

Communications Committee 25 January 2008

Events update  
Thomas Heiser

## **Executive Summary and Recommendations**

### **Introduction**

During 2008 – 2009 the HPC aims to further develop communication with stakeholder groups through the management of and participation in a variety of events. This paper is intended to provide a brief overview of the events schedule and activities planned to date. Attached is a schedule of events for 2008 and evaluation reports of events held since the last Communications Committee meeting in October 2007.

### **Decision**

This paper is for information only. No decision is required.

### **Background information**

As can be seen from the attached paper, Events Schedule 2008, the events we are involved in can be divided into several distinct groups. Brief information on each group is given below.

#### Listening Events

Listening Events continue to play a key role in promoting the HPC and receiving feedback from registrants. The format for these events has remained largely unchanged for many years however following feedback from registrants we are now developing the format to help generate a more engaging and productive event. Changes made to date include the shortening of the presentation and including small-group facilitated discussions.

Although the revised format has only been used at the January 2008 events, feedback has been positive. The new presentation received the highest marks from the last ten events and the discussion group format was mentioned positively in many comments. The May Listening Events will allow for a more comprehensive evaluation of the revised format which will then be presented at the May committee meeting. Evaluation reports from the October 2007 and January 2008 events are attached.

#### Exhibitions

The HPC is taking part in various exhibitions to raise the profile of the HPC and push forward our communications messages. These events are aimed at the general public, service users or a mixture of registrant groups. As and when specific campaigns are developed the exhibitions schedule will be adapted to

support them. An evaluation report from the Primary Care 2007 exhibition is attached.

#### Profession specific conferences

The HPC is increasing its involvement in exhibitions at professional conferences and where possible we are also trying to ensure that we have a speaker in the conference programme. This results in a more productive meeting from a communications perspective as we are able to speak directly to a large audience and then reinforce and support our messages via the exhibition.

#### Stakeholder Events

Stakeholder communication is increasing rapidly and will be supported through the production of events and the participation in external conferences. The stakeholder events to date have proved extremely popular and have resulted in many productive contacts and positive feedback. Feedback will be provided by Nina Blunck in a separate paper. Stakeholder events will be developed further over the coming year. An evaluation report from the NHS Employers event 2007 is attached.

#### Internal Events

Due to major changes in terms of size and physical layout of the HPC there is an increased need to ensure that effective communication and a positive working environment is maintained. The internal events planned will help support employees through providing focussed and enjoyable activities which recognise the ongoing challenges and aim to develop a positive attitude to change and the opportunities for new ideas and working practices that change generates.

#### General developments

To support the events and the developed HPC visual identity, new banners and pop-up exhibition stands have been created. One banner has also been created in Welsh which we will use at future events where appropriate. In addition, we are also developing a range of cost-effective HPC branded items including literature bags, post-it notes and sweets for use in-house and as promotional items while at events.

### **Resource implications**

None

### **Financial implications**

None

### **Appendices**

Events schedule 2008  
Exhibition evaluation – NHS Employers 2007  
Exhibition evaluation – Primary Care 2007  
Listening Events evaluation – October 2007  
Listening Events evaluation – January 2008

**Date of paper:** 25 January 2008

---

## Events Schedule 2008 (to date)

### Listening Events

January 22	Lowestoft
January 24	Cambridge
May 6	Glasgow
May 8	Edinburgh
September 2, 5, 9, 12	London series
November (date tbc)	Lincoln
November (date tbc)	Stoke-on-Trent
February 09	Northern Ireland x2 (details tbc)

### Exhibitions

March 5-6	Health & Wellbeing, Birmingham	
April 2-3	Annual Public Health Forum, Liverpool	
April 29-1	NAIDEX, Birmingham	(Stand + 2 x CPD sessions)
May 21-22	Primary Care, Birmingham	(Stand + CPD Session)

### Profession specific conferences

March 15 -16	British Ass. of Prosthetists & Orthotists, Bolton	(Stand + CPD session)
May 22-25	Council of OTs of the European Countries, Germany	(Poster)
June 2-4	UKRC, Birmingham	(Stand)
June 11-13	College of OTs, Harrogate	(Stand + CPD session)
June 17 – 19	British Dietetic Association, Liverpool	(Stand + CPD session)
Oct 17-18	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy, Manchester	(Stand + CPD session tbc)

Cont...

