

**CPSM EDUCATIONALISTS FORUM : PAPERS, NOTES, AND AN UPDATE
FROM THE MEETING OF THE CPSM EDUCATIONALISTS FORUM HELD
ON 7 NOVEMBER 2001**

Forwarded by Dr Peter Burley

For information.

Up – Date on the Position of Matters raised at the Educationalists Forum on 7 November 2001

Educationalists Forum

Item

- 5 The date for consultation on " Professional Advisory Committees " has been fixed for 31 January 2001.
- 7 At the National Audit Office's conference on the funding of nursing and AHP education and training in England and Wales on 21 November 2001, DoH announced that there would be a major consultation on how to develop the new Multi-Professional Education and Training levy in Spring 2002. QAA also presented an up-date of its perception of the health QA world – attached.
- 8.2 For information only, the DoH has undertaken work now to carry the approved nursing post-registration courses over into the Nursing and Midwifery Council and this seems to be where the proposal for a more general post-registration framework now rests.
- 11.4 " . . . as any other provider, " missing from the end of 11.4.
- 15 Since 7 November UUK has also reported that this paper's status will need to be agreed with GMC before it goes further.

Enc.

**EDUCATING AND TRAINING THE FUTURE
HEALTH PROFESSIONAL WORKFORCE
Developing the partnership**

**What you need to know about quality
assurance and the new quality
assurance arrangements for NHS funded
university courses**

Julie Swan
Director of Development
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

Julie Swan
Director of Development
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education
Southgate House
Southgate Street
Gloucester
GL1 1UB
Tel: 01452 557 000
Fax: 01452 557 131

The QAA is a UK body that aims to promote public confidence in the ability and standards of higher education in the UK.

Julie joined the QAA at the start of 1998, shortly after it was formed. She initially had responsibility for working with the professional and statutory regulatory bodies that had particular interests in higher education programmes and qualifications, her previous role was as a senior manager with the Education Division of the Law Society.

The QAA's Development Directorate has been leading the work to make the outcomes of higher education within the UK more explicit, through projects such as subject benchmarking, the introduction of a qualifications framework for higher education and publication, by higher education institutions, of programme specification. The Directorate also has responsibility for developing and testing, through prototype reviews, an approach to the review of higher education provision in health areas. The approach is being developed in a way that will satisfy the needs of the various stakeholders, and do so in a rigorous but streamlined way.

Higher education health profession programmes - the new approach to quality assurance in England

BACKGROUND PAPER

Essential characteristics of reviews of health profession programmes

The Department of Health in England funds considerable provision of higher education programmes for the health professions. The Department is of the view that the education and training for the health professions should be subject to quality assurance systems which are robust, but streamlined. These arrangements should build on the internal quality assurance arrangements of health profession education providers and make best use of existing documentation and data.

It is recognised that there are a number of particular features that need to be taken into account and fully reflected in the review process to be used. Health profession programmes are composed of two complementary and inter-related elements - theory and practice. Competence and safe practice, the pre-requisites for registration for a license to practice, must be developed and demonstrated on the programmes.

Placement learning is an integral and vital component of all health profession programmes. As such placement learning must be reviewed as a part of any overall review of a health care programmes. Therefore, when the quality of the learning opportunities available to students on a particular programme, and the standards achieved by students, are reviewed, the process must address both the theoretical and the practice components, however and wherever delivered.

The new review process

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was established in 1997 to provide an integrated quality assurance service for UK higher education. It is an independent body funded by subscriptions from universities and colleges of higher education, and through contracts with the main higher education funding bodies. It has charitable status.

The Department of Health is contracting with the QAA for the development and organisation of a process to review health profession programmes - this process is termed Academic Review. The QAA and the Department are working closely with the professional and statutory regulatory bodies, the workforce development confederations, and the higher education institutions to ensure that the new approach to review facilitates the integration of the quality assurance processes promoted by each of these key stakeholders.

