

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 54th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 13 September 2012

Time: 10:30 am

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

Members:

Eileen Thornton (Chair)	Stuart Mackay
Jo-anne Carlyle	Arun Midha
Mary Clark-Glass	Penny Renwick
June Copeman	Jeff Seneviratne
John Donaghy	Joy Tweed
Helen Davis	Diane Waller
Stephen Hutchins	Stephen Wordsworth
Jeff Lucas	

In attendance:

Colin Bendall, Acting Secretary to the Committee
Alison Croad, Policy Officer
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Educational Development
Abigail Gorringe, Director of Education
Hayley Graham, Partner Manager
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Richard Houghton, Head of Registration
Paula Lescott, Education Manager
Matthew Nelson, Education Officer
Abdur Razzaq, Education Officer
Greg Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

Part 1 – Public Agenda

Item 1 Chair's welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee and employees in attendance to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Committee noted that, following a recruitment process in July-August 2012, interviews would be held on 14 September 2012 for the occupational therapist and social worker members of the Committee. No applications had been short-listed for the hearing aid member of the Committee and it was likely that recruitment for that vacancy would be put on hold until decisions were made about the future of the Committee.
- 1.3 The Committee noted that the HCPC's consultation on service user involvement in education programmes had started on 3 September 2012. The consultation period was due to end on 7 December 2012. Several responses to the consultation had already been received.

Item 2 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Robert Smith, Jois Stanfield, Anna van der Gaag (Chair of the Council) and Marc Seale (Chief Executive and Registrar).

Item 3 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 Diane Waller declared an interest in item 9 (consultation on profession-specific standards of proficiency for arts therapists) as President of the British Association of Arts Therapists.

Item 5 Minutes of the meeting of 12 June 2012 (ETC 41/12)

- 5.1 The minutes were accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Item 6 Matters arising from previous meetings (ETC 42/12)

- 6.1 The Committee noted the list of actions agreed at previous meetings.

Item 7 Director of Education's report (ETC 43/12)

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department between June and September 2012, providing updates on ongoing projects and statistics on the approval and monitoring process.

- 7.2 The Committee noted that the report covered work at the end of the 2011-12 academic year and planning for the 2012-13 academic year.
- 7.3 The Committee noted that the Department was scheduling visits to social work education programmes for the 2012-13 academic year and for the next two academic years. Recruitment and training had taken place for social worker Visitors. The Department was preparing for the largest number of education seminars to date, including three introductory seminars for social work education providers. Visits to social work programmes were due to start in April 2013.
- 7.4 The Committee noted that, since its last meeting, the Department had received one new complaint about an education programme. The issues were outside of the remit of the complaints process, so the Department had been unable to investigate.
- 7.5 The Committee thanked the Department for its work and noted the Director's report.

Item 8 HCPC position statement on the NHS Clinical Leadership Competency Framework (ETC 44/12)

- 8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding the NHS Clinical Leadership Competency Framework (CLCF), a framework for leadership development within the National Health Service (NHS).
- 8.2 At its meeting on 8 March 2012, the Committee had considered a paper about the framework and its links with the standards of proficiency. The Committee had agreed that a position statement should be produced to set out the Committee's position on the CLCF; the CLCF's links to the HCPC's standards; and what the CLCF might mean for education providers.
- 8.3 The Committee held a discussion regarding the draft position statement, during which discussion the following points were raised:
- 8.3.1 The Committee agreed that the paper and the position statement were very clear and helpful;
- 8.3.2 The Committee noted that information from the previous paper, which had mapped the CLCF against the HCPC's standards, would be published alongside the position statement;
- 8.3.3 The last sentence of paragraph 3.6 should be amended to state that, 'as appropriate', the HCPC would publish example documents showing how the CLCF descriptors mapped across to the HCPC's standards.

- 8.4 The Committee approved the position statement, subject to minor editing amendments and the changes arising from the Committee's discussion under paragraph 8.3.

