

## **Unconfirmed**

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 seventh meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on Wednesday 12 February 2003 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

### **Present** :

Prof. D. Waller (Chairing)  
Prof. N. Brook  
Mrs. S. Chaudhry (to item 14)  
Ms C. Farrell  
M. P. Frowen  
Prof. J. Harper  
Dr. R. Kapur (to item 13)  
Prof. R. Klem  
Mr. I. Massey  
Ms G. Pearson (to item 29)  
Mr. G. Sutehall (to item 29)  
Miss E. Thornton  
Dr. A. van der Gaag (to item 29)

### **Also in Attendance**

Dr. P. Burley – Secretary, ETC  
Mr. D. Ashcroft  
Mr. T. Berrie  
Mr. J. Bracken  
Mrs. J. Carey  
Ms M. Collins (Newchurch)  
Mrs. M. Embleton  
Ms U. Falk  
Mr. G. Milch  
Ms C. Savage  
Ms N. O'Sullivan

Ms L. Pilgrim  
Ms R. Reyes  
Mr. G. Ross-Sampson  
Mr. M. Seale  
Mrs. S. Stirling

**ITEM 1 03/01 MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from :- Dr. G. Beastall, Mr. M. Collins, Miss H. Davis, Prof. A. Hazell, Mr. C. Lea, and Prof. J. Lucas,
- 1.2 Dr. Kapur was welcomed to his first meeting as the member for Northern Ireland.

**ITEM 2 03/02 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

- 2.1 The Chairman and Chief Executive commented here that this might be the most concentrated meeting for project plan business the Committee would have held – or would ever need to hold.
- 2.2 The agenda had been broken down into its smallest components and sequenced very carefully to aid monitoring, timetabling, and preparing the very large amount of important work falling to the Committee between now and 1 April 2003.
- 2.3 On the recommendation of the Chairman,

It was

**RESOLVED (1)**

**that the agenda be approved (subject to taking agenda item 29 while the Committee remained quorate).**

**ITEM 3 03/03 MINUTES**

- 3.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the sixth meeting of the Health Professions Council's Education and Training Committee held on 27 November 2002 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman subject to the words " definition and . . " being deleted in 6.5.
- 3.2 The Chairman asked if minor comments could be e-mailed to the Secretary prior to the meeting in future, provided the minutes were circulated far enough in advance.

**ITEM 4 03/04 MATTERS ARISING**

The Committee received the Secretary's report and agreed that the letter received on 12 February 2003 from the Council of Deans should be circulated.

**ITEM 5 03/05 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

5.1 The President reported on a meeting on the post-registration qualifications framework on 10 February 2003. Invitations to tender for project had now been issued by the Department of Health.

5.2 The Chairman thanked all the officers involved in preparing this present agenda.

**ITEM 6 03/06 SECRETARY'S REPORT**

6.1 The written report was received.

**6.2 Recruitment of " Partners "**

6.2.1 The Secretary reported on the progress of the exercise to recruit " partners ", including visitors and registrant assessors. Some 800 applications had been received to date, and these were still being analysed for shortlisting, so a full picture had not yet emerged. The deadline for applications had been extended, and applications were still welcome.

6.2.2 There was one transitional issue the Committee needed to be aware of. This was that after 1 April 2003 HPC could not use anyone in the capacity of a " partner " who had not been appointed as a partner (or was not a Council member). This meant that activities such as visits which were planned months in advance would have to rely on the outcome of a still future process. The advice being given was that :

- visits should continue to be planned,
- visitors who had applied to be partners should be used,
- people who were known not to have applied (or who were known to have no intention of applying) should not be appointed as visitors, and  
alternative visitors should be appointed if needed nearer the time should HPC Partner appointments not be confirmed.

6.2.3 In the meantime the secretariat was working to identify any difficulties and seek to pre-empt them.

6.2.4 The President stated that she understood that enough people had applied to be partners that there should not be a problem here.

- 6.2.5 It was clarified that only people approved by HPC could be used in " partner " capacities after 1 April 2003. The Order required that at least one properly appointed HPC visitor from the relevant part of the Register be present at any visit to be reported to the Committee. While not applying for partner status – or not being appointed by HPC – did not affect such a person's relationship with their professional body (and being appointed a visitor by that body) it would now mean that their advice could not formally be used by the Committee. This was an important difference from the previous legal position.
- 6.2.6 It was confirmed that Council members were automatically eligible to be visitors and play other partner roles (subject to the mutual exclusions in the Order).
- 6.2.7 The Committee felt it unacceptable to defer visits to approve or continue to approve courses, qualifications and institutions.
- 6.2.8 The discussion at item 17 below on the generality of visiting was relevant also to this item.

