

THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL

Chief Executive and Registrar: Mr Marc Seale

Park House
 184 Kennington Park Road
 London SE11 4BU
 Telephone: +44 (0)20 7840 9710
 Fax: +44 (0)20 7840 9807
 e-mail: colin.bendall@hpc-uk.org

MINUTES of the twenty-ninth meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on **Thursday 28 September 2006** at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU.

PRESENT: Miss E Thornton (Chairman)
 Mrs S Chaudhry
 Ms H Davis
 Mrs S Drayton
 Ms E Ellis
 Dr C H Green
 Professor T Hazell
 Mr S Hutchins
 Mr P McFadden
 Miss G Pearson
 Miss P Sabine
 Mrs B Stuart
 Professor D Waller

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr C Bendall, Secretary to the Committee
 Ms A Creighton, Education Manager
 Mr M Guthrie, Policy Officer
 Mr S Leicester, Finance Manager (part)
 Mr S Mars, Policy Officer
 Ms C Phillips, Project Manager (part)
 Mr G Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
 Ms C Savage, Manager, Continuing Professional Development and Aspirant Groups
 Mr M Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar
 Dr A van der Gaag, President

Item 1.06/55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Ms C Farrell, Professor J Harper, Professor C Lloyd, Professor J Lucas, Mr A Mount and Mr D Proctor.
- 1.2 The Chairman welcomed Ms Ellis to her first meeting of the Committee.

- 1.3 The Chairman welcomed the President to the meeting.

Item 2.06/56 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- 2.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 3.06/57 MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 13 JUNE 2006

- 3.1 The Committee agreed that the minutes of the twenty-ninth meeting of the Education and Training Committee should be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

Item 4.06/58 MATTERS ARISING

- 4.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 4.2 The Committee noted the action list as agreed at the last meeting.
- 4.3 The Committee noted that the action plan to prioritise strategic issues was due to be presented to the next meeting.

Action: RT (by 5 December 2006)

- 4.4 The Committee noted that the consultation on Standard of Education and Training 6.7.5 would take place in the autumn

Action: RT (ongoing)

Item 5.06/59 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

- 5.1 The Committee received a verbal report from the Chairman.
- 5.2 The Committee noted that the Chairman had attended the following meetings and events:
- July - approvals visit to an arts psychotherapy programme at an independent education provider;
 - Interviews for an Education Policy Manager. Following interviews, the panel felt that no candidate was suitable and the post would be readvertised;
 - Interviews for a Policy Manager. Ms Tripp had been the successful candidate.
- 5.3 The Committee noted that the Chairman had taken Chairman's action to approve further sample Continuing Professional Development (CPD) profiles for publication on the HPC's website.
- 5.4 The Committee noted that the Chairman had given a lecture on the Standards of CPD to an independent living event.

Item 6.06/60 EDUCATION MANAGER'S REPORT

- 6.1 The Committee received a report on the work of the Education - Approvals and Monitoring Department.
- 6.2 The Committee noted that the report covered approvals visits between 1 June and 31 July 2006 (the last visits of the 2005-6 academic year).
- 6.3 The Committee noted that the remaining submissions from education providers under the annual monitoring process would be considered by the Approvals Panel on 10 October.
- 6.4 The Committee noted that the Department would begin a series of presentations to education providers across the UK in October. The first event would be held at Ulster University on 4 October. The Committee noted that, due to the Council Awayday, no Council member would be available for that event.
- 6.5 The Committee noted that training for Visitors was due to be held in December 2006 and January 2007.
- 6.6 The Committee noted that there were vacancies for two Education Officers and that short-listing was due to take place in the week beginning 2 October 2006.
- 6.7 The Committee noted that the Department's current publications included supplementary information on annual monitoring and supplementary information on the major and minor change process. The Committee noted that the Department hoped to publish supplementary information on the approvals process in October.
- 6.8 The Committee noted that the Department had devised a protocol on advertising approved programmes, for use by education providers. The Department would send individual letters to providers, pointing out any inaccuracies concerning the HPC which appeared in prospectuses or on providers' websites.
- 6.9 The Committee thanked the Department for its work.

Item 7.06/61 FIVE YEAR PLAN

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. A revised version of the central case scenario, excluding detailed calculations of the number of registrants, was tabled.
- 7.2 The Committee noted that the Five Year Plan had last been updated in September 2005.

