

## Education and Training Committee

**Public minutes of the 46th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:**

**Date:** Thursday 16 September 2010

**Time:** 10:30 am

**Venue:** The Council Chamber, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

**Members:**

Eileen Thornton (Chair)  
Gerald Armstrong-Bednall  
Mary Clark-Glass  
Jo-anne Carlyle  
Helen Davis  
John Harper (items 1-15)  
Jeff Lucas  
Stuart Mackay  
Arun Midha (items 1-17)

Gill Pearson  
Penny Renwick  
Deep Sagar  
Jeff Seneviratne  
Jois Stansfield  
Annie Turner  
Joy Tweed  
Diane Waller  
Stephen Wordsworth.

**In attendance:**

Osama Ammar, Acting Director of Education  
Alison Dittmer, Policy Officer  
Brendon Edmonds, Education Manager  
Anna van der Gaag, Chair of the Council  
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards  
Steve Rayner, Secretary to the Committee  
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

## Part 1 – Public Agenda

### **Item 1 Chair's welcome**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the Committee.

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

- 2.1 Apologies were received from John Donaghy, Stephen Hutchins and Robert Smith.

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

- 3.1 The Committee agreed that item 18 on the agenda, relating to student fitness to practice, would be moved into the section for general discussion and approval, and would be taken as item 15.
- 3.2 The Committee approved the agenda.

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

- 4.1 Gerald Armstrong-Bednall notified the Committee that he had been appointed to the Board of Modernising Scientific Careers. The Committee did not consider this to constitute a conflict of interests.
- 4.2 Gerald would keep the Committee informed regarding the work of the Board.
- 4.3 There were no further declarations of interest.

### **Item 5 Minutes of the meeting of 8 June 2010**

- 5.1 The minutes were accepted as a true record, subject to minor editing changes, and signed by the Chair.

### **Item 6 Matters arising**

- 6.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive summarising actions taken against matters from previous meetings.
- 6.2 The Committee noted that the actions.

### **Item 7 Director of Education's report**

7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department (the Department) between March and June 2010, providing updates on ongoing projects, and providing a report on a review of the approvals process.

7.2 The Committee noted the following key activities for the Department:

#### Seminars

7.2.1 The report included details of education provider seminars for 2010. The Department extended an invitation to Committee members to attend the seminars.

#### Projects on hold

7.2.2 The Committee noted that some projects had been placed on hold by the department pending government decisions around the regulation of new professions. The work plan would be updated as necessary as information had been received.

7.3 The Committee noted the Director's report.

### **Item 8 Education workplan 2011-12**

8.1 The Committee received a paper for information and to make recommendations to the Department regarding the draft education workplan for 2011-2012.

8.2 The Committee had discussed the work planning process at its meeting on 8 June 2010 as part of an item on the education annual reports, and was due to discuss the 2011-12 workplan at its annual strategy meeting on 18 November.

8.3 This paper was intended to enhance the development of the workplan at the strategy meeting by providing a list of potential areas of work, identified by the Committee, by the Education Department and by external feedback providers, for consideration by the committee.

8.4 The item provided a first opportunity for the committee to discuss the appropriateness of individual items on the list; to discuss the relative priorities between items; and discuss new items for inclusion.

8.5 The Committee noted that projects relating to the potential regulation of Social workers by the HPC had been included in the items for consideration, as were the regulation of any new profession to go ahead it would have significant impact on a number of other projects. The Committee noted that, whilst the projects should be taken into account when considering the remainder of the Education department workplan, discussions regarding the regulation of social workers should be held over until the Council had

considered and made recommendations regarding the issue at its meeting on 17 September 2010.

- 8.6 The Committee noted the workplan, and provided the following suggestions to be taken into account when developing the list for consideration:

Professions recently entered onto the register

8.6.1 Committee members had noted that patterns appeared to be emerging in relation to new profession visits and conditions around assessment standards in defining objective assessment criteria and implementing a system formative assessment in advance of summative pass/fail assessments.

8.6.2 The Committee noted the current work taking place to review the outcomes from the first year of new profession visits and suggested that further work may arise from the patterns that are presented by the visits to new profession programmes.

Practice placements

8.6.3 The Committee noted the continuing trend of a high number of conditions on approval being attached to practice placement standards. The Committee agreed that further communication work was required and that future education seminars may be appropriately themed to assist with communicating the requirements of the standards of education and training.

Curriculum guidance

8.6.4 The Committee noted that HPC's position on the provision of curriculum guidance should remain an issue for consideration in light of changes to the standards of proficiency and standards of education and training.

