

## Education and Training Committee

**Minutes of the 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:**

**Date:** Thursday 7 June 2018

**Time:** 10:30 am

**Venue:** Room N, Health and Care Professions Council, Park House,  
184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

**Members:** Maureen Drake  
Luke Jenkinson  
Penny Joyce  
Sonya Lam  
Joanna Mussen  
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

**In attendance:**

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee  
John Barwick, Executive Director of Regulation  
Elaine Buckley, Chair of Council  
Niall Gouch, Education Officer  
Richard Houghton, Head of Registrations  
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager  
Katerina Kolyva, Council of Deans of Health  
Jacqueline Ladds, Executive Director of Policy and External Relations  
Sarah Ritchie, Policy Officer

# Public Agenda

## **Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee and Executive to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair thanked Katerina Kolyva, Executive Director Council of Deans of Health, for attending to present to the Committee.

## **Item 2 - Apologies for absence**

- 2.1 There were no apologies received.

## **Item 3 - Approval of agenda**

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

## **Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests**

- 4.1 Members had no interests to declare.

## **Item 5 - Minutes of the meeting of 1 March 2018 (ETC 09/18)**

- 5.1 The Committee considered the minutes of the 80<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Education and Training Committee.
- 5.2 The Committee approved the minutes.

## **Item 6 - Matters arising (ETC 10/18)**

- 6.1 The Committee noted those matters arising from the meeting held on 1 March 2018.
- 6.2 The Committee noted that the matter arising relating to fees in education would be addressed verbally later on the meeting's agenda.
- 6.3 The Committee agreed there was a further matter arising. This related to the agreement of a policy statement on the future approach to considering a change to SET 1. It was agreed the Executive Director of Regulation would discuss the timescales for this work with the Chair of the Committee.
- 6.4 The Committee noted the report.

## **Item 7 - Presentation by Katerina Kolyva, Council of Deans of Health**

- 7.1 Katerina gave a presentation to the Committee, which focused on the role and priorities of the Council of Deans of Health (CoDH) and its relationship with the HCPC.

7.2 During discussion the Committee noted the following points:-

- not all CoDH members are involved in UK wide education, this can be a challenge when addressing devolved matters;
- engagement for CoDH can be complex and there are a large number of policy and representation bodies with a role in health education, remit overlap can often arise;
- the first year of the shift from bursaries for some health professions has shown that fewer male or mature students have applied to programmes. This will continue to be monitored;
- advance practice is a priority area for the CoDH, particularly raising its profile for Allied Health Professions (AHPs);
- health faculties are becoming more complex and growing in size following restructuring based on business pressures;
- workforce pressures and the impact of Brexit on student applications is an area of focus for the CoDH;
- as higher education provision becomes more market driven, motivation to invest in AHP provision can be weakened, as this is not a priority area for government; and
- AHPs are particularly successful in the research field, however, CoDH have commissioned a research project to look at why AHPs do not reach the higher levels of University governance and leadership.

7.3 The Committee discussed the demographic change seen as a result of the first year of bursary removal. It was agreed that diversity enhances the learning experience of all students. This trend will be monitored in future years, as more data is required on the extent of the change.

7.4 The Committee agreed that the HCPC could collaborate with CoDH on its AHP workforce and student monitoring through data sharing. It was noted that better utilisation of the HCPC's data is on the Council's corporate strategy as a priority area.

7.5 The visibility of AHPs as a group was discussed. It was noted that there is no strong unified AHP voice promoting the benefits of the professions and influencing policy. It was agreed that this was an area the HCPC could work with CoDH and other stakeholder groups to strengthen.

7.6 In response to a question, it was noted that the introduction of nursing associates is a development providers in England are very engaged with. It is an England only change and so the other countries are not engaging.

7.7 The Committee noted that CoDH had found engagement with the Office for Students to be constructive and responsive. CoDH encouraged the HCPC to meet with the Office for Students regarding its strategic focus. CoDH offered to facilitate such a meeting.

7.8 The Committee thanked Katarina for a thought provoking discussion. It was noted that the Executive Directors and the Chair of the Committee would meet with Katarina soon to discuss future collaboration.

