

Park House
184 Kennington Park Road
London SE11 4BU
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7840 9716
Fax: +44 (0)20 7820 9684
e-mail: peter.burley@hpc-uk.org

MINUTES of the eighth meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on Wednesday 26 March 2003 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

Present :

Prof. D. Waller (Chairing)
Mr. M. Collins
Miss H. Davis
Ms C. Farrell
Mr. P. Frowen
Prof. A. Hazell
Dr. R. Kapur (to item 9)
Prof. R. Klem
Prof. C. Lloyd
Mr. I. Massey
Ms G. Pearson
Mr. G. Sutehall
Miss E. Thornton
Dr. A. van der Gaag

Also in Attendance

Dr. P. Burley – Secretary, ETC
Mr. J. Bracken (Bircham, Dyson Bell)
Mr. T. Berrie, Director
Ms M. Collins, Newchurch Healthcare
Ms U. Falk, Manager of Education
Mr. S. Hill, Newchurch Healthcare
Mr. G. Milch, Director
Ms N. O'Sullivan, Director
Ms L. Pilgrim, Director
Mr. G. Ross-Sampson, Project Manager
Mr. M. Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar.

ITEM 1 03/45 MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from :- Prof. N. Brook, Ms S. Chaudhry, Prof. J. Harper, Mr. C. Lea, and Prof. J. Lucas.

ITEM 2 03/46 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

On the recommendation of the Chairman,

It was

RESOLVED (1)

that the agenda be approved.

ITEM 3 03/47 MINUTES

It was agreed that the minutes of the seventh meeting of the Health Professions Council's Education and Training Committee held on 12 February 2003 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman subject to the points below. Prof. C. Lloyd should be included in those attending. The minute at item 6 should be amended to reflect the Solicitor's advice (see item 4 below). Minor typographical errors should be corrected. It should be ensured that reference had been made in the minutes to maintaining the status quo for approval arrangements and to a working group being set up to look at this work (see item 5 below).

Action : PB and Chairman.

ITEM 4 03/48 MATTERS ARISING

4.1 The Committee received the Secretary's report.

4.2 On "partners" Mr. Bracken stated that Council members needed to apply to be appointed in the capacity of "partners". He would discuss this with the Chief Executive and report to Council.

Action : MS and JB.

4.3 On item 10.3 (Interpretational Guidance for the Standards of Proficiency) it was agreed that the Solicitor's previous advice had only been "perceived" by members and had not been stated in those terms in writing.

4.4 On item 34 (Registration Committee) it was confirmed that no additional meeting had been held on 24 March 2003.

- 4.5 On item 17 (Brochures) the relationship between HPC's standards and processes and the requirements of other bodies would be discussed under several items in this present agenda. The position would be clarified that HPC would not rely on or defer to other bodies. HPC must make and enforce its own standards and criteria and must take its own decisions. The reference in papers for the previous meeting to collaborating with, consulting, and being aware of the interests of other bodies must not prejudice the integrity and independence of the operation of the Order.
- 4.6 The Committee expressed its appreciation of the hard and excellent work Newchurch had done on its behalf (and especially Miriam Collins).

ITEM 5 03/49 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- 5.1 The Committee received the report.
- 5.2 The Chairman reported that she had taken Chairman's Action to approve the Registration Forms and the "prescribed period" under Part III 9(1) of the Order.
- 5.3 The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) had advertised recently for Board members. Members who were interested were encouraged to apply.
- Action** : by Members.
- 5.4 The Department of Health (DH) (England) was appointing a working party to progress work on National Occupational Standards in Clinical Science. It was agreed to refer this to Dr. Beastall.
- Action** : PB.
- 5.5 Since the last meeting the President had proposed setting up a Professional Liaison Group (PLG) for approvals of programmes, institutions, qualifications and tests under IV 15 (5) (a) – (d). This was to meet once HPC had its new powers and would report by September. This should come back to the May ETC meeting.

Action : PB.

ITEM 6 03/50 SECRETARY'S REPORT

The report was received.

ITEM 7 03/51 STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY

- 7.1 The Standards were tabled and introduced by the Chairman who stressed that they were minimum requirements for safe and effective practice. The recent editing work had deleted very little from them although their format had changed a great deal.