**Internal events**

May 16	All employee away day
July 18	All employee BBQ
Dec 19	Christmas Lunch
Ongoing	8 x All employee meetings

**Stakeholder events**

Feb 18	Belfast Employers Event	
Feb 20	Cardiff Employers Event	
Feb 21	London Employers Event	
March 17-20	Scottish Parliament	(Stand + evening reception)
April 10	NHS Employers, London	(Stand)
Nov 4-6	NHS Employers, Birmingham	(Stand)

## External Exhibition Evaluation Report

**Name of Event:** NHS Employers Annual Conference and Exhibition  
**Date:** 9 – 11 October 2007  
**Location:** ICC, Birmingham  
**Details:**

- Approx. 1500 delegates over three days made up of Human Resource Directors, Managers, Health Professionals and Personnel within the NHS
- 83 stands within one hall
- Over 140 visits to the stand
- HPC used new 1500mm professional facing banner in a 2x2m stand
- Laptop with internet connection showing website and multiple registrant search facility
- Three members of staff: Public Affairs Manager on all three days. Representative from Registration on day one and half day two. CPD Communications Manager for half of day two and day three

### Publications distributed:

- |                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| • Employer concertina booklet    | 600 (approx.) |
| • Managing FTP                   | 24            |
| • Making a complaint about...    | 7             |
| • What happens if a complaint... | 4             |
| • CPD (large)                    | 55            |
| • SCPEs                          | 64            |
| • FTP Annual reports             | 63            |
| • Review of grandparenting       | 2             |
| • Welcome to the HPC             | 10            |
| • Returning to practice          | 8             |
| • 10 benefits                    | 17            |

### General thoughts:

The NHS Employers Annual Conference and Exhibition is recognised as the key workforce event in the NHS calendar. HPC has seen the value of attending these conferences due to the high quality of the conference and the delegates. The conference provided a good opportunity to promote HPC's key messages to those that employ our registrants and specifically to inform them of the new employer section of the website, the Employer Events, new multiple registrant search and employer specific publications.

Most of the delegates visiting the stand were aware of the HPC and seemed to have positive views of the organisation. Some of them had concerns about their employees' preparedness for CPD or their fitness to practise but we had the appropriate staff members on hand to answer any queries.

Our attendance was very well received and the stand often had many delegates talking at length with HPC staff members about a range of issues.

#### **Contact made:**

- Many of the delegates that visited the stand were Human Resource Directors, Managers and those involved with workforce planning and training within statutory NHS organisations and independent providers of NHS services across England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Many of these delegates are involved with recruiting and training our Registrants and are therefore valuable contacts, especially for the Employer Events.
- Other contacts were made with regard to specific queries including several requests for talks from the CPD Communications Manager.

#### **Comments received:**

- Very positive feedback from most delegates. They seemed to appreciate our involvement in the conference. Appreciated having informed staff members available to answer their queries about a range of issues.
- New employer concertina cards – quick reference cards – were well received by delegates. These were distributed around the conference hall to interested delegates.
- Staff concerns regarding CPD.
- Lots of queries about the CPD process, type of activities.
- Many delegates that are now managers or trainers were concerned about CPD and whether they will lose registration as they are not practising.

#### **Questions raised:**

- Concern about an OT who wasn't necessarily fit to practise despite glowing reports from university [dealt with onsite by Fitness to Practise representative]
- Request for clarification about who and which titles we regulate
- What happens when registrants come off the Register, similar to nurses?
- Lapsed registration and use of protected titles
- Return to practise process
- Queries about the regulation of psychologists – when are these coming on to the HPC register?
- Which new professions will be coming on to the HPC register in the future?
- Queries about healthcare assistants – are they going to be regulated?
- Questions about the fitness to practise process and at what stage employers should inform HPC about an employee that they have concerns about

#### **Benefits:**

The high number of quality delegates and the amount of literature distributed, especially the employer concertina booklets, demonstrates that our presence at the conference was beneficial. It also gave us the opportunity to speak to delegates about new employer specific literature, events and web pages. Understanding about CPD, the renewals process and the fitness to practise

process was also increased with many people saying that information would be fed back to further colleagues.

**Drawbacks:**

The stand could have been in a more prominent position as we were towards the back of the conference hall. A better position would have ensured more visits to the stand. A larger table or display racks for publications would have been useful as we had a fairly small space.

**Conclusions:**

The feedback from delegates was really positive and the amount of employer concertina cards and other literature distributed highlighted the success of our involvement.