Academic review is a process for the independent review of the quality and standards of higher education programmes. The process focuses on the establishment, maintenance and enhancement of quality and academic standards. Reviews are undertaken by teams of academic reviewers who include appropriately qualified academics, practitioners and employers.

The *academic review* method forms the basis of the approach to be used for the review of health profession programmes, but in view of the particular characteristics of health profession programmes a *Handbook* that is particular to the review of health care programmes is being developed. The *Handbook* sets out the detail of the review process. The *Handbook* recognises that *academic review* must accommodate review of practice as well as the theoretical aspects of the programmes; it must therefore fully recognise the key importance of teaching and

learning that takes place within a practice setting as well that which takes place within the higher education institution.

A draft of the *Handbook* will be tested in the prototype review (see below). The *Handbook* addresses both the subject and institutional level reviews that together make up academic review. However, it is only the aspects of review that take place at subject level that have been contextualised to address issues that are particular to the review of health care programmes. Only subject level reviews will be undertaken under contract between the Department of Health and the QAA.

What are the prototype reviews?

The Department of Health is contracting with the QAA for it to arrange prototype reviews involving six higher education institutions and their partner placement providers. The prototype reviews will take place during the academic year 2001-2.

The prototype reviews will provide an opportunity to test the approach to academic review developed for the health care programmes. Following an evaluation of the prototype reviews the approach will be modified as necessary and preparations for a full round of reviews, to start from October 2003, will then begin. All provision will be reviewed during the period October 2003 - July 2006.

Who will undertake the reviews?

The reviews will be undertaken by teams of academic reviewers. The teams will comprise individuals who have been nominated by the various organisations which have an involvement with, and a responsibility for, the provision of the programmes, namely, professional statutory and regulatory bodies, employers, workforce development confederations, practitioners and higher education institutions.

What will the reviews address?

The reviews to be undertaken under the contract with the Department of Health will address two inter-dependent areas:

- **academic standards:** concerned with the appropriateness of the intended learning outcomes (in relation to relevant subject benchmark statements, the qualifications framework and the overall aims of the provision); effectiveness of curriculum design and assessment arrangements (in relation to the intended learning outcomes); and the actual achievement of students;
- **the quality of learning opportunities in a subject:** concerned with the effectiveness of teaching, learning resources and academic support, wherever and however delivered, in promoting student learning and achievement.

The joint responsibility of higher education institutions and placement providers for establishing, monitoring and maintaining effective placement environments will be considered by the teams in the review of the provision, and will be commented upon in their reports.

In addition, but not included in the contract with the Department of Health, the QAA undertakes reviews at institutional level that:

- report on institutional management of standards and quality: concerned with the robustness and security of processes and procedures relating to the institution's responsibility as a body able to grant degrees and other awards that have a national and international standing. This involves, in particular, arrangements for dealing with approval and review of programmes, the management of academic credit and qualification arrangements, and the management of assessment procedures.

In each case, the institution produces a self-evaluation document. This allows the institution to reflect on what it does and why, and the methods it uses to fulfil its aims. A team of reviewers analyses the self-evaluation, and then visits the institution to gather the evidence they need to make their judgements. These judgements are expressed in published Academic Review reports.

Judgements

Reviewers will make a judgement about the standards set and demonstrated in the programmes for each of the professions covered by a provider. The reviewers will consider:

- whether there are clear learning outcomes that have been set appropriately in relation to the qualifications framework and the relevant subject benchmark statement;
- whether the curriculum is designed to enable the intended outcomes to be achieved;
- whether assessment is effective in measuring achievement of the outcomes; and
- whether student achievement matches the intended outcomes and the level of the qualification.

In the light of this, reviewers will state whether they have:

- confidence in standards (a judgement that is made if reviewers are satisfied with current standards and with the prospect of those standards being maintained into the future); or
- limited confidence in standards (a judgement that is made if standards are being achieved but reviewers have doubts about the ability of the institution to maintain them into the future); or
- no confidence in standards (a judgement that is made if reviewers feel that arrangements are inadequate to enable standards to be achieved or demonstrated).