Item 9 Results of consultation on profession-specific standards of proficiency for arts therapists (ETC 45/12)

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive providing the results and analysis by the Executive of a consultation on the profession-specific standards of proficiency for arts therapists.
- 9.2 The review of profession-specific standards had followed from the Council's approval of new generic standards of proficiency in March 2011. The Committee noted that analysis of the consultations on the profession-specific standards of proficiency for four other professions would be discussed at its next meeting.
- 9.3 The Committee held a discussion regarding the consultation response analysis and draft standards of proficiency, during which discussion the following points were raised:
- 9.3.1 The responses to the consultation had generally supported the proposed changes to the standards. Suggested additional standards were set out in appendix 2 to the consultation response analysis and respondents' detailed comments on the draft standards were set out in appendix 3. Section 5 of the consultation response analysis set out the HCPC's comments and the proposed decisions in response to the consultation;
- 9.3.2 Some members felt that the HCPC should raise awareness among stakeholders about the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE), possibly by cross-referencing those standards in the profession-specific standards of proficiency. The Committee noted that respondents' comments about ethical and conduct issues would be picked up by the Executive in the next review of the SCPE;
- 9.3.3 Some respondents had commented on use of the wording 'be aware of' and 'be able to' in the standards of proficiency. The Committee noted that the consultation document had explained the reasons for using that wording
- 9.4 The Committee recommended that the Council approve the consultation response analysis and draft standards of proficiency for arts therapists.

ACTION: Policy Officer to present the response analysis and draft standards of proficiency to the Council for discussion and approval at its meeting of 18 October 2012.

Item 10 Results of consultation on profession-specific standards of proficiency for orthoptists (ETC 46/12)

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive providing the results and analysis by the Executive of a consultation on the profession-specific standards of proficiency for orthoptists.
- 10.2 The review of profession specific standards followed from the Council's approval of new generic standards of proficiency in March 2011.
- 10.3 The Committee held a discussion regarding the consultation response analysis and draft standards of proficiency, during which discussion the following points were raised:
 - 10.3.1 Respondents had generally been supportive of the approach to the draft standards and had suggested a small number of amendments.
 - 10.3.2 It was proposed that standard 8.9 ('recognise the need to modify interpersonal skills for the assessment and management of children') should remain in the standards to reflect the need for orthoptists to be able to work appropriately with children.
 - 10.3.3 The Committee agreed that consideration might be given to producing 'frequently asked questions' or a similar document to address the misunderstandings and comments raised in the consultation about the standards of proficiency.
- 10.4 The Committee recommended that the Council approve the consultation response analysis and draft standards of proficiency for orthoptists.

ACTION: Policy Officer to present the response analysis and draft standards of proficiency to the Council for discussion and approval at its meeting of 18 October 2012.

Item 11 Consultation on Standards for Prescribing (ETC 47/12)

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive regarding proposals for a consultation on setting standards for prescribing.
- 11.2 In July 2012, the Department of Health had announced that legislation would be amended to allow appropriately trained chiropodists/podiatrists and physiotherapists to become independent prescribers.
- 11.3 It was proposed that once chiropodists/podiatrists and physiotherapists had completed training in independent prescribing, the HCPC would then annotate their entry on the Register to show that they had completed that training.

11.4 The Committee had agreed in September 2010 that the HCPC should prepare stand-alone standards for supplementary and independent prescribing. Those standards were set out in the consultation document.

11.5 The Committee held a discussion regarding the consultation document, and draft standards, during which discussion the following points were raised:

11.5.1 There was currently no intention to allow chiroprodists/podiatrists or physiotherapist independent prescribers to be involved in clinical management plans as the independent prescriber, although they could still become involved in clinical management plans as a supplementary prescriber.

11.5.2 The Department of Health project board had discussed the issue of health professionals communicating with colleagues about prescribing. Professional bodies have published detailed guidance on good practice in relation to prescribing, which included communication with other professionals. This supported the standards set by HCPC.

11.5.3 This work was part of a larger project by the Department of Health looking at medicines entitlements for the allied health professionals, including radiographers. The Committee agreed that the consultation document should include an explanation to the effect that radiographers' prescribing rights were due to be considered by the Department of Health at a later date.

11.6 The Committee recommended that the Council approve the consultation document and draft standards for prescribing.

ACTION: Policy Manager to present the consultation document and draft standards to the Council for discussion and approval at its meeting of 18 September 2012.

Item 12 Student Fitness to Practise (ETC 48/12)

12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive regarding recent work conducted by the Council and Executive in the area of student fitness to practise, and providing suggestions for potential future changes to the standards of education and training to be considered as part of a future review.

12.2 The paper included a literature review, which had been commissioned by the Council to identify and analyse the available research literature and evidence about student fitness to practise.

12.3 The Committee noted that some members felt that there might be particular risks in student fitness to practise on practice placements. Some members

felt that student fitness to practise issues could arise where there was inadequate supervision and feedback, or issues in the relationship between education providers and practice placement providers.