## **Item 8 - Fees in education**

8.1 The Executive Director of Regulation provided a verbal update on this item. The Committee noted that due to the recent restructure and a key employee being absent due to an unforeseen medical issue, work had not progressed as the Committee requested when it last considered this issue.

8.2 During discussion the following points were made:-

- the HCPC's motivation and aim in introducing a fee needs to clear before a decision is made;
- the recent Social Work England consultation included a provision to enable the new regulator to charge for education approval;
- some concern remains that introducing a fee would alter the HCPC's relationships with providers and could raise expectations of service that may not be able to be met with current resource and processes;
- a differentiated fee model should be explored depending on the size and complexity of a programme. Innovation in smaller new programmes should not be discouraged due to a fee for approval; and
- introducing a fee should not be considered separately from a review and improvement to the HCPC's current education processes.

8.3 The Committee discussed the expectations of registrants on the use of their registration fee. It was agreed that it was probably not expected that approving education programmes would be solely funded by the registration fee.

8.4 The Committee agreed that the HCPC should be confident in the quality of its approval processes and experience before a fee is introduced. It was agreed that opportunities to improve and streamline the visit process should be explored before a decision on fee introduction is made. Visitor feedback should be drawn on for this review. However, work on developing options for fees should continue in parallel.

8.5 The Committee agreed that a paper on fees in education would be received in September 2018. The paper should cover the following areas:-

- plans for review and improvement of the visit process, including visitor feedback already held and any plans for increasing this feedback if required;
- the Executive's initial thoughts on how a differentiated fee model would work;
- a review of the approach of the other regulators in this area; and
- the experiences of other regulators regarding how their relationship with providers is impacted by a charge for the approval process.

### **Item 9 - Findings of the biennial education provider survey 2016-18 (ETC 11/18)**

9.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.

9.2 The following points were noted:-

- the survey was conducted in early 2018, and covers the previous two academic years;
- the feedback gathered was broadly positive, with some areas noted for improvement; and
- where applicable, recommendations for action have been made by the Executive in response to the feedback received; and
- the results and recommendations from the survey will be the focus of an upcoming Education Update (stakeholder newsletter).

9.3 The Committee noted that some respondents perceived an inconsistency in how HCPC visitors operated. It considered that the perception of consistency was key to regulatory credibility. The Committee agreed that it would receive more information on the work of the Executive in addressing issues of consistency with Visitors and education employees.

9.4 The Committee considered that the wording of some of the recommendations was too passive and should be revised. The Committee agreed to receive by email a revised Executive response to the survey, with recommendations amended to be more active in phrasing and with timescales for completion included.

9.5 The Committee agreed that recommendation 14 should seek to include students to build on that relationship at an early stage.

- 9.4 In response to a question it was noted that broadening the stakeholder respondent pool had provided useful feedback and that this would be continued for the next survey.
- 9.5 The Committee noted that a HCPC wide stakeholder perception survey is soon to be launched. The Executive will look to include high level questions regarding interaction with education processes based on the findings of the education survey.
- 9.6 The Committee agreed to receive an update on the implementation of the recommendations in November 2018.

#### **Item 10 - Education Annual report data set (ETC 12/18)**

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper form the Executive.
- 10.2 The Committee noted that the Education Annual report was published earlier in 2018.
- 10.3 The Committee agreed that the report must come to the Committee before publication next year, accompanied by the data set.
- 10.4 The Committee noted the paper.

#### **Item 11 - Standards for prescribing: Review of Standards for prescribers 18 (ETC 13/18)**

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.
- 11.2 The Committee noted the following points:-
- as part of the five year review schedule, the standards for prescribing are due for review in 2018. The standards for prescribing are presented in two parts, those for education provider and those for registrant prescribers;
  - the Executive proposes that the HCPC adopt the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's Competency Framework for all Prescribers (SCF) in place of the HCPC's current standards for prescribers. This was initially raised at the Committee's March 2018 meeting and the Committee indicated it was in favour of exploring this possibility;
  - SCF is accredited by NICE and widely endorsed by professional bodies of prescribing professions;
  - there is considerable regulatory duplication around prescribing. Simplifying the current regulatory framework by setting common standards for prescribers will support a consistent and proportionate cross-regulatory approach;

- in March 2018, the NMC adopted the SCF as their standards of proficiency for nurse and midwife prescribing practice, effective from January 2018. This is the first regulator to take this step towards unifying professional standards for nonmedical prescribing practice;
- legal advice indicates that the HCPC can adopt the SCF as its standards for prescribers if the Council agree this; and
- if agreed, it is intended that a consultation on the change would launch in September 2018.

