Agenda Item 2

Enclosure 1

Paper RC 1 / 02

REGISTRATION COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Registration Committee meeting held on 5 April 2002

From : Secretary to the Committee

FOR AGREEMENT AND SIGNING

184 Kennington Park Road
London SE11 4BU
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7582 0866
Fax: +44 (0)20 7820 9684
e-mail: lucindapilgrim@cpsm.org.uk

MINUTES of the second meeting of the Registration Committee of the Health Professions Council held on Friday 5 April 2002 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SW11 4BU.

PRESENT :

Prof. R. Klem – Chairman
Miss P. Sabine – Vice-Chairman
Miss M. Crawford
Mr. P. Frowen

IN ATTENDANCE :

Prof. N. Brook – President, HPC
Prof. D. Waller (1st half-hour) – Chairman of ETC
Mr. M. Seale – Chief Executive / Registrar, HPC
Ms G. Malcolm – Director of Operations, HPC
Mr. P. Burley (1st half-hour) – Director of Education and Policy, HPC
Miss L. Pilgrim – Assistant Registrar, HPC
Mr. G. Ross-Sampson – Project Manager, HPC
Mrs. C. Gooch – Newchurch

Prof. R. Klem and Miss P. Sabine were confirmed as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively of the Registration Committee.

ITEM 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from : Dr. R. Jones, Dr. A. Van Der Gaag, Miss E. Thornton, and Mr. C. Lea.

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE

It was **AGREED** that the notes of the meeting held on 10 December 2001 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

ITEM 3 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

ITEM 4 THE REGISTRATION PROCESS

The Chairman said that the meeting would primarily focus on identification and discussion of the information required for the consultation document.

Dr. P. Burley confirmed that the Registration Committee was a non-statutory committee of Council and reported to the Council via the Education and Training Committee.

Mr. G. Ross-Sampson explained that he had extracted the relevant references from the Health Professions Order which detailed the issues on which consultation was required.

Mrs. C. Gooch said that a draft consultation document had to be prepared by 23 April 2002. This document, although a draft, would contain all the necessary details, even if these had to be expanded at a later date. Mrs. Gooch said she needed the following :

(a) confirmation of any processes about which the Committee had already formed a view, or

(b) if no view had been formed and a debate was necessary before any view could be formed, the possible options open to the Committee;

or

(c) a " middle way " i.e. a " fairly firm " view had been formed about how certain processes could be carried out, options with a recommended option could be included in the consultation document.

Mr. M. Seale explained that the purpose of the consultation document would be to lead people through the issues on which the Council had to make decisions. The lay-out of the document would make it easy for people to extract the issues of particular interest to them. He said the Order in Council (OIC) was specific about the issues on which the HPC was required to consult.

The committee referred to Enclosure 3 of the Agenda, namely the main points from the OIC for consideration by the Registration Committee.

One issue for inclusion in the consultation document and about which a decision had to be made was the length of the " prescribed period " referred to in paragraph 9 (2) (a) (ii).

Prof. D. Waller said that one year was too short but that a 5 year maximum was reasonable. Prof. Klem said that the position would have to be considered too in the light of the E.C. Directives and EEA nationals to whom the Directives applied. This should be borne in mind when including the issue of the " prescribed period " in the consultation document.

Mrs. Gooch said that the HPC would have to distinguish between processes it would be following from the outset and those it would be following at a later date.

Prof. Klem asked the Committee to consider whether or not a mechanism was needed for approving qualifications outside the U.K. Prof. Brook commented that, although the OIC allowed the Council to approve overseas qualifications, practicability was questionable as courses would have to be approved every five years. Prof. Brook raised the issue of resources; although the financial cost would be the HEI's the time commitment from individuals was likely to be prohibitive. Prof. Klem reminded the Committee that there was also the issue of equity to be considered. Institutions in any country would need to be able to submit courses to be assessed in the same way and against the same criteria, determine that individuals completing them attained the same standards of proficiency. The approval of non-U.K. qualifications and the procedure for doing this would be an issue for consultation.

The Committee noted that standards of proficiency necessary to ensure safe and effective practice would be established by the HPC. Prof. Brook said that if an applicant failed to demonstrate that they could practise safely and effectively they would then have to undergo a period of adaptation or an aptitude test. The Committee discussed the provision for a test of English language proficiency for overseas applicants and the apparent anomalous position with regard to EEA applicants. It was **AGREED** to seek advice by inviting Mr. J. Bracken to meet the Committee to discuss this issue.

ITEM 5 STANDING ORDERS

Mr. Seale confirmed that Mr. J. Bracken had drafted Standing Orders for Council and that these had been presented to Council at its last meeting on 2 April 2002. Some re-adjustments would be made to the Standing Orders following the Council meeting. The amended Standing Orders would be presented to Council at its next meeting in May. Once the Council Standing Orders had been agreed the relevant sections would be extracted and adapted for the Registration Committee Standing Orders.

The Committee noted that this was not an issue for consultation.

ITEM 6 TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The Committee noted these.