For each subject area in an institution, judgements about the quality of learning opportunities offered to students are made against the broad aims of the provision and the intended learning outcomes of the programmes.

Reviewers look at:

- effectiveness of teaching and learning, wherever and however it takes place - in relation to curriculum content and programme aims;
- student progression - recruitment, learning support, progression within the programme;
- learning resources - the adequacy and effectiveness of use of the library, equipment, accommodation, placement facilities and staff.

Each of these three categories is judged as either:

- **commendable** - provision contributes substantially to the achievement of the intended outcomes, with most elements demonstrating good practice; or
- **approved** - provision enables the intended outcomes to be achieved, but improvement is needed to overcome weaknesses; or
- **failing** - provision makes a less than adequate contribution to the achievement of the intended outcomes; significant improvement is required urgently.

Within the 'commendable' category, reviewers will identify any specific exemplary features that represent sector-leading best practice.

If reviewers have no confidence in the standards achieved or if they find that any aspect of quality of learning opportunities is failing, then the provision will normally be subject to a further formal review within one year.

What information will be available from academic review? How will it be used?

The reports produced from the academic review process are public reports. The reports provide:

- **information for the public**, who can use them to inform choices about where to study and to gain confidence in the quality and standards of the provision;
- **information for the professional statutory and regulatory bodies** who can use them to inform the decisions they must take about fitness to practice and recognition of programmes for professional purposes;
- **information for the providers**, both higher education institutions and trusts, who can use them as a basis for enhancing the quality of their provision and ensuring that standards are maintained;
- **information for the Department of Health** who need to be assured that the provision they are funding is fit for its purpose and to demonstrate that those in receipt of public money are accountable for that funding;
- **information for prospective partners** who may be considering establishing new courses in the health profession field;
- **information for the purchasers** (Workforce Development Confederations) who need to be assured about the quality and standards of the provision being commissioned.

The reports include a summary of the main conclusions of the review teams, narrative commentaries about placement learning, and a set of judgements about the quality and standards of the provision.

What happens once the report has been published?

The publication of a review report, containing the judgements, is an important stage in the review process, but it is not the final stage. The providers - higher education institutions and workforce development confederations - will prepare an action plan setting out the action they will take to build on the strengths identified by the review team and to address any aspects in need of improvement. This action plan will provide the focus for on-going quality assurance activities in which the Department of Health, the professional statutory and regulatory bodies and the workforce development confederations will have an interest.

Who has an interest in the academic review of the health care programmes?

The professional statutory and regulatory bodies: will be able to make use of the information that results from the reviews. They will be able to use the information to inform their decisions about fitness for practice and the accreditation of programmes. They will be invited to nominate individuals to act as academic reviewers who are members of the review teams. They will be invited to participate in the training events which all academic reviewers will have to complete before they are permitted to join review teams.

The higher education institutions: will be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of their internal arrangements for assuring quality and standards. They will be able to do so in a way that is familiar to the higher education sector as a whole. They will be able to use the preparation of the self evaluation document and the action plan as a focus for internal review, that will facilitate the enhancement of their provision. They will nominate individuals to act as reviewers.

The NHS trusts and other placement providers: will be able to consider the contributions they make to health profession programmes through the availability and quality of effective placement environments.

The workforce development confederations: will be able to use the information that results from the reviews to identify any areas where the trusts have demonstrated a strong contribution to the learning opportunities available to students; and where improvements are necessary. They will be invited to nominate individuals to act as reviewers (in teams that will be reviewing provision in which they do not have a direct interest).

The public: will have an interest in the independent reviews of the health care programmes, as they seek assurances about the quality and standards of provision.

The timetable of activities

2001 - 2002: prototype reviews, and associated preparation and evaluation.

2002 - 2003: preparation for full cycle of reviews including publication of the final *Handbook*, in the light of experience of the prototypes, nomination, selection and training of reviewers.

2003 - 2006: reviews undertaken and reports published. On-going reviewer recruitment and training, preparation and monitoring of action plans by providers.

2006 - 2007: overview reports written and published, evaluation of review process, review and revision of benchmark statements.

