reality there would have to be variations to reflect the needs of different funders and of different countries.

7.3 The Forum noted the Department of Health's briefing paper to support the summer workshops on Quality Assurance of DoH funded courses in England and reports from the consultations.

7.4 The Forum noted that there had been a report in the Times Higher Education Supplement on 28 September 2001 that the whole issue of QA had been remitted to the Cabinet Office's Better Regulation Task Force. This had no immediate implications for QA work.

#### 7.5 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and Prototype Reviews

7.5.1 The Forum received and discussed the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (for England) between HPC and DoH. The Forum also noted the sites selected for prototype academic review in 2001 / 2, and that this model for academic review was also being proposed for the future for validation of new provision. The MoU was not dependent on the DoH / QAA contract and it described the working relationship between DoH and HPC.

7.5.2 Ruth Howkins reported that review teams were being finalised to have a balance between educationalists, Workforce Development Confederations, and the professions. Each prototype reviewer needed to be a "champion". Reviewers would receive three days' training. NMC and HPC would be asked to "endorse" the review teams in due course.

7.5.3 The reviews would start with Sheffield Hallam University (SHU) in February 2002 (and finish in June at St. George's Hospital Medical School / Kingston University).

7.5.4 The guidance on how to include practice placements and teaching was still being finalised (and in discussion with the Commission for Health Improvement).

7.5.5 The Steering Group for the prototype reviews included Prof. Norma Brook (to link with SHPC) and Prof. Rosemary Klem (to link with CPSM).

7.5.6 Concern had been expressed at the Steering Group about the limitation of review teams to eight members where this meant that only one reviewer was a member of the profession concerned – as would happen at SHU. The SHU report could well be submitted in time for consideration by existing JVCs. Their response would be a significant factor in the evaluation of the prototypes.

7.5.7 There was agreement that the practical impact of the new model of Academic Review should be intended to reduce anxiety and burdens, include all stakeholders, and be a developmental process.

7.5.8 Ruth Howkins reported that the prototype reviews would be evaluated separately from the generality of QA in health-funded provision. This evaluation would be carried out by Prof. Jeff Lucas at Bradford University. (NB. Jeff Lucas was a lay member of SHPC and had declared that interest there).

7.5.9 SHPC had discussed this paper in general terms on 5 November 2001 and remitted it to its Shadow ETC.

7.5.10 QAA and DoH were in dialogue with the Commission for Health Improvement (CHI) as a potential stakeholder in the process. CHI had liaised with CPSM in January 2001, but found that there was no overlap between the PSM Act and its own remit. CHI would be meeting SHPC on 12 November 2001 to discuss a possible memorandum of understanding between CHI and HPC in due course. It did not appear that CHI had yet started in its own right to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical education. CHI's focus at present was on recruiting its own visitors, where its requirements were similar to QAA's.

Registrar's note :

At a meeting with CHI on 12 November 2001 officers there clarified that while their remit did cover the quality of the learning experience in individual clinical placements in NHS institutions, there was no immediate prospect of CHI being able to move into this work under present priorities. This meant that CHI would not be a participant in the prototype Academic Reviews nor need to be integrated into QA procedures for the foreseeable future.

## 8. THE MODERNISATION OF ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

8.1.1 The Forum received this paper.

8.1.2 Prof. Mary Watkins represented that there was a mismatch between the DoH's intention in the bidding process and the current statutory approvals mechanisms.

8.1.3 It was agreed that CPSM (in consultation with DoH) should write to the approved HEIs notifying them of the position with regard to approvals, namely that :

- all approvals would have to follow the procedures in the prevailing statute,
- the timetables for modernising professional self-regulation and professional education and training had become separated by Ministers,
- the communications from DoH had not been sufficiently clear in this area, despite advice from CPSM, and
- until the relevant Boards or JVCs had seen proposals in detail it was not possible to form a judgement as to whether a visit or reapproval would be needed in each case.

8.1.4 Margaret Curr reported that the JVCs were already discussing how to respond most effectively to the initiative (as in 5.1.2 above).

8.1.5 Helen Allen raised in this context the issue of how the PSMs were represented in the four UK countries in liaison arrangements with the Government concerned. This initiative demonstrated that appropriate information had not been communicated effectively. It was also noted that arrangements to consult with the health-funded PSMs would exclude a number of professions unless appropriate action was taken.



