

Park House  
184 Kennington Park Road  
London SE11 4BU  
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7840 9716  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7820 9684  
e-mail: peter.burley@hpc-uk.org

**MINUTES** of the ninth meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on Wednesday 14 May 2003 at King's College Conference Suite, St.Thomas' Hospital, London SE1.

**Present** :

Prof. D. Waller (Chairing)  
Prof. N. Brook  
Mrs S. Chaudhry  
Miss H. Davis  
Ms C. Farrell  
Mr. P. Frowen  
Prof. A. Hazell  
Dr. R. Kapur – to item 14  
Prof. C. Lloyd  
Prof. J. Lucas  
Ms G. Pearson  
Mr. G. Sutehall  
Miss E. Thornton– to item 22  
Dr. A. van der Gaag – to item 14

**Also in Attendance**

Dr. P. Burley – Secretary, ETC  
Mr. T. Berrie, Director  
Ms U. Falk, Manager of Education  
Mr. S. Hill, Newchurch Healthcare  
Mr. C. Middleton  
Mr. G. Milch  
Ms N. O'Sullivan, Director  
Ms L. Pilgrim, Director  
Mr. M. Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar.

**ITEM 1 03/74 MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from : Mr. G. Beastall, Ms. M. Collins, Prof. J. Harper, Prof. R. Klem, Mr C. Lea, and Mr. I. Massey.

**ITEM 2 03/75 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On the recommendation of the Chairman,

It was

**RESOLVED (1)**

**that the agenda be approved.**

**ITEM 3 03/76 MINUTES**

It was agreed that the minutes of the eighth meeting of the Health Professions Council's Education and Training Committee held on 26 March 2003 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman, subject to minute 12.2.2 reading that, "... applicants under the " three out of the last five years " provisions may be subject to a test of competence as part of the assessment of their application ...", and 12.2.3 to read, "... this assessment would have regard to the Standards of Proficiency as relating to their scope of practice ".

**Action :** PB and Chairman.

**ITEM 4 03/77 MATTERS ARISING**

4.1 The Committee received the Secretary's report.

4.2 Ms Chaudhry asked for clarification of who could make a test of language competence for EEA nationals.

The Chief Executive clarified that this would arise if during the application process it emerged that a (potential) registrant's language skills were inadequate for safe and effective practice. Such an applicant if registered would then fall under competence procedures.

4.3 It was noted that there would be a report to Council on 4 June 2003 on Partner appointments.

**Action :** DT

**ITEM 5 03/78 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

5.1 The Committee received the report.

5.2 The Committee discussed the invitation to make a nomination to the QAA Steering Group on criteria for extending Subject Benchmarking to new groups. It was clarified that the immediate remit of the steering group would be confined to health-funded professions, but it would also be able to look across to non-health-funded groups for the wider picture. It was noted that another part of its remit would be to move the “ emerging health professions framework ” towards an “ overarching health professions framework ”. In view of the size and complexity of the brief it was agreed that no one member might be able to undertake the whole task and it was agreed that QAA be asked if Prof. D.Waller could represent HPC together with Prof. J. Lucas.

**Action** : PB to notify QAA.

5.3 The Chairman congratulated the executive on the Edinburgh re-launch event on 9 April 2003.

5.4 The President was congratulated on becoming chair of the validation group in the DH's (England) Partnership working initiative.

**ITEM 6 03/79 SECRETARY'S REPORT**

6.1 The report was received.

6.2 The Secretary reported orally on a meeting with the Department of Health's Refugee Professionals Steering Group. (NB. There were no refugee applicants for registration at the time of the meeting).

6.3 The President reported further on liaison with QAA's major review work:

- An advert for appointment of reviewers had been published and members of the Committee were encouraged to apply;
- It was clarified that only registered members of professions were being invited to apply to be reviewers at this stage. There was a separate (subsequent) procedure for lay appointments for reviewers who could act as co-ordinators of review teams; and
- The President clarified that this current stage of the work was without prejudice to HPC's eventual decisions on approval, re-approval, and monitoring procedures.