- 7.2 The Chief Executive said that the Standards could not become effective until HPC's " Rules " were made and this was not now expected until 1 May 2003. The Council still needed to approve the Standards. Mr. Bracken also needed to continue to scrutinise them. He recommended that the Committee continue to consult on them.
- 7.3 In discussion it was agreed that – subject to Mr. Bracken's work – the Standards were an acceptable template and " 97 % " satisfactory but that :-
- greater consistency was still needed in the profession-specific parts,
 - the hierarchy within them between essential skills, essential knowledge, and desirable knowledge be made clear,
 - some information was still needed in some profession-specific parts, and
 - all members would be welcome to comment on the generic parts.
- 7.4 It was agreed that the Standards were appropriate to be used in the meetings to be held on 28 March and 2 April 2003 to develop assessment criteria for the tests of competence.
- 7.5 It was agreed that clarity was needed on how the Standards would be used. Mr. Bracken stated that while registrants would be expected to be able to meet these standards, their scope of practice might mean that they were unable to demonstrate that they continued to meet every one of the standards that applied for their profession. For instance, if a registrant worked with adults alone, then any standards that related to how they must work with children would not apply to their day-to-day work. So long as registrants stayed within their scope of practice and made reasonable efforts to stay up to date with the whole of these standards, this would not be problematic. However, if registrants moved outside their scope of practice, they must be absolutely certain that they were capable of working safely and effectively, including undertaking any necessary training and experience.

Registrants did not have to maintain a portfolio that demonstrated how they met or continued to meet the standards of proficiency, and HPC would not routinely test registrants to ensure that they met or continued to meet the standards. HPC could and would ask registrants to take a test of competence (or carry out some other form of assessment) if there were good reasons for believing that registrants might not meet the standards. New entrants to the register from approved UK programmes would be expected to meet all the Standards for their profession.

- 7.6 It was agreed to remit the relationship between the standards and maintaining competence, maintaining registration, and the eventual Continuing Professional Development (CPD) scheme to the CPD PLG in due course.

Action : CPD PLG in due course.

- 7.7 It was agreed that issues in 7.3 – 7.6 above be addressed in a new introduction. This was tabled during the meeting and members agreed to return comments.

Action : by Members.

7.8 The timetable and action arising from the discussion was agreed as :

<u>Timing</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>By</u>
By 28 March 2003 (28 March and 2 April, “ assessment working groups ”	Comments to be made on introduction	Members
2 April 2003 :	report to Council	Executive (PB)
4 April 2003 :	legal scrutiny completed	Mr. Bracken
4 April 2003 :	amended document sent electronically to :	members of the Committee, the working groups at QAA, the professional bodies (PB).
(15 April	Registration Committee)	
(15 April	Debriefing meeting at QAA)	
17 April	Return of comments to HP	members and consultees

7.9 Other matters clarified in discussion included that :

- the Standards would need to be dynamic, but
- they should not be changed if at all possible during the two year “grandparenting ” period.

ITEM 8 03/52 STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

8.1 The Standards were tabled and introduced by the Executive.

8.2 It was agreed that the introduction be proceeded with subject to the changes made in discussion, written comments being submitted to the secretary, and the document being put into “ house style ”.

Action : PB and CM.

8.3 It was agreed that the Standards themselves should be progressed in the same procedure and to the same timetable as the Standards of Proficiency :

<u>Timing</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>By</u>
By 28 March 2003	Comments to be made on introduction	Members
2 April 2003	report to Council	Executive
4 April 2003 :	legal scrutiny completed	Mr. Bracken
4 April 2003 :	amended document sent electronically to :	
	members of the Committee, the professional bodies, and UK Health Departments and their agents.	
17 April 2003 :	Return of comments to HP	members and consultees

8.4 The Standards would then be referred to the Approvals PLG for further development and to devise the processes which would arise from them.

8.5 The Committee noted that not all the necessary profession-specific information had been included yet. All professions should have the same level of information.

8.6 In discussion it was agreed that :

- HPC should consult the UK Health Departments and their agents direct (and not via the Department of Health (England)),
- the Standards operated for all employment sectors, not just the NHS,
- the Standards needed to operate for all four UK countries and not be based on English structures, and
- the Standards could only take account of the specific requirements of the Order and not be drafted to reflect the proper interests of other bodies.