**Recommendations for the future:**

- Involvement of staff members from fitness to practise and registrations is useful and should be continued
- More prominent position for stand and/or larger stand space – book early
- Purchase or hire additional literature holders
- Employer packs should be developed for employers to take away with them

**Repeat the Exhibition?:** Yes

---

## External Exhibition Evaluation Report

**Name of Event:** Primary Care 2007

**Date:** 10-11 May 2007

**Location:** NEC, Birmingham

**Details:**

- Approx. 4,800 delegates over the two days
- Mixed group but included high numbers of Midwives, Nurses, GPs, Physios, SLTs, Dietitians, OTs, Chiropodists, and others
- 221 stands
- Contact time was high as the exhibition drew visitors in its own right. People tended to go to sessions but there were always people in the exhibition hall
- Over 150 visits to the stand
- HPC used small stand in a 2x2m stand
- Laptop showing website and HPCheck
- Registrant and patient facing literature
- Three members of staff: Thomas Heiser and Jacqueline Ladds both days plus Sarah Giles and Andrea Kanaris on alternate days

**Publications distributed:**

- |                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| • Returning to practice             | 21 |
| • CPD – Long                        | 62 |
| Short                               | 42 |
| • 10 Benefits of registration       | 1  |
| • Standards of Education            | 11 |
| • Welcome to the HPC                | 9  |
| • SCPEs                             | 42 |
| • SOP – OTs                         | 3  |
| Physiotherapists                    | 35 |
| Chiropodists                        | 19 |
| Dietitians                          | 25 |
| SLT                                 | 29 |
| • Making a complaint                | 13 |
| • What happens if a complaint is... | 3  |
| • “Be safe, Be sure”                | 95 |
| • Car stickers                      | 12 |
| • Posters                           | 5  |

**General thoughts:**

The event was very well attended and although the main delegate groups appeared to be Nurses and Midwives there were a substantial number of registrants present and also interest from GPs. Many people approached the stand who were not aware of the HPC but who worked with registrants. These



people left the stand with a better understanding of the regulatory environment and many took away patient-facing leaflets for distribution. Many of the registrant enquiries we received concerned CPD and the audit process and a large amount of CPD publications were distributed. It was interesting to note that many people were taking copies of the SOPs relevant to their professions although they should already have had them. Many people also took the opportunity to take away the SCPEs. A few of the delegates were frustrated with issues such as the fees rise and also the difficulty of finding time for CPD. Although we were not able to offer the solutions they wanted our presence and willingness to discuss the issues was welcomed.

#### **Contact made:**

- Enquiry as to the tax status of the registration fee. Can tax on the fee be claimed back?  
[Finance confirmed that yes – the income tax can be claimed back for the payment of registration fees]
- Physiotherapist – Enquiring as to the exams that “HPC” were going to set for entry onto the register. Apparently this information is being circulated however he was not sure where it originated. This will be monitored
- Enquiry into the CPD renewal dates
- Representative from the Commission for Social Care Inspection was interested in the process for referring to FTP. Relevant publications were provided. [This may be a good body to target via the Public Affairs Manager]
- SLT complained that the coding of CPD elements required is too confusing. We explained that this was not a requirement of the HPC but she seemed convinced that it was. [Looking at the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists website it seems that their process for CPD is more complicated than the HPC’s which may be leading to this confusion. The distinction between which are HPC requirements and which originate from the RCSLT is also unclear. This is to be taken up with the RCSLT].
- SLT had a query regarding when to apply for registration if returning to practise. Should this be before or after the updating period has been completed? The “Returning to practise” publication provided the information but this seems to be contradicting what the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists were saying. [It appears that the information on the RCSLT website may need updating. This is to be taken up with the RCSLT].
- Biomedical Scientist wanted to know about maintaining CPD while non-practising
- Query about paramedics on the Isle of Wight going through FTP processes. Referred to FTP directly for further information
- Individual wanted to know about the appointments of CPD Partner Assessors. [Jacqueline Ladds to follow up via Partner Manager]

#### **Comments received:**

- No specific comments were received. The above people did have queries but these were generally answered.