**ITEM 7 03/07 PRESENTATION BY THE N.H.S. UNIVERSITY**

Deferred.

**ITEM 8    03/08    DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (DH) INDEPENDENT  
EVALUATION OF THE " PROTOTYPE REVIEWS "**

- 8.1    The Secretary explained that the importance of this item was that it might help confirm some of the processes and ethos of how HPC interacted with other bodies in QA in the future (ie. how Part II of the HPO was discharged in this context). HPC was expecting a revision of the Academic Reviewers Handbook for health funded courses from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) very shortly. This Handbook was still also open for comment in the meantime.
- 8.2    The President (and a representative from the Department of Health [DH]) clarified that while the exercise had begun with (retrospective) review, the benefits were now being analysed for other activities as well. She also clarified that this was designed to support HPC's statutory duties and was only of value to HPC if this was the case. It was essential that all the requirements of all the stakeholders be met in any new collaborative arrangements and the QAA and DH understood this.
- 8.3    The aim of the exercise was to establish trust and collaboration in order to create reciprocal understanding and to reduce burdens on education and training providers.
- 8.4.1    The Committee endorsed working with the recommendations from the exercise and especially to explore seeking common data sets and monitoring arrangements.
- 8.5    The discussions elsewhere about visiting, partners, and collaborative working (eg. 17.4 below) were also relevant to this item.
- .

**ITEM 9    03/09    STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY : STANDARDS FOR  
APPROVAL**

- 9.1    The Chairman reported that these were the proposed multi-professional, overarching, standards
- 9.2    The Chairman reported that the workshop for the Standards of Proficiency (SoP) project had accepted the Steering Group's strategy of a multi-professional SoP supported by (uni-)professional working documents, which would be dynamic. The professional standards would be available together with the multi-professional framework by 1 April 2003, and they must be able to interact.
- 9.3    There would be a three week process starting very shortly of consultation and development of the profession-specific standards. This would then need to come back to the Committee. It was agreed that work elsewhere dependent on the SoPs should proceed on a working basis using the documents prepared for

consultation. These documents were expected on 17 February 2003. The full set of documents would need to be approved on 26 March 2003 with the final fully edited and integrated text being ready for formal publication after 15 April 2003 (whilst being available earlier in rougher form for statutory use).

- 9.4 Prof. Harper asked for more explicit cross reference in the multi-professional SoP to the profession-specific standards. The Chairman clarified that the documents would flow into one another. The Solicitor clarified that the standards had to be both multi-professional and profession-specific to meet the requirements of the Order.
- 9.5 Miss Thornton asked for clarification as to the level at which the SoPs would operate. The Committee should include issues such as clinical governance and key skills and she offered to convene a group of members to achieve this. The Committee asked her to do this. The exercise would be by e-mail. Papers would be circulated on Monday 17 February 2003 with comments to come back in to her by 22 February. The revised multi-professional SoP would then be recirculated to the Committee.
- 9.6 The Solicitor confirmed that the professional-specific standards were fully properly part of the SoPs as legally defined. (See also the legal advice in 10.2 – 10.4 below).
- 9.7 It was accepted that there were a number of communications issues still to be resolved in the exercise, and the project needed to be aware of this. It was agreed in this context that the working groups be thanked for their helpful recommendations on the multi-professional SoP.
- 9.8 The Department of Health reported in this context that the contract to extend Subject Benchmarks had now been let, and this should help and support the Committee's work on its various standards.
- 9.9 The Committee asked QAA to reschedule the final editorial meeting on 15 April 2003 to a date before 1 April 2003 to avoid any risk of the Standards as available on 1 April being radically altered shortly thereafter.
- 9.10 The Chief Executive clarified that there was no statutory need for brochures, leaflets, etc to be approved and published by 31 March 2003.
- 9.11 Although SoPs could be changed if needed, the Council should seek to avoid any major changes for the two year grandparenting period.
- 9.12 The Solicitor clarified that the SoPs must only address issues of individual practice and could not move into issues around the needs of practice in specific employment sectors. He also reported that he had replied to the queries raised by the project (in the tabled paper). This would be circulated to the Committee.