Modernising careers

8.6.5 The Committee noted that if the modernising scientific careers initiative produced results during the year 2011-12 it would have an impact on the work of the department, and should be considered when developing the workplan. The Committee also noted the wider agenda of modernisation that may impact other professions also.

Responsiveness to the devolved governments

8.6.6 The Committee considered the importance of ensuring that any future work is responsive to the devolved governments and also sensitive to the impact it may have in each home country.

- 8.7 The Committee noted the remaining items on the list.

**ACTION: Director of Education** to take the Committees suggestions into account when developing the long list for consideration by the Committee at its strategy day on 18 November.

**Item 9 Service user involvement in approval and monitoring processes**

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval regarding service user involvement in the approval and monitoring processes of the Education Department.
- 9.2 The area of work had been developed initially as a response to the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (CHRE) performance review 2007/8 and had been discussed by the Committee at its meetings on 10 March and 8 June 2010.
- 9.3 The Committee had agreed at its last meeting that the greatest impact on service user involvement on approved programmes would come about from the proposed amendments to the standards of education and training. The Committee had agreed that changes should take place before the next cyclical review of the standards in 2014. The Committee asked the executive to consider this in the detailed implementation plan for the changes to standards of education and training.
- 9.4 The Committee had also agreed at the last meeting that the concepts of service user involvement and of lay representation on HPC approval visit panels should be taken forward as separate issues.
- 9.5 The Committee were invited to discuss the issues in the paper and agree recommendations for further work by the Executive.
- 9.6 The Committee did not agree that it had been given compelling evidence that regulatory involvement in promoting involvement of service users added value to the existing work taking place by education providers.
- 9.7 The Committee noted that some type of service user engagement was becoming the norm in the development of policy by public bodies. Some education providers were already engaging with service users in a number of ways when planning and developing courses.
- 9.8 The Committee did not reach a consensus on whether a new standard should be developed, but noted that some action must be taken regarding service user engagement.
- 9.9 The Committee agreed that a further paper was required in relation to the issue of the Committee's role in relation to service user involvement. The Director of Policy was asked to compile a paper outlining the work done to date by the Committee and the work of other bodies approving and monitoring education and training.

**ACTION: Director of Policy** to submit a paper to a future meeting of the Committee.

**Item 10 Pilot of lay members on approval visit panels**

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and to provide recommendations to the Executive regarding the development of a pilot to include lay members on panels conducting approval visits to education programmes.
- 10.2 The area of work had been developed initially as a response to the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (CHRE) performance review 2007/8 and had been discussed by the Committee at its meetings on 10 March and 8 June 2010.
- 10.3 The Committee had agreed at the last meeting that the concepts of service user involvement and of lay representation on HPC approval visit panels should be taken forward as separate issues.
- 10.4 The Committee had directed the Education Department to investigate conducting a pilot of lay partners on approval visit panels. As directed by the panel, the paper provided information regarding:
  - the schedule of implementation;
  - potential implementation models; and
  - any other major issues to consider.
- 10.5 The Committee were invited to discuss the paper, and make recommendations for further work by the Executive.
- 10.6 The Committee noted that lay representation was standard practice across other elements of HPC practice, including on Fitness to Practice Panels, Council and Committees [and that the executive was 'lay in its entirety'].
- 10.7 The Committee did not consider that it had received sufficient evidence that lay involvement would add value to the approvals and monitoring process, a pilot would be a valuable source of evidence.
- 10.8 The Committee noted that, whilst the pilot may be beneficial, it was not viewed as being of greater priority than other areas of the Committee's work. Any decision to proceed should be considered in line with other priorities.
- 10.9 The Committee agreed:
  - that a pilot including lay visitors on approval visit panels in 2011-12 academic year should be added to the list for activities for 2011-12 to be considered at the November meeting; and, should a pilot be undertaken;

- that the Executive use a model involving panels of 3 members, including one lay visitor,
- that the Executive apply the pilot to a minimum of 5 approval visits and a maximum of 10; and
- that the Executive design the pilot in order to address the objectives and assess the criteria set.

**ACTION: Director of Education** to include a Pilot of lay members on approval visit panels with list of projects to the November meeting.