Prof. Hazell and Dr. Kapur reminded the Committee that this work applied only to England.

**ITEM 7 03/80 STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY**

- 7.1 Members noted the current version of the Standards.
- 7.2 The Executive reported that comments had been returned over the last two weeks from eight professions. They varied from complete agreement, to continued major concerns, to requests for new Standards to be added. Much data had also been collected from the meeting on 15 April 2003. All these data and comments had been reviewed by the Solicitor.
- 7.3 The Chief Executive explained how the current version had been prepared and the considerations the executive had had to take into account.

The Council could not proceed with Standards known to be immediately open to legal challenge, and this explained why some requests could not be incorporated.

It had been a difficult process because of the very different expectations of the Standards from different participants in the process of preparing them and because it was the first ever such exercise.

The Standards were not just for grandparenting but also for re-registration purposes. Registrants had to confirm that they could still conform to the Standards at re-registration.

The Standards could not accommodate the “ aspirational ” nature of the Subject Benchmarks where they were based on the ethos of Higher Education.

Because of the link with re-registration for all registrants, the Standards could not include reference to procedures which were post-registration specialisms for some registrants, even if they were a majority on the given part of the Register.

Minute 7.5 of the meeting on 26 March 2003 made a distinction between having to demonstrate the actual practice of an item in the Standards as against the proficiency to engage in it. This also interacted with the Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics where registrants had to confine their scope of practice within the Standards of Proficiency to the areas in which they were competent.

The current document could be re-edited at the close of the grandparenting process, but should be stable for that period.

- 7.4 After discussion it was agreed that if the Committee needed more time to complete the process then that time should be taken. It was agreed that a meeting be held between representatives of the professions and the lawyers to discuss the way items had been omitted from the Standards. This should also be a meeting of the Committee designed to finalise the Standards. A date to be within the next three weeks could be sought from members by e-mail. This meeting should not be to air grievances about the process in the past, but to focus on the issues needed to finalise the work.

**Action :** PB.

7.5 It was agreed to start the process of reviewing the Standards in a year's time.

**Action** : PB.

7.6 It was

**RESOLVED ( 2 )**

**that an additional meeting of the Committee be convened to discuss the balance between professional and legal advice in what was included and excluded from the Standards of Proficiency, and then for the Committee to recommend their approval, with the Solicitor and professional representatives attending.**

**ITEM 8 03/81 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT FROM THE STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY (TESTS OF COMPETENCE)**

8.1 Miss Thornton reported on the progress to date. Work had been proceeding pending finalisation of the Standards of Proficiency, particularly around assessment strategies. The generic standards would also be included in the assessments.

8.2 The Committee endorsed the Registration Committee's recommendations.

**ITEM 9 03/82 STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

9.1 The Committee received the report.

9.2 The Committee agreed that a separate professional liaison group would be the best way to progress this work and this should be recommended to the Council.

**Action** : PB.

**ITEM 10 03/83 TESTS FOR KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH**

10.1 The Committee received the report, previous papers, and recommendations from Registration Committee.

10.2 The Committee accepted the case for asking applicants for IELTS level 7 and SLT applicants for level 8.

**Action** : SD

10.3 It was agreed that the Executive should head its summary reports "Executive Summary and Recommendations".

**Action** : Committee Secretaries.

- 10.4 It was noted that these language requirements would align with entry requirements to approved programmes and entry to the register by reference to the Standards of Proficiency on communications skills. (This thereby preserved equity between all categories of applicants for registration).
- 10.5 The position on the Welsh Language Act would need to be considered if applications of any sort for approval or admission to the Register were made solely in Welsh.
- 10.6 It was

**RESOLVED ( 3 )**

**That IELTS level 7 be the standard requirement with level 8 for Speech & Language Therapists.**

**ITEM 11 03/84 PROFESSIONAL LIAISON GROUPS (PLG) : CPD**

- 11.1 The Committee received the report.
- 11.2 For all PLGs, it was agreed that the Secretary should circulate members of the Committee with invitations to express an interest in joining one of the groups and suggestions as to what external appointments should be made.
- 11.3 Membership should be smaller rather than larger.
- 11.4 PLGs generally should report to ETC on a monthly basis.
- 11.5 It was agreed that Miss Thornton be appointed chair.