9.13 It was

**RESOLVED (2)**

**that the approach to the Standards of Proficiency as emended from the workshop on 6 February 2003 be approved and that a final project meeting be rescheduled to before 31 March 2003.**

**ITEM 10 03/10 REPORT ON INTERPRETATIONAL GUIDANCE FOR STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY (INCLUDING REPORT ON THE WORKSHOP ON 6 FEBRUARY 2003)**

- 10.1 The reports for this item had been taken under item 9 above.
- 10.2 It was confirmed that the circulated Solicitor's advice be followed that approved education and training provision should aim to operate at a level higher than the Standards of Proficiency (SoP) because of its different context and purpose.
- 10.3 It was also clarified that the circulated Solicitor's advice on only the multi-professional SoP being the legal standard should be set aside and the guidance set out in the minute for item 9 above now be adopted.
- 10.4 There would be a paper for the next Council meeting on the interaction of definitions of competence and discussion should continue there.

**ITEM 11 03/11 STATEMENT OF GOOD CHARACTER, CONDUCT AND HEALTH**

- 11.1 This was received for information and context. The Committee needed to use these in various contexts. It had agreed not to re-invent its own but to use the Statement approved by the Council on the recommendation of the Conduct and Competence Committee. The Statement was still under revision.
- 11.2 The Solicitor clarified that the different standards had different purposes, and each had to be complete in itself. The Committee asked that the interaction between the different standards be addressed in the communications strategy.

**ITEM 12 03/12 STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING : STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL**

- 12.1 The Secretary reported that these were the standards as an overarching common framework (as for Proficiency) for approval and still subject to amendment.

- 12.2 Prof. Klem queried the ethos of so prescriptive an approach being taken and of the approach being focused on in-puts in terms of time rather than out-puts in terms of capabilities.
- 12.3 It was clarified that historically the initiative for curriculum framework development lay with the professional bodies as learned societies and was then endorsed by the regulator after the exercise of proper discretion. It was agreed that these provenances and interactions be acknowledged in the standards.
- 12.4 The approach suggested was to make standards for in-puts much more general and retain the explicit references to existing out-put documentation.
- 12.5 It was agreed that Prof. Lloyd would convene an e-mail working group to revise the standards over the week 17 – 21 February 2003 working with Newchurch. The Committee's registrant member for each profession should receive the profession-specific data for their profession and discuss it with their relevant professional body.
- 12.6 The Solicitor confirmed that the legal obligation under Part II of the Order to consult on these standards had technically already been met.
- 12.7 It was agreed that the secretariat meeting to take this work forward should proceed, but with at least one relevant expert professional person present.
- 12.8 The full re-alignment of profession-specific documentation should follow after 1 April 2003 and also be in the light of external developments.
- 12.9 It was

**RESOLVED (3)**

**that the Standards of Education be developed along the lines agreed above.**

**ITEM 13 03/13 STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING :  
BROCHURE**

- 13.1 The Secretary reported that this particular brochure was not in the original business plan, but it seemed more appropriate in this format than as an afterthought to the approvals process.
- 13.2 It was agreed that the following principles be adopted in the drafting of this, and every other, brochure :
- potential users be consulted before publication,
  - all terms (eg. " HPC ") should be written out in full on every occasion,

- language across all brochures should be consistent,
- there should be the same timetable for the preparation and publication of brochures as for standards and requirements wherever possible,
- the terms " programmes " and " approval " should be used throughout (and not " courses " or " validation " ),
- suggestions and comments should be submitted to the Secretary, and
- terms of reference and terms of office should be included where relevant and known.

**ITEM 14 03/14 REPORT ON INTERPRETATIONAL GUIDANCE FOR STANDARDS OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

Received under item 13.

**ITEM 15 03/15 BROCHURE ON AN OVERVIEW OF ETC**

- 15.1 The Secretary reported that each statutory committee would have one of these, but they had yet to be correlated and edited together.
- 15.2 It was agreed that reference to education and training of assistant grades should be made specific to the professions asking Council to do this.
- 15.3 See 13.2 above.

**ITEM 16 03/16 BROCHURE ON HOW AN INSTITUTION GAINS APPROVAL (FOR ITSELF AND COURSES) UNDER THE HPO**

- 16.1 The Secretary reported that this would be the main vehicle of communication to institutions investigating starting up provision needing approval under the HPO,
- 16.2 It was agreed to remit this to a working group, to include Newchurch, to review the balance between information in the different operating manuals and brochures, and to review the appropriateness of the text. The group would be set up on 26 March 2003 and the brochure would be finalised later in 2003.
- 16.3 See 13.2 above.

**ITEM 17 03/17 BROCHURE ON VISITORS (GENERAL)**

- 17.1 The Secretary reported that this would be the main vehicle of communication about visitors in general terms based on the text of the Order.