8.7 Until the Standards were finalised and published approval work would continue to be carried out under the previous arrangements as appropriate to the Order.

ITEM 9 03/53 CHARACTER REFERENCE FOR ADMISSION TO THE REGISTER

9.1 The Committee received the reference from Registration Committee and the information the Committee had requested on the Nursing and Midwifery Council's scheme. The Committee noted the action the Chairman had taken to approve the format in which the reference would be submitted in the application process.

9.2 A number of important principles were established in discussion :-

9.2.1 Blanket references from institutions for a whole cohort would not meet the requirements of the Order, references had to be specific;

9.2.2 HPC could not prescribe who the referee should be;

9.2.3 Providing a false reference would be a criminal offence; and

9.2.4 HPC could not compel institutions to withhold a named profession-specific award from students known to be unfit for practice, for whom they would not provide a reference, and who could not be admitted to the Register.

9.3 It was agreed that HPC should give guidance to applicants on how to obtain and submit a reference and who would be a suitable referee. It was also agreed that guidance to referees was needed to explain to them their legal responsibilities.

Action : SD, CH, RD.

9.4 Urgent communication was needed with institutions in the wider context to explain the implications for them of HPC's new powers in conduct, health, and character.

Action : PB.

ITEM 10 03/54 TESTS OF COMPETENCE

10.1 The Committee noted that the circulated papers had been superseded.

10.2 Professor Klem reported that this work would be taken forward at meetings on 28 March and 1 April 2003 to bring the information from the Standards of Proficiency into the process of assessing applicants. More meetings might be needed. The work needed to be completed in time for report to the Registration Committee on 15 April 2003.

Action : LP.

10.3 The Committee asked that the level of detail of assessments be considered carefully at the meetings.

10.4 Mr. Bracken confirmed that the assessments would need to be dictated by what was in the applications for registration.

Action : LP.

10.5 To date only registrants had been contacted for the 28 March and 1 April, but lay members would also be welcome and should notify the Secretary of the Registration Committee if they wished to attend.

ITEM 11 03/55 TESTS FOR KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH

11.1 The Committee received the papers referred from Registration Committee.

11.2 It was agreed that the IELTS test could be used if a test was needed, but it was also agreed that other tests or forms of evidence of Knowledge of English could be accepted if judged appropriate.

11.3 For EEA applicants it was agreed that a test could be imposed if there were grounds for suspecting that a migrant's knowledge of English was insufficient for safe and effective practice.

- 11.4 It was confirmed that for the IELTS tests SLTs would require grade 8 because of their unique language needs, and other professions grade 5.

ITEM 12 03/56 PROGRESS REPORT ON GRANDPARENTING

- 12.1 The Committee received the papers, and the tabled paper referred from Registration Committee.
- 12.2 A number of important points were clarified in discussion about applications made by people claiming to have practised a profession for three out of the last five years :-
- 12.2.1 HPC could exercise discretion to judge if the activity claimed by an applicant was in the relevant profession as defined by HPC;
- 12.2.2 Applicants under the “three out of the last five years” provisions may be subject to a test of competence as part of the assessment of their application;
- 12.2.3 This assessment would have regard to the Standards of Proficiency as relating to their scope of practice;
- 12.2.4 HPC did have discretion to come to a view as to whether practice in the three out of five years was “ effective ”;
- 12.2.5 Illegal practice could not be used as evidence of effective practice;
- 12.2.6 Case studies should be a very useful tool in coming to a view;
- 12.2.7 The Standards of Proficiency were just one part of a wider assessment process;
- 12.2.8 These applicants could properly be rejected, but they must be given reasoned judgements; and
- 12.2.9 The Order placed no limits on how many times, or how often, an applicant could apply.
- 12.3 Two basic principles were confirmed :
- that three of the last five years in practice did not give an automatic right of admission to the Register, but
 - that a practitioner on the Register at HPC could be regulated (and the public better protected) while an unregistered practitioner could not be.
- 12.4 In the light of the discussion it was agreed that very careful guidance would be needed to registrant assessors.

Action : LP, SD, RD.

ITEM 13 03/57 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

The meeting agreed to suspend SO 22 restricting the meeting to three hours to allow discussion to continue.