### **Questions raised:**

- A question came up about the timeline for the registration of Emergency Care Practitioners
- Registrant informed us that a request for information from the HPC was unanswered, as was a report that she emailed to us regarding a non-registered individual offering dietary services

### **Benefits:**

Aside from distributing HPC publications our presence conveyed a concrete attempt at engaging with registrants. We were able to provide a face to the organisation and to discuss issues of concern. Even when we were unable to help, as in issues of job scarcity, delegates felt reassured that we understood their situations. This is a very valuable outcome. In addition, many people took away copies of the “Be safe, Be sure” leaflets and the importance of checking that professionals are registered was communicated to referrers and service providers.

### **Drawbacks:**

The stand space was small and so limited the amount of information we were able to display. That said the use of the publication holders allowed more effective use of the space we had. We should probably invest in some additional holders or larger stands.

At points during the day having three staff on the stand was unnecessary. During lunches however the extra person was invaluable in allowing breaks to be taken away from the stand.

The hotels at the NEC booked up extremely quickly. This resulted in staff having to stay in Birmingham town centre and travel in by train each morning.

### **Conclusions:**

Although the largest group of delegates were not registrants of the HPC the stand generated a lot of interest. The publications proved very popular and provided the answers to many queries. Of those questions that we were unable to answer the majority regarded specific registration issues. It may be worth considering taking a member of the registration team along to future events.

### **Recommendations for the future:**

- Accommodation must be reserved far in advance to be able to stay on site at the NEC
- For larger events three staff members are required however if the show was more quiet you would be able to manage with just two
- Consider taking a member of the registration department along to answer specific questions

- It may be worth investing in some give away gifts – fridge magnets or mints were suggested – as a means of drawing people to the stand and of publicising the HPC
- Purchase additional literature holders
- Develop more of an introductory text on the HPC for general distribution
- Ensure that a more complete version of the website is available off-line, perhaps also including a test version of the register
- Look at the branding of the stand for the events we take part in – to be discussed as part of the update to visual identity

**Repeat the Exhibition?:** Yes

Providing the opportunity to meet HPC representatives and take away HPC publications, coupled with the relatively high amount of visits to the stand made attendance worthwhile.

## Listening Events Report October 2007

<b>Invitations mailed to:</b> 16,272 registrants				
303	Arts therapists	108	Orthoptists	
1695	Biomedical scientists	1329	Paramedics	
1134	Chiropodists/podiatrists	3899	Physiotherapists	
433	Clinical scientists	72	Prosthetists & orthotists	
459	Dietitians	1943	Radiographers	
3046	OT	1019	SLT	
832	ODP			
<b>Mailing date:</b> 10 June				
<b>Venues:</b> Imperial Hotel, Barnstaple, (October 16) Menzies Hotel, Swindon (October 18)				
<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Barnstaple</b>		<b>Swindon</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>6-8</b>
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>48</b>
Registered	60	58	97	55
No-show	13	17	23	17
On the day	6	6	14	10
Arts therapists	0	0	3	0
Biomedical scientists	1	1	3	2
Chiropodists/podiatrists	13	21	36	25
Clinical scientists	0	0	0	0
Dietitians	0	1	4	0
OT	13	8	18	6
ODP	8	3	2	1
Orthoptists	0	0	0	0
Paramedics	3	3	1	1
Physiotherapists	14	6	19	11
Prosthetists & orthotists	0	0	0	0
Radiographers	0	2	2	2
SLT	1	1	0	0
Unknown	0	1	0	0
<b>Evaluation Marks:</b>	Anna	Anna	Marc	Marc
Average scores from returned forms (n)	<b>n = 41</b>	<b>n = 36</b>	<b>n = 71</b>	<b>n = 22</b>
Registered (1 = Yes, 2 = No)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Travel time (mins.)	54.71	42.5	62.75	45.91
Easy to find (1 = Yes, 2 = No)	1.61	1.06	1.20	1.23
Number of colleagues to be reported back to	11.61	14.31	8.73	12.05
Presentation (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)	3.26	3.11	3.20	3.00
Q and A (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)	3.13	3.06	3.21	3.05
Venue (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)	3.28	3.33	2.93	2.95

## Evaluation Comments:

Barnstaple 2-4

- Shame about the low numbers
- Council members should have mingled with audience before the events so that people would feel more relaxed about asking questions
- Can the HPC lobby government to ensure greater time is allocated to CPD? It is going to be extremely difficult to fit in to already stretched lives. (x2)
- More information on the CPD audit profile should be provided
- A most informative and worthwhile event (x2)
- Very positive
- More events like this please
- A more informal format might get people to open up more. Perhaps small groups followed by large discussion? (x6)
- A more informal way of submitting questions would have been appreciated (x2)
- Please keep engaged with the therapists in the field as many may not be engaging in HPC work