- 7.3 The Committee noted that the Finance and Resources Committee had discussed the plan at its meeting on 18 September and recommendations from that Committee were incorporated in the paper.
- 7.4 The Committee noted that the central case scenario proposed that all fees charged by the HPC would rise with effect from July 2007. The Committee noted that this would affect registrants renewing their registration over time, as the renewals cycle progressed. However, new applicants or those readmitted to the register would need to pay the increased registration, scrutiny or readmission fees with effect from July 2007.
- 7.5 The Committee noted that the central case proposed that a further fee rise would be considered in 2009 and subject to discussion by the appropriate Committees and Council. Any future proposal for fee rises would require a separate consultation.
- 7.6 The Committee noted the key assumptions of the central case, including:
- Fitness to Practise cases would increase from 375 to 936 during the period of the plan;
 - Four aspirant groups would be statutorily regulated during the period of the plan (applied psychologists; two groups of healthcare scientists; and counsellors and psychotherapists) but it was assumed that all existing Fitness to Practise cases for these professions would be resolved before statutory regulation commenced;
 - There would be no growth in UK graduate volumes; and
 - There would be no growth in international registration volumes.
- 7.7 The Committee noted that the alternative scenarios presented in the paper included a decrease in registrant volume (UK graduates coming onto the Register) of 10% and a decrease in registrant volume (UK graduates coming onto the Register) of 20%. The Committee noted that the Executive monitored the volume of registrants on an ongoing basis and the total number of registrants was reported to Council meetings in the Chief Executive's report.
- 7.8 The Committee agreed to recommend to Council the central case scenario as the updated Five Year Plan.

Action: SL (by 4 October 2006)

Item 8.06/62 PROPOSED CHANGES TO FEES

- 8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.

- 8.2 The Committee noted that the paper proposed that the revised fees should take effect from 1 July 2007, subject to the outcome of the consultation process and obtaining Privy Council approval of the proposed rise.
- 8.3 The Committee noted that the central case proposal had been recommended by the Finance and Resources Committee at its meeting on 18 September 2006, subject to increasing the renewal fee to £70 per annum and reducing volume estimates in years 3-5 of the Five Year Plan on the assumption that recruitment by employers would fall.
- 8.4 The Committee noted that some of the terms in the paper would be amended for the consultation document: "non graduates" meant individuals who applied for registration more than two years after graduating from an approved programme.
- 8.5 The Committee noted that students of all nationalities who graduated from an approved programme in the United Kingdom would be eligible to pay the registration fee for UK graduates.
- 8.6 The Committee noted that the HPC's internal auditors, PKF (UK) LLP, had developed a costing model which assigned HPC costs to the services able to be charged for under the Registration and Fees Rules Order of Council. In the costing model, 80% of the Approvals and Monitoring cost and the associated overhead costs were allocated to the UK Registration chargeable service. The rationale was that, of the fees which HPC was permitted to charge for, the cost of approving and monitoring programmes most closely aligned with the UK registration chargeable service.
- 8.7 The Committee noted that an appendix attached to the paper set out the HPC's general policies on fees which had been approved by the Council on 11 May 2006. These required that:
- the HPC should aim to avoid significant and deliberate cross-subsidisation between chargeable services;
 - fee rises should be made on a regular basis (i.e. every two or three years, or more often in high inflationary periods); and
 - fees should be set at a level to maintain the agreed reserves policy and ensure the HPC's financial viability.
- 8.8 The Committee supported the principle that there should be no significant cross-subsidisation across different chargeable services. However, there was concern among Committee members regarding the rate of increase of the initial registration fee for new graduates with an approved qualification.
- 8.9 The Committee noted that, under the Health Professions Order 2001, the HPC had no power to request a fee from education providers for considering whether to approve a programme.

- 8.10 The Committee agreed that it would be helpful for the Council to receive a summary of the points made by the Finance and Resources Committee on 18 September, to facilitate the Council's discussion about the Five Year Plan and the proposed fee increase.

Action: CB (by 4 October 2006)

- 8.11 The Committee agreed that scenario one (the central case fee outcome) in the paper, to take effect from July 2007, should be recommended to the Council, but the Committee's concern about issues debated in the proposed increased registration fee for UK graduates should be highlighted to Council.

Action: SL (by 4 October 2006)

Item 9.06/63 THE FUTURE OF THE APPROVALS COMMITTEE

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 9.2 The Committee noted that, at its meeting held on 13 June, it had agreed that it should review the future of the Approvals Committee as the processes for approving and monitoring programmes had now been established.
- 9.3 The Committee noted that some members felt that the Approvals Committee should continue in existence, to monitor development of the relatively new annual monitoring process and the major and minor changes process. However, it was agreed that the Education and Training Committee could directly oversee these matters.
- 9.4 The Committee noted that it was proposed that a Panel of the Education and Training Committee should be established with effect from 1 January 2007 to consider Visitors' reports, annual monitoring reports, major and minor changes to programmes and education providers' representations on Visitors' reports. It was proposed that the Panel should hold ten meetings a year, to allow timely consideration of Visitors' reports and other issues as they arose.
- 9.5 The Committee noted that the proposed Panel would have a quorum of three members of the Education and Training Committee, although five members would be invited to each Panel to ensure quoracy, in case a member was unavailable at short notice due to a diary clash or for personal reasons. The Committee noted that, to minimise the call on the HPC's resources and members' time, Panels would as far as possible be held on the same day as other meetings as it was anticipated that Panels would be relatively short meetings.