**Item 11 Changes to prescribing rights for chiropodists/podiatrists and physiotherapists**

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval regarding a Department of Health project to extend independent prescribing rights to chiropodists/podiatrists and to physiotherapists.
- 11.2 The paper provided information on the implications of changes to prescribing rights, and included recommendations from the Executive for a new approach to setting standards for prescribing.
- 11.3 The Committee was invited to discuss the paper and make recommendations for further work by the Executive.
- 11.4 The Committee noted that standard was clear in that the changes to prescribing rights specifically extended to the prescription of medicine only, and that practitioners existing prescribing responsibilities would not change.
- 11.5 The Committee noted that any decision should be made 'in principle', pending the outcome of a consultation and engagement campaign being run by the Department of Health.
- 11.6 The Committee agreed in principle:
- that the Executive draft standards for independent prescribing depending upon the outcomes of the public consultation by the Department of Health;
  - that the standards should sit alongside standards for supplementary prescribing in a separate document; and
  - that the Executive provide the Committee with regular updates on the progress of the AHP medicines project board.

**ACTION: Policy Manager** to deliver the actions outlined in 11.6 as appropriate, following the conclusions of the Department of Health consultation process.

## **Item 12 Amendments to health psychologists standards of proficiency**

- 12.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive presenting the outcome of a consultation into changes to the standards of proficiency for health psychologists.
- 12.2 The consultation had taken place in response to feedback that one of the domain specific standards was potentially confusing and was not a threshold standard.
- 12.3 The Committee were invited to discuss the paper, and make recommendations to the Council.
- 12.4 The Committee made the following recommendations to the Council:
  - that the standards of proficiency for health psychologists should be amended as outlined above; and
  - the text of the consultation responses document (subject to minor editing amendments), for publication on the HPC website.

**ACTION: Policy Manager** to provide the Committee's recommendations to the Council as a verbal update at its meeting of 17 September 2010.

## **Item 13 Hearing aid dispensers revised schedule of visits**

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussing and approval regarding the schedule of visits to approved hearing aid dispenser programmes over the following two academic years. The schedule had been developed following an annual monitoring audit of hearing aid dispenser programmes.
- 13.2 The paper presented a revised schedule of visits. The proposed changes to the schedule had been made by the Executive to take account of a programme which had been scrutinised a second time by visitors following realisation that an administrative error had occurred and that visitors were not initially in possession of all the available documentation .
- 13.3 The Committee was invited to discuss, and reach agreement, on whether to accept the visitors report and approve the revised visit schedule.
- 13.4 The Committee noted that in determining whether to approve a programme, the Committee must reach its decision on the basis of the evidence put before it, in the form of the visitors' report and any observations on the report made by the education provider.
- 13.5 The Committee noted that the visitors' report was only a recommendation and the Committee could depart from that recommendation where it was satisfied that it was appropriate to do so.



13.6 The Committee noted that it must reach its own decision and give reasons for that decision. If the Committee wished to amend the report, it should give reasons for each amendment.

13.7 The Committee's decision regarding the Foundation Degree in Hearing Aid Audiology, full time, delivered by Mary Hare and validated by Oxford Brookes University was:

- That the Visitors' report should be accepted and that an approval visit should be scheduled for the academic year 2011/12 to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

13.8 The reasons the Committee gave for approving the visitors report were as follows:

- An approval visit scheduled for the academic year 2011/12 is the most appropriate method to assess the programme against the standards of education and training.

13.9 The Committee approved the revised schedule of visits.

#### **Item 14 Practitioner psychologists list of approved programmes (current)**

14.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive for discussion and approval regarding minor changes to the list of agreed programmes for practitioner psychologists.

14.2 The Committee approved the current list at its meeting on 8 June 2010. Following that date the Department had received further information from Education Providers which resulted in changes to the way a number of courses were displayed in the list.

14.3 The Committee were invited to note the changes and agree that amendments could be made to the list.

14.4 The Committee noted the changes, and approved the amendments to the currently approved programmes as listed in appendix 1 of paper ETC 51/10.

#### **Item 15 Student Fitness to Practice**

15.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive to for discussion and approval regarding CHRE recommendations that regulators receive every outcome of education providers' student fitness to practise committees.

15.2 The paper provided information on the issue of student fitness to practise, as well as the outcomes of the CHRE report into student fitness to practise, published in February 2010. The CHRE report included a number of recommendations regarding student fitness to practise issues.

- 15.3 The Committee was invited to discuss the report and make recommendations for further work.
- 15.4 The Committee noted that the link between student fitness to practise issues and post qualification issues was not clear, and that the collection of aggregated data on student fitness to practise could be valuable.
- 15.5 The Committee noted that, whilst HPC did not have control over the fitness to practise processes of education providers currently delivering HPC courses, there was evidence that the independent fitness to practise processes of those providers had improved.
- 15.6 The Committee agreed that, whether regulators should have separate student registers was a separate issue.
- 15.7 The Committee noted that research had just been published into student fitness to practise.. The Committee noted that it may be useful to invite the author to a future meeting of the committee to discuss the research.
- 15.8 The Committee agreed:
- that the HPC should not require applicants and education providers to declare information about student fitness to practise sanctions.
  - that the HPC should explore carrying out research to collect aggregated data about student fitness to practise outcomes.
  - that the HPC should explore the possibilities for work with education providers to share good practice in the management of student fitness to practise issues.
  - That the Executive return to a future meeting of the committee setting out options for further work, and exploring the resource implications of those options.