Barnstaple 6-8

- Thanks for coming all this way (x5)
- Well chaired
- An informative and helpful evening (x2)
- Session made me far less apprehensive about the audit (x4)
- Please work with employers on giving us enough time for CPD
- Room too small – some colleagues were unable to find a space
- More education for the general public about the HPC would be appreciated
- Please provide follow up workshops on CPD profiles

Swindon 2-4

- Nice to meet the HPC face to face (x2). Much appreciated
- Made the HPC appear much more accessible (x2)
- Chair (Rachel Tripp) very good (x4). A clear interpretation of questions asked
- All questions clearly answered
- Chair overly keen to bring the session to an end
- Very helpful session (x9)
- The easy and open dialogue between registrants and the HPC should be built upon at future events
- Marc Seale too quick with presentation (x2)
- Case studies, as requested by the HPC, would be difficult to obtain due to confidentiality issues
- A low number of radiographers present
- A stage for the panel would be good when the number of guests is high
- More guidance on CPD would have been good
- Q and A session not specific enough but great to speak one-on-one to the team afterwards
- HPC website needs to advise on the use of "State Registered"
- More time should be given for the open discussion

Swindon 6-8

- Requested large print and was not provided
- 6pm start a little early for some people
- Should invitations to LEs make it clear that non-registrants are invited to attend? Their views might be useful
- Good to put names to faces
- Feel more involved with HPC now that I have met you all
- Very worthwhile meeting
- Good explanation of how we are being looked after by the HPC

**Observations:**

- Generally both events went well. Registrants engaged with the discussions and appeared to receive satisfactory answers to their queries
- The personal contact with the HPC is clearly one of the major benefits of these events
- Rachel Tripp continues to be very well received by registrants
- CPD remains the main issue of concern
- Numbers at the Barnstaple event were above those expected resulting in a very full room. Registrants arriving on the day were able to enter the room but only due to others dropping out

**Specific points to note:**

- The request for case studies needs to be more clearly explained so that registrants understand that confidentiality is not an issue
- Although only mentioned briefly the issue of HPC's stance on using "state registered" needs to be clarified. This has come up at a number of previous events and has resulted in mixed messages

**Ongoing recommendations (to be used in the development of the LE events):**

- The use of small groups would seem to be the natural progression for these events
- Panel members must be encouraged to mingle with guests to increase engagement and also to develop an open environment for the later discussions
- An informal means of submitting questions would be useful
- Request for case studies should be more clearly explained
- Minimum room size should be increased even with the risk of paying more for a larger room that on the day may not be fully used

Listening Events Report  
January 2008

<b>Invitations mailed to:</b> 8,859 registrants		<b>Mailing date:</b> 10 December 2007			
160	Arts therapists	63	Orthoptists		
1049	Biomedical scientists	887	Paramedics		
610	Chiropodists/podiatrists	1923	Physiotherapists		
161	Clinical scientists	27	Prosthetists & orthotists		
274	Dietitians	1322	Radiographers		
1227	OT	477	SLT		
679	ODP				
<b>Venues:</b>		Hotel Victoria, Lowestoft (January 22) Homerton College, Cambridge (January 24)			
<b>Venue:</b>		<b>Lowestoft</b>		<b>Cambridge</b>	
<b>Time:</b>		<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>
<b>Attendees</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>40</b>
Registered		38	23	85	54
No-show		9	4	19	16
On the day		18	2	9	2
Arts therapists		0	1	3	0
Biomedical scientists		3	2	10	3
Chiropodists/podiatrists		13	9	16	12
Clinical scientists		0	0	2	1
Dietitians		0	1	0	3
OT		14	3	9	2
ODP		2	1	4	1
Orthoptists		0	0	2	0
Paramedics		1	1	2	1
Physiotherapists		16	1	12	6
Prosthetists & orthotists		0	0	1	2
Radiographers		3	1	2	7
SLT		1	0	4	2
Unknown		3	1	8	0
<b>Evaluation Marks:</b>		Rachel	Rachel	Anna	Anna
Average scores from returned forms (n)		n = <b>44</b>	n = <b>18</b>	n = <b>50</b>	n = <b>39</b>
Registered (1 = Yes, 2 = No)		1.02	1.00	1.06	1.00
Travel time (mins.)		31.45	45.33	48.70	29.61
Easy to find (1 = Yes, 2 = No)		1.02	1.06	1.24	1.38
Number of colleagues to be reported back to		9.93	10.61	31.40	8.86
Presentation (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)		3.39	3.61	3.22	3.27
Groups discussion (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)		2.98	3.22	2.80	3.22
Q and A (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)		3.02	2.94	3.04	3.19
Venue (1 = poor to 4 = excellent)		3.30	3.11	2.84	2.68