**Action : PB.**

**ITEM 12 03/85 PROFESSIONAL LIAISON GROUPS : “ APPROVALS ”**

- 12.1 The Committee received the report and noted that Prof. N. Brook was already chairing the equivalent group in the Department of Health’s (England) Partnership Working Initiative. It was agreed that Prof. Brook be appointed chair.
- 12.2 See item 11 minute 03/84 above.

**Action : PB.**

**ITEM 13 03/86 PROFESSIONAL LIAISON GROUPS : STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

- 13.1 The Committee received the report. See also item 9 minute 03/81 above.
- 13.2 The Committee recommended to Council that this group be set up and that it be chaired by Prof. Lloyd.

13.3 See item 11 minute 03/84 above.

**Action** : PB.

**ITEM 14 03/87 BROCHURES AND MANUALS**

14.1 The Committee received the report and confirmed the approach to brochures and manuals, that they be remitted to the approvals PLG.

14.2 The Secretary reported that a number of comments had come in on the brochures, particularly the need to change the tone of the brochure “ Visitors are coming to my institution . . . . ”. Members asked that the tone generally be less directive when the publications were re-edited.

**Action** : CS.

**ITEM 15 03/88 NOTES OF THE MEETINGS OF PRE-REGISTRATION  
EDUCATION AND TRAINING WORKING GROUPS  
JOINT VALIDATION COMMITTEES AND JOINT QUALITY  
ASSURANCE COMMITTEES HELD SINCE THE LAST  
MEETING**

[ from Ulua ]

**ITEM 16 03/89 REQUIREMENTS FOR RE-ADMISSION TO THE  
REGISTER**

16.1 The Committee received the paper.

16.2 Prof. Lloyd asked about the procedures for (first) admission to the Register. The Chief Executive clarified that the procedure was part of the Rules and currently before Parliament.

**ITEM 17 03/90 PROGRESS REPORT ON GRANDPARENTING**

The papers submitted to Registration Committee and the present position were noted.

**ITEM 18 03/91 MINUTES OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE ON  
30 APRIL 2003 AND MATTERS ARISING FOR ETC  
NOT DEALT WITH ABOVE**

18.1 The Committee received the minutes.

18.2 Miss Thornton reported that the certification for Chiropody registrants using local anaesthetics and prescription only medicines had been agreed. A review process for applicants not admitted to the Register had also been agreed.

18.3 The Committee asked that the description of the legislation under local anaesthetics etc. be made exact.

**Action** : LP.

18.4 As further follow-up from the meeting, the Chief Executive reported that the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) had put issuing “basic” checks into indefinite abeyance. Until this was revived HPC would rely on approved institutions’, placement providers’ and employers’ checks to secure public safety here supported by some random checks against application forms with CRB.

**ITEM 19 03/92 QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY’S ‘HANDBOOK FOR MAJOR REVIEW OF HEALTH PROFESSION PROGRAMMES’, DRAFT 2 (MARCH 2003)**

Noted.

**ITEM 20 03/93 NHSU NATIONAL GROUP CONSULTATION**

Noted.

**ITEM 21 03/94 SCHEDULE OF DIRECTORS’ PRESENTATIONS TO STUDENTS ON APPROVED PROGRAMMES**

Noted.

**ITEM 22 03/95 ANY OTHER BUSINESS : RECONVENING THE EDUCATIONALISTS FORUM**

It was agreed that the Forum be reconvened and meet in the autumn. The format of the meeting would be decided nearer the time on the basis of the business arising.

**ITEM 23 03/96 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next scheduled meeting would be at 10.30 am on 30 July 2003 in Park House. (An additional meeting would be held in terms of item 7 minute 03/80 above).

**ITEM 24 03/97 MEETING IN PRIVATE**

The members present directed that the remainder of the discussion be held in private because publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest, by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

**CHAIRMAN**