- 12.4 The Committee discussed whether the HCPC should require education providers to provide information to the HCPC about fitness to practise sanctions (short of removal from a programme) that were imposed on students. The Committee felt that there was currently no evidence to support such a requirement. The Committee noted that research had been commissioned by the HCPC about behaviour by students and future professional behaviour.
- 12.5 The Committee suggested that the Executive might consider producing guidance for education providers on student fitness to practise procedures. The Committee noted that some other healthcare regulators already produced guidance in this area. Some members felt that education providers would find it helpful to have guidance available.
- 12.6 The Committee noted that the Council had agreed a transitional social work student suitability scheme. The scheme enabled the HCPC to provide an opinion, in exceptional circumstances, to a social work education provider on whether an applicant was of suitable character to be admitted to a programme. The education provider would make the final decision. To date, a small number of cases had been referred to the HCPC, but no education providers had yet asked HCPC for an opinion on an admission. Guidance on the scheme had been produced and provided to education providers. The Council had agreed that it was not necessary to operate a similar student suitability scheme for the other professions regulated by the HCPC.
- 12.7 The Committee agreed that the Executive should consider how to take forward the proposed guidance for education providers discussed at paragraph 12.5.

Action: Director of Education and Director of Policy and Standards to consider how to incorporate guidance for education providers on student fitness to practise procedures into workplans.

Item 13 Annotation of the Register - qualification in clinical neuropsychology (ETC 49/12)

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive regarding the annotation of qualifications in clinical neuropsychology on the register.
- 13.2 The Committee noted that the HCPC had discretionary powers to annotate the Register. In December 2011 the Council had agreed a policy statement setting out the principles that HCPC would adopt in deciding whether or not to do so.

13.3 The paper included background on the qualification, analysis of the risk to the public, fitness to practise considerations and supporting information, including a summary of responses to the recent consultation on annotating qualifications which related to neuropsychology.

13.4 The Committee held a discussion regarding the proposals, during which discussion the following points were raised:

13.4.1 The evidence in the paper did not present a good case for annotation of the register for the qualification in question.

13.4.2 One member was concerned about the use of the terms 'neuropsychology' and 'clinical neuropsychology' and felt that they were used interchangeably when they were actually different areas. The Committee noted that the qualification being considered for annotation was the Qualification in Clinical Neuropsychology. The consultation in 2010 had used the phrase 'neuropsychology' as that had been the name used in Department of Health documents on the regulation of practitioner psychologists. However, the consultation document made clear that the HPC was considering annotating the Qualification in Clinical Neuropsychology and asked stakeholders for their views on these proposals. The website of the British Psychological Society referred to both terms.

13.5 The Committee recommended that the Council should not annotate the qualification in Clinical Neuropsychology on the register.

ACTION: Policy Manager to present the Committee's recommendation to the Council for discussion and approval at its meeting of 18 October 2012.

Item 14 Annotation of the Register - qualifications linked to practice in podiatric surgery (ETC 50/12)

14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive regarding the annotation of qualifications in podiatric surgery.

14.2 The Committee noted that the Council had agreed at its meeting on 10 May 2012 that the HCPC should annotate the register to show those registrants who had gained the Certificate of Completion in Podiatric Surgical Training. The paper set out a timetable for implementing that decision.

14.3 The Committee noted that an equivalent qualification was being developed in Scotland. This qualification would also be annotated if it met the standards set.

14.4 One member was concerned at the length of the proposed timetable, which would include preparation of stand-alone standards linked to the annotation, engagement with stakeholders and a consultation process. The Committee

noted that the consultation would allow stakeholders to express their views on the proposals.

14.5 The Committee agreed that:

- (a) the Executive should start work to prepare stand-alone standards linked to the annotation;
- (b) the Executive should continue to engage with stakeholders and should hold a meeting with key stakeholders to discuss a draft of the standards;
- (c) the Executive should follow the approach to managing the annotation process set out in paragraphs 2.11-2.12 of paper ETC 50/12; and
- (d) the Executive should follow the approach to annotation set out in paragraphs 2.17-2.19 of paper ETC 50/12.

Item 15 Criteria and allocation of visitor Partners to Approved Mental Health Professional (AMHP) approval and monitoring work (ETC 51/12)

15.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive on proposals for a framework for the allocation of HCPC visitors to approvals and annual monitoring work in relation to AMHP programmes.