ITEM 14 03/58 REGISTER OF APPROVED COURSES, QUALIFICATIONS, INSTITUTIONS AND TESTS OF COMPETENCE AND KNOWLEDGE

- 14.1 The Committee noted that this was now on the HPC web-site.
- 14.2 It was agreed that “ Course ” should be changed to “ programme ” in the light of legal advice that this was allowable, and to delete the word “ modality ” throughout in headings.
- 14.3 Members asked that it then be recirculated again widely for comment.

Action : PB.

ITEM 15 03/59 BROCHURES : REPORT ON CONTEXT AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee received the report on the strategy for re-submitting the brochures in item 16 – 19 below.

ITEM 16 03/60 BROCHURE : ROLE OF A VISITOR

- 16.1 It was agreed that there could be further development of this brochure. It was appropriate now, though, for the purposes of the relaunch subject to the term “ attendance at teaching sessions ” being deleted and “ evidence of the learning environment ” being substituted.

Action : CM.

- 16.2 It was agreed that the text be recirculated electronically but the secretary reported that there might not be time for any further changes before the relaunch. Comments received might have to be carried over to a later redraft.

Action : PB.

ITEM 17 03/61 BROCHURE : OVERVIEW OF E. T. C.

- 17.1 It was agreed that there could be further development of this brochure. It was appropriate now, though, for the purposes of the relaunch.
- 17.2 It was agreed that the text be recirculated electronically but the secretary reported that there might not be time for any further changes before the relaunch. Comments received might have to be carried over to a later redraft.

Action : PB.

ITEM 18 03/62 BROCHURE : HOW YOUR INSTITUTION CAN OBTAIN AN APPROVED PROGRAMME

- 18.1 It was decided not to proceed with this brochure for the relaunch but to remit it to the Approvals PLG.
- 18.2 It was also agreed that the text should be recirculated electronically after 9 April 2003 for comment and revision and for resubmission to the meeting on 14 May 2003.

Action : PB after 9 April 2003.

ITEM 19 03/63 BROCHURE : VISITORS ARE COMING TO MY INSTITUTION...

- 19.1 It was decided not to proceed with this brochure for the relaunch but to remit it to the Approvals PLG.
- 19.2 It was also agreed that the text should be recirculated electronically after 9 April 2003 for comment and revision and for resubmission to the meeting on 14 May 2003.

Action : PB after 9 April 2003.

ITEM 20 03/64 NOTES OF THE MEETINGS OF PRE-REGISTRATION EDUCATION AND TRAINING WORKING GROUPS JOINT VALIDATION COMMITTEES AND JOINT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEES HELD SINCE THE LAST MEETING TOGETHER WITH THE PAPERS CIRCULATED FOR THE PREVIOUS MEETING

- 20.1 The Committee received the notes of the meeting of the Pre-registration, Education and Training Working Groups, Joint Validation Committees and Joint Quality Assurance Committees held since the last meeting, together with the papers circulated for the meeting on 12 February 2003, and

RESOLVED (2)

to agree the recommendations in them as set out below.

20.2 **PHYSIOTHERAPISTS**

On the advice of the JVC and after scrutiny of the documentation :-

Approval of New Programmes under Section 4(1)(a) and (b) and Institutions under Section 4(1)(c) of the PSM Act 1960

UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON :-

- a. under the terms of Section 4(1)(a)(b) and (c) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Programme of training to be offered by, the examinations set by and the qualification awarded by the University of Brighton, and the institution itself, be approved as meeting the standards and requirements for State Registration, and
- b. under the terms of Section 4(2) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Working Group recommends that the Health Professions Council send its recommendation to the Privy Council that it be requested to determine approval of the application by the University of Brighton to offer the registrable Programme and qualification as set out below :-

In	Physiotherapy
Type of Programme	Full time accelerated
Institution of Training/Education	University of Brighton
Awarding Higher Education Institute	As above
Title of Programme	MSc Rehabilitation Science (with eligibility to practise Physiotherapy)
Qualification/s (to be approved for State Registration)	MSc Rehabilitation Science
Length of Programme	2 year accelerated
Date of Validation event	11 September 2002
With effect from	24 March 2003
Participants in approval process	Health Professions Council Chartered Society of Physiotherapy University of Brighton

Minor Changes to Provision Approved under Section 4 of the PSM Act 1960

UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA

BsC (Hons) Physiotherapy

GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY

MSc Rehabilitation Science

20.3 **CHIROPODISTS**

On the advice of the Pre-Registration Education and Training Working Group for Chiropody, and following scrutiny of the documentation :-