2007 - 2008: preparation for reviews to commence 2008/9, including decisions about opportunities for 'lighter touch', nomination of reviewers etc.

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 (Chiropodists 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-put 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, QAA, 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).

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).

THE COUNCIL FOR PROFESSIONS SUPPLEMENTARY TO MEDICINE

REGISTRAR: M. D. Hall OBE GM FIM

25 October 2001

AGENDA FOR A MEETING OF THE EDUCATIONALISTS FORUM TO BE HELD AT 11.00 a.m. ON WEDNESDAY 7 NOVEMBER 2001 AT PARK HOUSE, 184 KENNINGTON PARK ROAD, LONDON SE11 4BU

The agenda and papers are sent to the "educationalist" members of the Council and Boards, Chairmen of the relevant Boards' Joint Validation bodies, other Board/Committee Chairmen as appropriate, and to appropriate outside bodies as follows:-

Members appointed to the Council and Boards :-

Prof. Jackie Campbell* (Arts Therapists Board),
Prof. Linda Challis* (SLT Board),
Prof. Michael Eraut* (Clinical Scientists Board),
Prof. John Harper (appointed by the Privy Council to the Council),**
Prof. Judith Hitchen* (Radiographers Board),
Mr. Alan Hutchinson* (Chiropodists Board),
Mrs Catherine Lawrence* (Occupational Therapists Board),
Prof. Anne de Looy* (Dietitians Board),
Prof. Mike Pittilo* (Prosthetists & Orthotists Board),
Prof. David Rogers* (MLT Board),
Mr. Paul Turner (OT Board, teacher in HE),
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 :-

Mrs Catherine Wells, Ms Ruth Heames and Ms Remy Reyes (OT JVC),
Ms Kathy Burgess and Ms Mary Embleton (Radiographers JVC),
Dr. Gaye Powell and Ms Sylvia Stirling (SLT JVC),
Ms Margaret Curr, Mr. Alan Walker and Ms Jenny Carey (Physiotherapists Joint Validation Committee),
and Mr. Paul Frowen* and Mr. Don Lorimer and Mr. David Ashcroft (Chiropodists Joint Quality Advisory Committee).

Other relevant Board and Committee Chairmen :-

Ms Helen Allen and Mrs Mary MacDonald (MLT Board),
Miss Gill Pearson** (Dietitians Board),
Mrs Gail Stephenson (Orthoptists Board),
Mrs Sandra Sexton** (Prosthetists & Orthotists Board),
Prof. Diane Waller** (AsTs Board).

Other Bodies :-

Ms Ruth Howkins (QAA),
Dr. Derek Pollard (CVU),
Ms Eve Jagusiewicz (UUK),
Ms Patricia Ambrose (SCOP),
Ms Rosemarie Simpson-Marks and Mr. Paul Shenton (H&CPEF),
Prof. Hugh Barr (CAIPE),
Prof. Peter Dangerfield (UKIPG),
Ms Gi Cheesman (DoH), and
Dr. Margaret Sills (LTSN).

Members of the Shadow Health Professions Council :-

Prof. Norma Brook (President),
Prof. Anthony Hazell (lay member nominated by Universities UK).

- ** Also now a Shadow HPC member or alternate.



Council Members

The notice of the meeting is also circulated to other members of Council who may wish to attend at the meeting. Please could such Council members wishing to attend inform the Registrar and full papers can be sent to them.

AGENDA

ITEM 1 INTRODUCTION, WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS AND REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP

- 1.1 The Deputy Registrar will introduce and welcome any new members or representatives from external bodies attending.
- 1.2 To report that Prof. Geoff Meads has resigned from the Physiotherapists Board. Prof. John Harper has agreed to let his name go forward for nomination.
- 1.3 To welcome Mr. Marc Seale, Registrar Designate, Shadow HPC.

ITEM 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Please could you let the Registrar's office know if you will be unable to attend). Apologies have been received from : Prof. Norma Brook, Prof. Anne de Looy, and Mrs. Mary MacDonald,

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

To receive the notes.