## 8.2 Post-Registration Frameworks

The Forum received in this context an oral report from Gi Cheesman on a video-conference held on 22 October 2001 on taking post-registration educational initiatives forward on a UK-wide level. It was hoped that Helen Fields would be reporting further at the Learning for Partnership Network meeting on 8 November 2001. \*

The conference had been designed to initiate the issues as needing a collaborative response from all stakeholders who would need to sign up to whatever action / next steps were agreed.

\* Registrar's note : this report was not, in fact, made.

## 8.3 Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Programme

The Forum noted in this context the invitation to bid under HEFCE's " Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning " with special reference to developing inter-professional education in the " other subjects allied to medicine " .

## 9. PRACTICE PLACEMENTS – A DISCUSSION PAPER

The Forum received and discussed this DoH paper and responses to it to date noting that editorial comment had been requested by 16 October 2001. Gi Cheesman would now be working up some concrete proposals for further discussion – eg. on aligning the various relevant DoH levies. It was hoped that these would be ready for the February 2002 meeting.

[ Subsequent to the meeting, DoH clarified that the Review of Workforce Information Needs initiative was still underway and that its work should be communicated to this current initiative ].

## 10. MODERNISING REGULATION IN THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS – CONSULTATION DOCUMENT [ON A COUNCIL FOR THE REGULATION OF HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS ]

10.1 The Forum received this paper, noting that it would only affect HPC and not CPSM as currently constituted and that the closing date for comment had passed. It was anticipated that the final legislation might be substantially altered from the consultation paper in the light of issues which had arisen in the consultations. The Forum would have been very concerned if a lay body had been given reserve powers to intervene in matters of detailed uni-professional expertise, such as treatment methodologies in pre-registration curricula. \*

10.2 The Forum received CPSM's response to the CRHP proposals.

\* Registrar's note : the " NHS Reform Bill " was published on 9 November 2001.

## 11. "EVERYONE" : INTRODUCING THE N.H.S UNIVERSITY

- 11.1 The Forum received this DoH paper noting that it applied to England and Wales only. The NHSU's remit in Northern Ireland was still under discussion. It would definitely not operate in Scotland.
- 11.2 Concern was expressed about the – prima facie – misuse of the title " university " and the risk of duplication of accreditation and the conflict of commercial interests with existing HE provision.
- 11.3 UUK welcomed the innovatory aspects of the proposals – especially in CPD – and was in discussion with DoH with a view to a Memorandum of Understanding between UUK and DoH. There did not seem to be any immediate implications for existing pre-registration provision.
- 11.4 It was appreciated that the NHSU's CPD remit would have great implications for HPC in due course. It was also pointed out that NHSU would have to seek approval for CPD provision to be linked to re-registration on the same basis as any other provider.

## 12. CREDIT FRAMEWORKS

- 12.1 Information was received on work in progress by the " credit consortia " to support developing a National Credit Framework. It was noted that the PSM Act debarred CPSM from using credit in its registration schemes, but HPC could look at credit on its merits.
- 12.2 Ruth Howkins reported that QAA had engaged with the Scottish framework (see 13 below), but was still exploring its own position with regard to a (national) credit framework elsewhere. There was discussion still on aligning QAA and QCA qualifications frameworks.
- 12.3 The issue of credit might be of great significance for the NHS University and for HPC's post-registration work in due course.

## 13. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCOTTISH CREDIT AND QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

The Forum received and welcomed this paper.

## 14. UK COUNCIL FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Forum noted the current project on creating a research culture in health professions. The Forum recommended that CPSM / (S)HPC investigate closer involvement with this group.

15. **" FITNESS TO PRACTISE IN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION "**

The Forum received and discussed this paper and noted the Registrar's comments on it. Eve Jagusiewicz reported that it would be discussed at a meeting of UUK's Health Committee in mid-November. It was noted that the paper focused on a specific concern on the status of Pre-Registration House Officers unique to medicine. Whether the proposals would be universally applicable was not yet clear; there were negotiations to be held and redrafting to be done.

16. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

17. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting would be held at 11.00 a.m. on 13 February 2002 (in Park House).