- 9.6 The Committee agreed to recommend to the Council that:
- (1) the Approvals Committee should be disbanded with effect from 31 December 2006;
 - (2) a Panel of the Education and Training Committee should be established with effect from 1 January 2007 and that it should meet 10 times a year and the arrangements should be as outlined above;
 - (3) the Education and Training Committee's Standing Orders should be amended accordingly;
 - (4) the Council should consider the matter of reallocation of members of the Approvals Committee to other committees; and
 - (5) the members of the Approvals Committee should be notified of the decisions.

Action: MJS (by 14 December 2006)

Item 10.06/64 STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING GUIDANCE

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 10.2 The Committee noted that the HPC had consulted on the Standards of Education and Training (SET) guidance for education providers between 1 February and 28 April 2006. The Committee noted that the paper included responses to the consultation and the amended guidance on the SETs. The guidance would undergo Plain English editing before being presented to the Council for approval.
- 10.3 The Committee noted that the document would be retitled "Standards of Education and Training Guidance".
- 10.4 The Committee noted that the draft guidance document would be updated to reflect the fact that SET 6.7.5 was subject to a separate consultation.
- 10.5 The Committee agreed that the summary of responses should include a clear statement that the HPC's processes were separate and independent from processes run by other organisations, such as professional bodies.
- 10.6 The Committee agreed that:
- (1) the text of the documents should be approved, subject to the amendments discussed;
 - (2) the consultation responses document should be published on the HPC's website; and
 - (3) the documents should be approved and recommended to the Council for approval.

Action: SM (by 14 December 2006)

Item 11.06/65 REVIEW OF THE STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY FOR OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONERS

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 11.2 The Committee noted that the Standards of Proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners had been published in July 2004 and the register for the profession had opened on 18 October 2004. The HPC had made a commitment to keep the standards unchanged during the grandparenting period, which would end on 17 October 2006.
- 11.3 The Committee noted that, in 2004, a Professional Liaison Group (PLG) had been established to review the Standards of Proficiency for the first twelve professions regulated by the HPC. The PLG had taken into account the views of the Association of Operating Department Practitioners and other stakeholders within the profession, in considering whether changes were necessary to the generic standards. The Committee noted that the generic standards would change in line with the recommendations of the PLG, as agreed by the Council on 6 July 2006.
- 11.4 The Committee noted that the workplan attached to the paper set out the proposed timetable of activities to review the profession-specific Standards of Proficiency for Operating Department Practitioners.
- 11.5 The Committee approved the workplan.

Action: MG (Ongoing to January 2008)

- 11.6 The Committee noted that the workplan included a discussion meeting with representatives from professional bodies and the Committee, to be held in early 2007. The Committee agreed that it should be represented at the meeting by Mrs Drayton, Mr Mount and the Chairman.

Action: MG, Mrs Drayton, Mr Mount, Chairman (by February 2007)

Item 12.06/66 CREATING AN INTER-PROFESSIONAL WORKFORCE

- 12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 12.2 The Committee noted that the Executive had contributed to the work of Creating an Interprofessional Workforce, a three year programme funded by the Department of Health and hosted by the South West Peninsula Strategic Health Authority. The project examined how education providers, regulators, health care providers and

commissioners could integrate, support and promote interprofessional learning and development (IPLD).

- 12.3 The Committee noted that a member of the Executive had participated in the Regulation and Quality Assurance Working Group, which included representatives from the General Medical Council, the Society and College of Radiographers, the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence and Skills for Health.
- 12.4 The Committee noted that, during meetings of the working group, there had been some discussion about the fact that the Standards of Education and Training did not have an affirmative statement of the importance of IPLD as an integral part of the standards.
- 12.5 The Committee felt that it would not be appropriate for a statement on IPLD to be included in the Standards of Education and Training, as the Standards of Proficiency already included a section on working with other professionals and as part of a multi-disciplinary team. The Committee agreed that each education provider was responsible for identifying and using the most appropriate learning opportunities and teaching methods for their students to ensure that the Standards of Proficiency are met.
- 12.6 The Committee noted that the Executive would keep it informed of developments.

Action: MG (Ongoing)

Item 13.06/67 APPROVED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 13.2 The Committee noted that an amendment to the Mental Health Act 1983 would create a new role, approved mental health professional (AMHP), which would be open to social workers, nurses and occupational therapists.
- 13.3 The Committee noted that the Department of Health had proposed that AMHP training would be approved by the General Social Care Council, in conjunction with the Nursing and Midwifery Council and the HPC. This would involve the regulators agreeing the training requirements and quality assurance standards. The detailed arrangements for joint approval had not yet been explained.
- 13.4 The Committee noted that each local authority would make a decision on whether to approve an AMHP to act on their behalf under the terms of the Mental Health Act. Approval by a local authority would last for five years and approved professionals could move between local

authorities and act on their behalf without the need for re-approval by each authority.