15.2 Under the Health and Social Care Act 2012, the HCPC had responsibility for approving AMHP programmes in England. The paper set out the criteria required of visitors for the approval and monitoring activities for AMHP programmes and for the allocation of visitors for AMHP programmes.

15.3 The Committee noted that the paper proposed that at least one visitor considering an AMHP programme would be a qualified and experienced AMHP. If necessary, a second visitor could be from any profession entitled to train as an AMHP, who has experience of working in an educational setting.

15.4 The Committee approved the framework for the allocation of visitors to approvals and monitoring work in relation to AMHP programmes as detailed in appendix one of the paper.

Item 16 Criteria and allocation of visitor Partners to independent prescribing approval and monitoring work (ETC 52/12)

16.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion and approval from the Executive on proposals for a framework for the allocation of HCPC visitors to approvals and monitoring work in relation to independent prescribing programmes.

16.2 The Committee had discussed the HCPC's approach to setting standards to in relation to the scope of practice for independent prescribers under item

11. The paper set out the criteria required of visitors for the approval and monitoring activities for independent prescribing programmes and for the allocation of visitors for independent prescribing programmes.

16.3 The Committee noted that the paper proposed that at least one visitor considering an independent prescribing programme would be trained in independent prescribing with the appropriate annotation on their professional register. It was possible that these visitors might be registered with other regulators of health professionals. If necessary, a second visitor could be a HCPC registrant with an annotation in supplementary prescribing, a chiropodist/podiatrist with Local Anaesthetic and/or Prescription Only Medicine or a paramedic.

16.4 The Committee approved the framework for the allocation of visitors to approvals and annual monitoring work in relation to independent prescribing programmes as detailed in appendix one of the paper.

Item 17 New readmission application form (ETC 53/12)

17.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding proposals for a new HCPC readmission form for registrants who have lapsed from the register because of non-payment.

17.2 The Committee recommended that the Council approve the new readmission form.

ACTION: Head of Registration to submit the readmission form to the Council at its meeting on 18 September 2012.

Item 18 Transfer of regulatory functions from the GSCC to HCPC (ETC 54/12)

18.1 The Committee received a verbal update from the Director of Education and the Director of Policy and Standards regarding the project to transfer regulatory functions from the GSCC to the HCPC.

18.2 At the Council meeting on 14 October 2010, the Council had agreed that there would be a standing item on every Council and Committee agenda, whereby the Executive would update the meeting on the progress of the project.

18.3 Following the successful completion of the project this would be the final such update to the Committee.

18.4 The Committee noted the following points:

- the Social Work Regulation Oversight Group and the Social Work Reform Board were no longer meeting;

- the transfer of regulatory functions had been completed on 1 August 2012. The register of approximately 88,000 social workers had been transferred to the HCPC register; approximately 250 fitness to practise cases had been transferred to the Fitness to Practise Department; and information on 300 education programmes (including AMHP programmes) had been transferred to the Education Department;
- the HCPC were finalising the agreement with the Department of Health on the terms of the grant towards the costs incurred by the HCPC on the project;
- the Joint Social Work Unit was expected to close this month and with employees expected to relocate to either the Department of Health and the Department of Education and Skills social workforce teams or the office of the Chief Social Worker, once announced. It was expected that the Chief Social Worker would oversee issues relating to the Assessed and Supported Year in Employment.

The Committee noted the following items:

Item 19 Health and Character Report (ETC 55/12)

Item 20 Education systems and process review (ETC 56/12)

Item 21 Panel decisions June to August 2012 (ETC 57/12)

Item 22 Reports from representatives at external meetings and events (ETC 58/12)

Item 23 Date and time of next meeting:

1pm, Wednesday 14 November 2012 (Training away day)
10.30 am, Thursday 15 November 2012

Item 24 Any other business

24.1 The Committee thanked the Executive for producing an excellent and informative set of papers.

Resolution

The Committee agreed 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 one or more of the following;

- (a) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or applicant for registration;
- (b) information relating to an employee or officer holder, former employee or applicant for any post or office;

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

Item	Reason for Exclusion
25	e, g, h

Part 2 – Private agenda

Item 25 Minutes of the private part of the meeting of 12 June 2012

25.1 The minutes were accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chair. The Committee noted that actions arising from the minutes had been completed.

Item 26 Any other business

26.1 There was no further private business.

Chair

Date