**ACTION: Director of Policy and Standards** to arrange for updates on the research being conducted, as part of the revalidation programme into the link between pre-registration education and training and subsequent fitness to practise, to be submitted to the committee for information on a yearly basis.

**ACTION: Policy Officer** to bring a paper to a future meeting of the Committee setting out options for the further work described in 15.8 above.

## **Item 16 Withdrawal of ongoing approval**

- 16.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive to note providing an update on the current status of a project to withdraw approval from programmes which either have no students, or are no longer recruiting additional cohorts.
- 16.2 The Committee noted the project update.

**Item 17 Consulting on amendments to the Guidance on health and character**

- 17.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive to note providing an update to the timetable for the removal of the health reference requirement for HPC registration in January 2011.
- 17.2 The Council had agreed to remove the requirement at its meeting in July following a recommendation from the Committee at its meeting of 8 June 2010.
- 17.3 The Committee noted the update.

**Item 18 Workforce planning**

- 18.1 The Committee received a paper from Council member Jeff Lucas, regarding educational commissioning for the health and social care professions.
- 18.2 The paper was intended to be submitted to the Council to help discussion at its away day in October, but had been provided to the Committee to allow members an opportunity to contribute to that discussion.
- 18.3 The Committee were invited to note the paper and provide any comments in writing to the Chair for inclusion in the Council's discussion at its away day in October.
- 18.4 The Committee noted that a useful addition to the report data would be comparable data on non Multi Professional Education and Training levy professionals.
- 18.5 The Committee noted that an issue of relevance for the committee may be the relationship between additional penalties and student fitness to practise outcomes. The risk was likely to increase that education providers would be tempted to keep failing or unfit students on programmes in order to retain funding that they had received for them.

**Item 19 Review of annual monitoring activities of pre-registered education and training delivered by UK ambulance trusts**

- 19.1 The Committee received a paper to note providing a review of the annual monitoring activities of pre-registration education and training delivered by UK ambulance trusts. The review was an initial version, as the data set was not yet complete.
- 19.2 A final report would be provided to the Committee at its meeting on 18 November 2010.

## **Item 20 Committee standing orders**

- 20.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive providing the Committee's standing orders for information.
- 20.2 Standing orders were provided to the Committee on a yearly basis to provide as an element of good governance, and provided an opportunity for members to discuss any issues they may have with the standing orders, or ask for clarification on the role of the Committee.
- 20.3 The Committee noted that the standing orders stated that the standing orders did not state that the Chair cleared the agenda. The procedure followed by the Executive was that the Chair was given an opportunity to comment on the agenda, and approved a draft, but that the final draft agenda was the responsibility of the Executive. The final agenda was the responsibility of the Committee, and was approved as item one of each meeting.
- 20.4 The Committee noted the standing orders.

## **Item 21 Panel decisions**

- 21.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive to note providing the decisions made by Panels of the Committee between June and August 2010.
- 21.2 The Committee noted the decisions.

## **Item 22 Any other business**

- 22.1 There was no further business.

## **Item 23 Future meetings of the Committee.**

- 23.1 Further meetings of the Committee would be held on:
- Thursday 18 November 2010
  - Thursday 10 March 2011
  - Thursday 9 June 2011
  - Thursday 8 September 2011
  - Thursday 17 November 2011

The Committee was invited to adopt the following resolution:

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

- (1) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or applicant for registration;
- (5) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Committee or the Council;
- (7) the source of information given to the Committee in confidence;

## Part 2 – Private agenda

### **Item 24 Minutes of the private part of the meeting of 8 June 2010**

24.1 The minutes were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chair.

### **Item 25 Education provider complaint**

25.1 The Committee received an investigation report for consideration from visitors regarding a complaint received in August 2009 in respect of the Doctorate in Counselling and Psychotherapy by Professional Studies (DCPsych) programme delivered by the Metanoia Institute, London.

25.2 The Committee noted observations on the visitors' report, which had been submitted by the complainant and by the Metanoia Institute, and legal advice regarding the complaint received from the HPC's solicitors, Bircham, Dyson Bell.

25.3 The Committee agreed with the conclusion of the visitors report; that there was no case to answer, and therefore no further action was necessary.

### **Item 26 Any other business**

26.1 There was no further business.