- 13.5 The Committee noted that the Department of Health believed that a central record of AMHP approval was needed to protect the public and the Department was seeking the views of regulators in relation to the annotation of approval. It was proposed that the HPC's Register should be annotated.
- 13.6 The Committee noted that there was a lack of clarity about how an annotation on the Register would help to protect the public, as the Register was intended to reflect fitness to practise while AMHP approval reflected fitness of purpose for a particular role.
- 13.7 The Committee noted that some members were concerned that the proposal reflected a wider move toward distributed regulation.
- 13.8 The Committee agreed that, in responding to the Department of Health, the Executive should seek clarification on whether the proposals also applied to Wales and seek an explanation of the rationale for the proposed extension of the role of AMHP to other professionals.

Action: MG (by 5 December 2006)

- 13.9 The Committee approved the interim position statement set out in appendix 2 of the paper.

Action: MG (ongoing)

Item 14.06/68 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUDIT SAMPLE SIZE

- 14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 14.2 The Committee noted that, in July 2005, the HPC had agreed the Standards for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and to link re-registration to meeting those Standards. From July 2006, all registrants had been required to participate in CPD activities and maintain an up-to-date record of activities in a portfolio. At each registration renewal point, each registrant was required to sign a declaration that they continued to practise their profession and had met the HPC's Standards.
- 14.3 The Committee noted that, following the CPD consultation on the proposed Standards and processes, the HPC had decided that a 5% sample of the first two professions (Chiropodists and Podiatrists and Operating Department Practitioners) should be audited and required to

provide their CPD profile to the HPC. Thereafter, 2.5% of subsequent professions would be audited.

- 14.4 The Committee noted that the paper asked it to consider whether the audit sample size for the first two professions should be set at 100 audits per profession (in accordance with earlier advice received from the statistical services unit at the University of Reading) or whether the sample size should be based on 5% of the Register. The Committee agreed that the second option should be adopted, although the sample sizes could be reviewed after the first full cycle of audits taking factors into account such as failure rates.

Action: CS (Ongoing)

- 14.5 The Committee agreed that the Executive should provide a progress report on implementation of CPD processes for the next meeting.

Action: CS (by 5 December 2006)

Item 15.06/69 DATES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2007-8

- 15.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 15.2 The Committee noted the meeting dates in 2007-8 which had been agreed by the Chairman.

Item 16.06/70 REPORTS FROM EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES AT EXTERNAL MEETINGS

- 16.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive.
- 16.2 The Committee noted the reports from representatives of the Committee.

Item 17.06/71 UNCONFIRMED MINUTES OF THE APPROVALS COMMITTEE HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

- 17.1 The Committee noted the unconfirmed minutes of the Approvals Committee held on 5 September 2006.

Item 18.06/72 REGULATION OF HEALTHCARE SUPPORT WORKERS

- 18.1 The Committee received a paper for information from the Executive, detailing the current situation with regard to regulation of non-professional healthcare staff (healthcare support workers).

- 18.2 The Committee noted that the regulation of healthcare support workers was a matter for the devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Item 19.06/73 HEALTH AND CHARACTER DECLARATIONS

- 19.1 The Committee received a paper for information from the Executive, detailing the number of Health and Character declarations which had been made on renewal, admission or readmission to the register.
- 19.2 The Committee agreed that it should receive a paper from the Executive, providing clarification on the statistics.

Action: KJ (by 5 December 2006)

- 19.3 The Committee agreed that the Health Committee should receive clarification of the statistics for its information.

Action: KJ (Ongoing to 2007)

Item 20.06/74 SUMMARY OF COST ALLOCATIONS IN THE COSTING MODEL

- 20.1 The Committee received a paper for information from the Executive, setting out the detailed calculations of indicate unit costs for services provided by the HPC (registration, readmission, renewal, international application scrutiny and grandparenting application scrutiny).
- 20.2 The Committee noted that the detailed analysis in the costing model was a significant improvement in strategic planning and would facilitate transparency about the HPC's finances.

Item 21.06/75 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 21.1 There was no other business.

Item 22.06/76 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

- 22.1 The next meeting of the Committee would be held at 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday 5 December 2006.
- 22.2 Subsequent meetings would be held at 10.30 a.m. on:
 Wednesday 28 March 2007
 Tuesday 12 June 2007
 Thursday 27 September 2007
 Tuesday 4 December 2007
 Wednesday 26 March 2008
 Tuesday 10 June 2008

CHAIRMAN

DATE