ENCLOSURE 3

ITEM 4 MATTERS ARISING

4.1 Subject Benchmarking

To note that the Subject Benchmarks – as seen and discussed at previous meetings – were formally published on 13 August 2001. The covering letter is attached for information.

ENCLOSURE 4.1

4.2 Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN)

To report that the LTSN Learning Festivals will in fact be an ongoing process, not just limited to 2002. This means there will be opportunities to hold Festivals in a number of English regions – not just at Bristol as discussed at the last meeting.

- 4.3 Any other matters arising not reported elsewhere on the agenda.

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

- 5.1 The President or other Members present from SHPC to comment as appropriate on any educational work undertaken by SHP, noting that the consultation to set up "Professional Advisory Committees" (the title itself being part of the consultation) has educational implications.

ENCLOSURE 5.1

- 5.2 Deputy Registrar to report on any issues arising from the HPC Implementation Group.

- 5.3 To note CPSM's paper on educational approval transitional procedures.

ENCLOSURE 5.3

ITEM 6 **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM DoH, OAA, AND THE NATIONAL TRAINING ORGANISATION**

- 6.1 Since the last meeting several publications have been issued which form a context for educational work at CPSM / HPC. They are not for consultation, but can be discussed if or as needed :-

6.2 **Bristol Royal Infirmary Enquiry**

To note 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.

ENCLOSURE 6.2

6.3 **DoH Allied Health Professions' Bulletins**

To note the Bulletins published since May 2001.

ENCLOSURE 6.3

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

Particular attention is drawn to the mapping exercise in Chapter II.

ENCLOSURE 6.4

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

To note this important follow-up to the NHS Plan which shows the organisational framework and policy objectives within which future Quality Assurance and workforce planning initiatives will operate.

ENCLOSURE 6.5

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

To note the final versions of these Codes published in July and September 2001.

ENCLOSURE 6.6

6.7 DoH Internal Information

To note.

ENCLOSURE 6.7

ITEM 7 FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

7.1 To note the HEFCE / SCOP / QAA / UUK consultation paper of July 2001, with particular reference to para 33 exempting DoH funded provision from its scope.

ENCLOSURE 7.1

7.2 To note 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.

ENCLOSURE 7.2

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

ENCLOSURE 7.3

7.4 To note that there was 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.

7.5 To ask for any comment on the position of non-DoH funded provision and on the position of PSM courses in the other Home Countries.

7.6 To receive and discuss the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (for England) between HPC and DoH and the sites selected for prototype academic review in 2001 / 2, noting that the model for academic review is also being proposed for the future for validation of new provision.

ENCLOSURE 7.6

ITEM 8 THE MODERNISATION OF ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION

8.1 To receive and discuss this paper.

ENCLOSURE 8.1

8.2 To receive in this context an oral report from those present at a video-conference held on 22 October 2001 on taking post-registration educational initiatives forward.

- 8.3 To note 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 ".

ENCLOSURE 8.3

ITEM 9 PRACTICE PLACEMENTS – A DISCUSSION PAPER

To receive and discuss this DoH paper and responses to it to date noting that editorial comment had been requested by 16 October 2001.

ENCLOSURE 9

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

- 10.1 The Forum is asked to receive this paper, noting that it will only affect HPC and not CPSM as currently constituted and that the closing date for comment has passed.

ENCLOSURE 10.1

- 10.2 To receive CPSM's response to the CRHP proposals.

ENCLOSURE 10.2

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

To receive this DoH paper.

ENCLOSURE 11

*** ITEM 12 CREDIT FRAMEWORKS**

Information is presented for discussion if desired (or for individual response) on work in progress to support developing a National Credit Framework (to inform the National Qualifications Framework) by the Southern England Consortium for Credit Accumulation and Transfer on behalf of England, Wales and Northern Ireland. (Equivalent work is being undertaken in Scotland).

ENCLOSURE 12

*** ITEM 13 AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SCOTTISH CREDIT AND QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK**

To receive and discuss as needed.