ITEM 7 ORDERS IN COUNCIL FOR HPC

The Committee noted these.

ITEM 8 CPSM REGISTRATION AND APPEALS RULES

The Committee noted these.

ITEM 9 DRAFT REGISTRATION AND APPEALS RULES FOR HPC

Mr. Seale informed the Committee that Rules would have to be drafted for approval by the Privy Council and that the HPC would have to consult on the overall principles but not on the details of the rules.

ITEM 10 THE REGISTER

The committee considered that the main issues to be addressed were the purpose of the Register and the information consequently required to be recorded in it. This was something about which the HPC was required to consult. Several issues were raised, including, inter alia:

(a) would the Register be electronic only; or both electronic and hard copy ?

(b) which address(es) would be published; a registrant's work/practice or home address?

(c) how much of the register would be accessible to the public ?

(d) what information would be required by and should be given to the public ?

(e) what would be the situation where a registrant was dual qualified ?

(f) what information would registrants be required to give HPC in order to stay on the Register ? It was **AGREED** that registrants should be asked for their National Insurance number.

Ms G. Malcolm confirmed that there was two-tier access to the Register currently:

(1) anybody could look under a registrant's number or surname to check that they were registered – the town where the registrant practised was accessible to anybody.

(2) a password was given to supervisors / managers who could log on and browse through the Register and see names and addresses of registrants. The password expired after one year.

ITEM 11 PROTECTION OF TITLE

The Council would have to determine what titles would be protected under each part of the Register. The Committee was referred to Enclosure 9 which detailed the titles to be protected under the OIC : (a) titles already protected under the PSM Act 1960; (b) general titles, and (c) titles specific to parts of the Register. It was confirmed that, with respect to (c), the Professional Bodies had been consulted. The list would be considered by the HPC, via the Education and Training Committee. The list would be included in the Consultation document.

The Committee queried the position in cases where a profession was referred to by the use of joint terms, e.g. prosthetist & orthotist. Would the protection of one title only by implication mean that the other title was also protected. This question would be put to Mr. Bracken when he joined the committee on 8 May 2002.

ITEM 12 DESIGNATORY TITLES

It was **AGREED** that letters after names would omitted but that it would be necessary to obtain this information from registrants in order that they could be included in the correct section of the Register to enable their area(s) of specialty / scope of practice to be accurately reflected. Letters after registrants' names would still be held on HPC's database. It was also **AGREED** that no indication would be given that a registrant had been trained overseas. Mrs. Gooch confirmed that she had enough information about this issue to include in the consultation document.

It was **AGREED** that the question of CPD would be included in the consultation document but it would be a brief reference, stating that within the next five years CPD would be required in order for a registrant to remain on the Register.

The Committee discussed the subdivisions of the Register. It was **AGREED** in the first instance that the divisions would be as follows : (a) Practising; (b) Academic; (c) Manager; (d) Other. The Committee considered that this was another matter about which Mr. Bracken could offer advice.

ITEM 13 APPROVED QUALIFICATIONS

Ms Malcolm said that there was no list of approved qualifications because the twelve professions currently regulated by the HPC were not in the Sectoral Directives.

Prof. Klem said that there were two main issues: (a) approving courses and qualifications; and (b) overseas applicants providing information about the courses they had taken, for the purposes of being assessed with a view to becoming State Registered. The Committee discussed the process for assessing and recommending State Registration of overseas applicants. There appeared to be some anomalies between the assessment procedures for EEA applicants under EU Directives and other overseas applicants. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful to seek advice from Mr. Bracken.

For the purposes of the consultation document it would say that an applicant who had not met the required standard of proficiency would have to undergo a period of adaptation or successfully complete an aptitude test/test of competence.

ITEM 14 PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The Committee noted that these issues were not for consultation but would need to be dealt with by the Committee at a later stage.

ITEM 15 GRANDPARENTING

Another issue for consultation was Article 13 of the OIC. This article applied to those who were not state registered at the date of the OIC coming into force but who applied to be state registered within two years of that date. The Article raised questions about when an applicant could be considered to have applied for admission to the Register – at the point of application or after the grandparenting process had been completed ?

It was **AGREED** that the Committee would ask Mr. Bracken to attend the next Committee meeting on 8 May 2002 and to include this as another issue on which to seek advice .

The Committee noted that there had to be provision for a test of competence. There would also have to be a statement about Grandparenting which would apply across all professions. This would be a statement of general principles only, and not of details. The Committee considered the " Draft Common Application Form " at Enclosure 11. It considered that the term "Transitional Provisions", as in the OIC would be used to avoid confusion. Although there would be a common application form and process to be used by all the professions it was acknowledged that some variation in detail would be required to accommodate the different professions.

ITEM 16 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting of the committee would take place on Wednesday 8 May 2002 at 10.00 a.m. at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU.

ITEM 17 MINISTERS' LISTS FOR THE HPC

The HPC had to decide what to do about the names on this list. In particular, did the list give these people the right to be on the Register as they had been under the PSM Act ? It was agreed that clarification was required.

CHAIRMAN