Approval of New Programmes under Section 4(1) (a) and (b) and Institutions under Section 4(1)(c) of the PSM Act 1960

UNIVERSITY OF SALFORD :-

- a. under the terms of Section 4(1)(a)(b) and (c) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Programme of training to be offered by, the examinations set by and the qualification awarded by the University of Salford, and the institution itself, be approved as meeting the standards and requirements for State Registration, and
- b. under the terms of Section 4(2) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Working Group recommends that the Health Professions Council send its recommendation to the Privy Council that it be requested to determine approval of the application by the University of Salford to offer the registrable Programme and qualification as set out below :-

In	Chiropody
Type of Programme	Full-time and Part-time
Institution of Training/Education	University of Salford
Awarding Higher Education Institute	As above
Title of Programme	BSc (Hons) Podiatry
Qualification/s (to be approved for State Registration)	As above
Length of Programme	3 Years Full-time 4.5 years Part-time
Date of Validation event	6 December 2002
With effect from	September 2002
Participants in approval process	Health Professions Council University of Salford Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists

Continued Approval of Institutions (and associated clinical placements), Programmes, Examinations and Qualifications under Section 5 of the PSM Act

GLASGOW CALEDONIAN UNIVERSITY

Division of Podiatry

REPORTS RECEIVED

UNIVERSITY OF WALES INSTITUTE CARDIFF

A report of follow-up visit to the Wales Centre for Podiatric Studies, University of Wales Institute Cardiff was received.

PLYMOUTH COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

A report of the fourth monitoring visit made to the Plymouth School of Podiatry, Plymouth College of Further Education was received.

MATTHEW BOULTON COLLEGE

The report of the Quinquennial Visit made to Birmingham School of Podiatric Medicine, Matthew Boulton College of Further Education was received.

20.4 **SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPISTS**

On the advice of the JVC and after scrutiny of the documentation :-

Continued Approval of Institutions (and associated clinical placements), Programmes, Examinations and Qualifications under Section 5 of the PSM Act

QUEEN MARGARET UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, EDINBURGH

BSc/BSc (Hons) Speech and Language Therapy

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

BMedSci (Hons) (Speech)

Major Changes to Provision Approved under Section 4 of the PSM ACT 1960

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

BMedSci (Hons) (Speech)

ITEM 21 03/65 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, PERFORMANCE AND ETHICS AND REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO GOOD CHARACTER AND HEALTH

The position was noted that this was now an item for Council on 2 April 2003.

ITEM 22 03/66 MINUTES OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE 6 MARCH 2003

The minutes were received and approved as needed noting that the Chairman had already taken the urgent action which had been needed.

ITEM 23 03/67 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Committee agreed after discussion of item 2 on the private part of the agenda that that item should be dealt with as public business. The relevant minute is set out here as well.

“ ITEM 2 03/71 POST 1 APRIL 2003 ADVISORY AND HUMAN RESOURCES SUPPORT FOR THE COMMITTEE

- 2.1 The Committee received the report.
- 2.2 The Chief Executive reported that the review of approval and re-approval processes by the Approvals PLG should be completed in autumn 2003 in parallel with this process. After that HPC would review the support needed for the work. He explained that no decisions had been made and proposals were subject to the outcome of the PLG’s work. The aim was to provide all the secretariat support at HPC in Park House. It was also proposed that existing staff located elsewhere could stay as they were for up to three years. New groups joining HPC would be supported at HPC.

Action : PB.

- 2.3 In this context the Chief Executive made it clear that HPC Partners must not place themselves in a position of a conflict of interests. A DH / QAA working party set up by DH (and chaired by Prof. Brook) would need to look at how to preserve the integrity and independence of each agency’s role, while maximising collaboration.

Any comments on this should be submitted to Prof. Brook.

Action : by Members. ”

ITEM 24 03/68 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 24.1 The next scheduled meeting would be at 10.30 am on 14 May 2003.
- 24.2 It was agreed that the dates for the next year would be recirculated to members.

Action : PB.

ITEM 25 03/69 MEETING IN PRIVATE

The members present directed that the remainder of the discussion be held in private because publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest, by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

CHAIRMAN