## Evaluation Comments:

Lowestoft 2-4

- Longer Q and A session next time (x2)
- Useful information given in a good supportive way
- Small group work is an easy way to interact and discuss – less intimidating (x2)
- Good to hear the views from other disciplines
- A specific time for questions to the panel would have been useful
- Please bring examples of the CPD profiles
- Excellent meeting (x5), very useful and informative (x2)
- A motivating event
- Clarified a lot of the issues regarding CPD. The publications and discussions cover the process well
- HPC doing a very good job despite its many challenges
- Rachel Tripp a very good chair (x2)
- Difficult to hear other groups during discussions (x2)
- Discussion groups could have been smaller
- Only 15 minutes needed to network before the start
- Glad you came to this location
- Difficult to take time off work to attend sessions

Lowestoft 6-8

- Small group discussions an excellent idea
- A very positive session, thank you (x2)
- Start time should have been made clearer (x2)
- Good to meet registrants from other professions
- Would have preferred to have been able to discuss both of the group topics in detail
- Thank you for coming locally

Cambridge 2-4

- Good to have the group work to split up the session and encourage input (x9)
- When issues were mentioned as not being the remit of the HPC it would have been good to have been told who's they were
- Shocked to find how many people were ignorant of the CPD process
- Reassuring to know that CPD is not just about going on training courses
- Separate rooms for the discussions would have been useful (x11) as would smaller groups (x7)
- Good event (x4), well organised (x2)
- Good to see what HPC is up to
- Event seemed to be more useful to the HPC than registrants
- Thanks for showing that you do actually care about us! We need you to help us continue to be good practitioners
- Great to be able to take back the booklets and publications (x2)
- Would have been nice to see some examples of the CPD profiles



Cambridge 6-8

- A well informed and interesting debate
- Very informative and interesting (x8)
- Choice of venue and times was ideal
- Great to hear more about CPD (x3)
- Good to see the human face to HPC
- Number of podiatrists in attendance was poor. Perhaps a later time would have been better
- Needed to have multiple rooms for the discussions (x2)
- Small group sessions should have been longer
- More notice of the event should have been given
- Nice to meet registrants from other professions and hear their views (x2)
- Enlightening, certainly glad I attended, clarified many things in my mind

**Observations:**

- New format seems to be well liked
- Group discussions led to increased interaction and general atmosphere in the venue was more involved and relaxed
- Presentation ran much closer to time and received the highest feedback to date
- Registrants able to help each other during small group discussions – suggest their own personal solutions to problems
- The facilitators worked well in guiding and supporting the discussions
- Clear issues regarding venue size, delegate numbers and space for the discussion groups
- The Q and A session seemed to lack focus as a Q and A – appeared more of a summing up
- It was interesting to note that one delegate was surprised at how worried people were about CPD and included a long response on their feedback form to this effect. This is perhaps a useful reminder that many attendees of LEs have issues to discuss and may not therefore be a balanced representation of Registrants as a whole

**Specific points to note:**

- Discussion groups need to be given enough space to talk without disturbing others
- Venues requiring use of stairs to move room are best avoided
- Postcode inaccurate on some sat-nav devices. Possible to check in future?
- During group discussions time must be specifically allowed for the discussion of topics that are “off subject” – not solely the topics allocated by the HPC
- Timings must be adhered to in order to ensure groups break and reconvene on time
- Second refreshment break perhaps unnecessary

**Ongoing recommendations (to be used in the development of the LE events):**

- Develop supporting guidelines to assist group facilitators
- Over time, introduce further employees to the role of Chair so as to develop a bank of individuals able to run the meetings
- Clarify start times on invitation letters
- Explain the request for people to let us know if they are unable to attend

- Either decide on maximum numbers and be prepared to turn people away or book larger venues and be prepared to overspend on larger rooms or breakouts that may not be required
- Presentation to be further developed and key information added to notes
- Investigate the necessity of the second refreshment break