ENCLOSURE 13

* Full papers not circulated. Available on request.

ITEM 14 **UK COUNCIL FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION**

To note the current project on creating a research culture in health professions.

ENCLOSURE 14

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

To receive and discuss this paper and note the Registrar's comments on it.

ENCLOSURE 15

ITEM 16 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

ITEM 17 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

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

CONFIDENTIAL

Unconfirmed

NOTES of a meeting of the Educationalists Forum held on Wednesday 23 May 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 :-

Prof. Jackie Campbell* (Arts Therapists Board),
Mr. Alan Hutchinson* (Chiropodists Board),
Mrs. Catherine Lawrence* (Occupational Therapists Board),
Mr. Paul Turner (OT Board, teacher in HE),
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 Kathy Burgess and Ms Mary Embleton (Radiographers JVC),
Ms Sylvia Stirling (SLT JVC),
Ms Jenny Carey (Physiotherapists Joint Validation Committee), and
Mr. Paul Frowen (Chiropodists Joint Quality Advisory Committee).

Other relevant Board and Committee Chairmen:-

Miss Gill Pearson (Dietitians Board),
Mrs. Gail Stephenson (Orthoptists Board),
Prof. Diane Waller (AsTs Board).

Shadow Health Professions Council :-

Prof. Norma Brook (President)

Other Bodies:-

Ms Julie Swan and Ms Louise Holder (QAA),
Ms Eve Jagusiewicz (UUK), and
Prof. Catherine Geissler (for Dr. Margaret Sills (LTSN)).

CPSM Staff

Mr. Thomas Berrie)
Mr. Gerald Milch) – Assistant Registrar
Ms Niamh O'Sullivan)

Also in attendance

Dr. Dell Lowenthal, Universities Psychotherapy and Counselling Association

1. INTRODUCTION AND REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP

1.1 The Deputy Registrar introduced and welcomed new members.

1.2 Since the last meeting :-

1.2.1 The Shadow Health Professions Council (SHPC) had been appointed. Prof. Norma Brook was president and Prof. Anthony Hazell and Prof. John Harper (a current CPSM Council member) had been nominated by UUK and appointed to the SHPC. All three now received invitations to the Forum. Prof. Brook was congratulated and welcomed by acclamation.

1.2.2 Also since the last meeting Ms Jane Marr had been replaced by Ms Gi Cheeseman as the lead officer on work with the QAA at DoH.

1.2.3 Members noted that as from 25 April 2001 the NHS Executive had ceased to exist and had become part of DoH. The same announcement had included a reorganisation of Regional Offices co-inciding with the move from Consortia to Confederations.

1.3 " L. T. S. N. "

1.3.1 Professor Geissler was welcomed and was attending for the first time on behalf of the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN), Centre for Health Sciences and Practice. She introduced the work of this new body and in particular the report for Health Sciences and Practice : A Preliminary Needs Analysis ". LTSN operated in all HE sectors irrespective of funding.

1.3.2 There would be a two day " learning festival " in 2002 as a series of events in spring to autumn 2002. Members urged LTSN to base events in all four UK Home Countries and to make the English venue geographically central (eg. London or Birmingham).

1.3.3 Dr. Burley from CPSM had recently been appointed to the Advisory Board (joining Rosemary Simpson-Marks and Alan Walker from the PSM professional bodies).

1.3.4 Prof. Pittilo clarified that the Subject Benchmarking work (SB) had not been seeking to create a generic therapist.

1.3.5 An alignment with the Institute for Learning and Teaching was desirable, but proving complex in detail and was for the longer term.