11.3 The Committee welcomed the proposal to adopt the SCF and agreed to receive a draft consultation document on this basis in September 2018.

11.4 The Committee agreed that the current regulatory burden should be a point of emphasis in the consultation document.

11.5 The Committee noted that advice will be sought on the length of the consultation period. This would be included in the paper to be considered by the Committee in September 2018.

#### **Item 12 - Standards for prescribing: Review of Standards for education (ETC 14/18)**

12.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.

12.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- the standards require review to ensure they remain consistent with the recently revised SETs;
- the current standards require practice educators in prescribing to be a registered doctor. The NMC and GPhC have removed this requirement, instead specifying that practice educators must be appropriately qualified and experienced prescribers. The Executive proposed that the HCPC's standards should be similarly amended;
- it is proposed that current requirements for interprofessional education in the SETs should not be included in the post-registration prescribing. This is because education providers must already deliver these standards as proficiencies in registrants; and
- the Executive considered that the need for profession-specific skills and knowledge on prescribing programmes should be reviewed as the qualifications awarded are not profession-specific.

12.3 The Committee agreed that whilst profession specific skills may not be required, learning materials should be relevant to the different professions. It

was noted that the approach to quality assurance of this would be explored with the Education Department.

- 12.4 The Committee agreed that the Executive should develop a draft consultation document on the proposed changes outlined in the paper.

### **Item 13 - Registration performance report (ETC 15/18)**

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.
- 13.2 The Committee noted that the first Registration Department biannual performance report has been based on the Committee's previous discussion on its reporting requirements. Further feedback and refinement is sought to be incorporated into the November 2018 report.
- 13.3 The Committee thanked the Executive for developing the report and agreed that its focus on themes and trends was appropriate.
- 13.4 The Committee agreed that it did not require all the service standard data if the standard was met. If it was not met it would require the data that illustrates why.
- 13.5 The Committee agreed that a 'dashboard' cover the report would be useful to indicate which of the 10 standards were met in the reporting period.
- 13.6 It was noted that the Council's KPIs include processing times for applications and registration appeal decisions. It was agreed that the Committee needed to be in a position to provide assurance to the Council on the other aspects of the Registration Department's performance.
- 13.7 The Committee noted that recent registration advisor recruitment had been successful with 16 advisors appointed in the reporting period. This high number of new employees has associated training and quality assurance resource requirements.

### **Item 14 – Any other business**

- 14.1 There was no further business.

### **Item 15 – Date and time of next meeting**

- 15.1 10.30am – Thursday 6 September 2018 at Park House, SE11 4BU

### **17. Resolution**

The Committee is invited to adopt the following:



'The Committee hereby resolves that the remainder of the meeting shall be held in private, because the matters being discussed relate to the following;

- (a) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or application for registration;
- (b) information relating to an employee or office holder, former employee or applicant for any post or office;
- (c) the terms of, or expenditure under, a tender or contract for the purchase or supply of goods or services or the acquisition or disposal of property;
- (d) negotiations or consultation concerning labour relations between the Council and its employees;
- (e) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Council;
- (f) action being taken to prevent or detect crime to prosecute offenders;
- (g) the source of information given to the Council in confidence; or
- (h) any other matter which, in the opinion of the Chair, is confidential or the public disclosure of which would prejudice the effective discharge of the Council's functions.'

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason for Exclusion</b>
18	a

### **Summary of matters considered in private session**

The Committee considered an investigation report relating to an education provider concern.

**Chair Stephen Wordsworth**

**Date 06/09/2018**