1.3.6 The Forum did ask LTSN to consider bringing Radiotherapy into the same category as Diagnostic Radiography.

1.3.7 Prof. Geissler was thanked very much for attending and the Forum agreed that LTSN was a major new resource for the PSMs and for HPC in due course.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from :- Ms Helen Allen, Ms Patricia Ambrose, Prof. Hugh Barr and Ms Barbara Clague (CAIPE), Prof. Linda Challis, Miss Margaret Curr and Mr. Alan Walker, Prof. Peter Dangerfield, Prof. John Harper, Prof. Tony Hazell, Mrs Julia Henderson and Mr. Paul Shenton (H&CPEF), Prof. Judith Hitchen, Ms Ruth Howkins (QAA), Mr. Don Lorimer, Prof. Anne de Looy, Ms Giercia Malcolm, Mr. Rowan Malley, Prof. Geoff Meads, Dr. Gaye Powell, Ms Cathy Savage, Mrs Sandra Sexton, Prof. Mary Watkins, and Mrs Catherine Wells.

3. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The notes of the previous meeting held on 14 February 2001 were agreed as an accurate record.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 The Forum noted correspondence between the Chairmen of the Nursing and of the PAMs Shared Framework Subject Benchmarking Groups and DoH arising from the discussion on 14 February 2001. Subsequent to the letter of 26 February 2001 from Helen Fields, further clarificatory guidance had been issued by NHSE / DoH.

4.2 In the light of various discussions on 14 February 2001, the formal DoH guidance to Workforce Development Confederations was noted together with the formal notice of the merger of NHSE into DoH on 25 April 2001.

[4.3 The all day discussion on burdens on HEIs arising from new Codes as requested at 9.14 and 14 of the notes on 14 February 2001 had not been scheduled for 23 May 2001 because not all the documents were ready, the internal reorganisation of the DoH on 25 April 2001 had caused a hiatus in some of the relevant work, and the discussion at item 8.2 on para 25 of the QAA " Handbook for Academic Review " would remove one of the more significant burdens being complained of].

5. HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL AND APPOINTMENT OF SHADOW COUNCIL

5.1 The Forum received a report on recent progress towards the setting up of the Health Professions Council (HPC). DoH had held its meetings in the previous week on the Order in Council (OIC). A number of points had been clarified, including that the transition to new ways of working in the area of educational approval would be a measured process following consultation on a number of " Rules " and " Guidances ", which could not formally be started until after 1 April 2002.

5.2 The Forum urged that whatever transitional arrangements were made must preserve a continuity of business.

5.3 The Forum received the Press Release announcing the appointment of the Shadow HPC on 27 April 2001.

- 5.4 The Forum discussed the specifically educational provisions in the revised Order in Council as published on 2 April 2001.
- 5.5 Prof. Brook explained that the prerequisite for implementing the educational parts of the OIC would be liaison with the Boards and professional bodies on how to constitute Professional Advisory Committees. There was a presumption in favour of retaining the strengths of the current JVC system.
- 5.6 The Forum urged DoH to allow HPC the discretion not to have to publish every visit report. The requirement to publish if a report co-incided with personnel procedures being invoked against – say – a course leader would mean that the report could not include the information HPC would most need.
- 5.7 It was agreed that these views be communicated within CPSM and that individual members would also respond on matters within their expertise as appropriate.

6. PROFESSIONAL SUBJECT BENCHMARKS (SB)

- 6.1 QAA reported that the feed-back from editorial meetings was being worked on. The SBs would be published by July.
- 6.2 QAA reported the social work SB was informing the development of the new social work qualifications and that the nursing and PSM SBs were being considered by those involved with the benchmarking of medicine, dentistry, biomedical sciences, and other subjects.
- 6.3 It was agreed in the light of the thorough discussions and general agreement to date that an additional meeting did not need to be held to discuss the next draft of the SBs.
- 6.4 It was agreed that the SBs should be referred direct to relevant Boards and JVCs.

7. DoH / OAA CONTRACT

- 7.1 Ms Swan reported that the contract was now days away from being signed. After signature, reviewers for the prototype reviews could be recruited. The paper "H.E. Health Profession Programmes – the new Approach to QA in England" supported this item.
- 7.2 There was concern (expressed again at item 11) that the detailed understanding of the different parts of the modernisation agenda – and how NHS modernisation interacted with higher education modernisation – was not always shared by all the relevant stakeholders. Several Confederations were thought to be in some ignorance still, largely because of the pace of organisational change. There was also concern that all PSMs were sometimes considered to be alike and to be the same as nursing.
- 7.3 Mr. Turner reported that other bodies (eg. Council of Nursing Deans) shared these concerns and they would also be addressed elsewhere.

7.4 Ms Swan confirmed that the role of the contract (and of the DoH in-put to it) would be strictly defined. The issue of incorporating clinical placement experience in the reviews to be undertaken under the terms of the contract was addressed in the Academic Review Handbook.

7.5 There was continued uncertainty about the Education and Training Division (ETD) at DoH and delays in clarifying its role had been caused by organisational changes. It was noted that an option might be for each Confederation to have a Quality Assurance officer with the ETD playing only a co-ordinating role.

8. OAA HANDBOOK FOR ACADEMIC REVIEW OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS PROGRAMMES (SECOND DRAFT 26 APRIL 2001)

8.1 Ms Swan introduced the tabled paper (appended to these notes) explaining that :

- the current consultations were an informal exercise designed to . . .
- secure a workable, but not yet definitive document, for the autumn prototype reviews,
- all comment on the Handbook was welcome,
- it could be shared with colleagues provided its draft status was always made clear,
- a redraft and more formal consultation would take place after the conclusion of the prototype reviews, and
- a definitive version would be ready by early 2003.

8.2 In discussion of para 25 QAA agreed to consider allowing "representatives of" placement providers to agree the Self-Evaluation Documents with HEIs. This would retain the intention of this paragraph but reduce an otherwise impossible burden to manageable proportions.

8.3 It was acknowledged that this document would have a status and function analogous to that of JVC Handbooks. As a result all relevant Boards and JVCs should see it and be invited to comment.

9. INVESTMENT AND REFORM FOR NHS STAFF - TAKING FORWARD THE NHS PLAN IN ENGLAND

9.1 The Forum received this paper.

9.2 The Forum noted that while equivalent papers were expected for the other UK countries, only the intention to prepare them had been announced to date.

10. **MODERNISING PRE-REGISTRATION EDUCATION INVITATION TO BID**

- 10.1 The Forum received the DoH's letter of 27 April 2001.
- 10.2 Prof. Brook reported that the exercise had been initiated by a letter of 6 March 2001, which had received very limited circulation, and had been supported by a meeting between relevant Board Chairmen and DoH. The advice given by Board Chairmen, however, had not been reflected in the document.
- 10.3 Several members pointed out that the timetable (of final approval by April 2002) in the invitation was unrealistic even if HEIs only had to comply with their own procedures.
- 10.4 If the exercise was analogous to a modernisation initiative in nursing education in 1999, then approval by SRBs was implicit. However, many of the circumstances around that nursing initiative were very different from the position for PSMs now.
- 10.5 The Registrar's concerns were endorsed (as set out in the attached memo) and it was agreed to advise that :
- the Shadow President of HPC and Chairmen of CPSM should jointly communicate their concerns to DoH, and
 - all the affected Boards and JVCs should raise these concerns separately in their own right.

11. **EDUCATION COMMISSIONING**

Ms Stephenson reported on the conference held on 2 May 2001. She felt that it had been focused almost exclusively on nursing. It was, though, taking forward the agenda set out in "Investment and Reform for NHS Staff". Flexibility between courses had attracted much attention. The detailed understanding of how all the different initiatives interacted had not been demonstrated by the speakers.

12. **STUDENT PROGRESS FILES (SPF)**

The Forum received a report on QAA's conference on 13 March 2001 welcoming the linkage made between SPFs and SBs.

13. **NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE (NAO) REPORT, " EDUCATION AND TRAINING THE FUTURE HEALTH PROFESSIONAL WORKFORCE FOR ENGLAND "**

- 13.1 The Forum received for information this report published on 1 March 2001.
- 13.2 The report was commended as a " lever for improvement " and should be used as such.
- 13.3 NAO would be holding a conference on the report in the autumn.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled meeting would be held at 11.00 a.m. on 7 November 2001 (in Park House).