- 17.2 There was concern that commentary based solely on the text of the Order left the role of visitors unhelpfully isolated from the wider context and from other stakeholders.
- 17.3 Members asked about the relationship between HPC and the professional bodies in the context of visiting and why professional bodies conducted visits to approve courses. It was clarified that:
- some professional bodies had specific statutory duties to approve courses under Royal Charters, Whitley Council legislation and such powers,
  - automatic eligibility for membership of the relevant professional body co-terminous with eligibility for entry on HPC's register was seen as a benefit by both UK Health Departments, employers, and education institutions – and educational institutions actively sought it,
  - professional body membership often conferred access to Professional Indemnity Insurance, and
  - some professional bodies could enroll students in membership and advised education and training institutions on ethical issues for their student members.

A benefit of the current collaborative arrangements was that it minimised the risk of the professional and regulatory bodies for a profession coming to conflicting views about the outcome of a course.

The joint arrangements were greatly welcomed by education institutions which had resented the earlier model of two separate visits – sometimes even conducted by the same people – to look at the same evidence and reach the same conclusion.

It was recognised that the professional bodies, therefore, would continue to conduct visits. The issue for HPC was whether to collaborate with this process or separate from the professional bodies and exercise its own powers in isolation.

The Committee agreed that knowingly working in isolation and creating duplication and additional burdens for education institutions would not be acceptable and were contrary to the ethos of the Order.

In agreeing that the operation of visitors should acknowledge the need to collaborate and interests of other stakeholders, however, the Committee needed to be sure that there was no conflict of interest or delegation of duty to other bodies. This meant that visitors appointed by professional bodies worked alongside HPC visitors but could not substitute for them.

- 17.4 This brochure would be remitted to the working party under 16.2 above.
- 17.5 The figure " 30 days a year " should be a maximum if retained. A phrase around " a minimum of four and maximum of 30 days as an indicative figure " could be considered.
- 17.6 See 13.2 above.

**ITEM 18 03/18 BROCHURE ON " VISITORS ARE COMING TO MY INSTITUTION, WHAT SHOULD I DO " ?**

The discussion and decisions on 17 above applied equally to this brochure.

**ITEM 19 03/19 BROCHURE ON STUDENTS' INTRODUCTION TO HPC**

Deferred along the lines of 16 – 18 above and to be redrafted to be more relevant to student needs. Any suggestions from members would be gratefully received. Prof. A van der Gaag offered to explore what assistance she could give.

**ITEM 20 03/20 OPERATING MANUAL ON COURSE AND INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL AT HPC**

- 20.1 The Secretary reported that this had been supplied for completeness only. It was the item most in the nature of " work in progress ". The Committee noted the approach being taken and that an equivalent manual on visits would be prepared.
- 20.2 This would be referred to the working group under 16.2 above.
- 20.3 The approach to the manual was noted.

**ITEM 21 03/21 OPERATING MANUALS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO COURSES AND PLACEMENTS**

- 21.1 Deferred pending the outcome of the work of the working party under 16.2 above.
- 21.2 The approach to these manuals was noted.

**ITEM 22 03/22 TESTS FOR STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE :  
BACKGROUND AND STRATEGY**

- 22.1 The Secretary reported that this work had been being developed through Registration Committee, but must now be reported to and endorsed by ETC. This was a progress report to be received.
- 22.2 It was agreed that references to " anti-discriminatory " practice should make it explicit that this referred to legislation not to professional judgement.
- 22.3 It was clarified that all processes had to be in English (or Welsh where appropriate).
- 22.4 The report was received.

**ITEM 23 03/23 APPROVAL OF THE TESTS OF COMPETENCE**

- 23.1 The Secretary reported that the actual tests could not be presented to the Committee, but approval was needed of the approach being taken. This would be reported again to the Registration Committee on 6 March and ETC on 26 March 2003.
- 23.2 The developmental work could proceed along the lines of 9.3 above.
- 23.3 The report was received and the Committee approved the approach being taken.

**ITEM 24 03/24 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

The meeting agreed to suspend SO 22 to allow discussion to continue.

**ITEM 25 03/25 TESTS FOR KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH**

- 25.1 The Secretary introduced the report explaining that it was a position paper to be received to authorise continuation of work.
- 25.2 Information about tests for knowledge of English elsewhere was being collated. The Secretary also reported that knowledge of English was dealt with in general terms in the Standards of Proficiency and of Education and Education and Training under the heading of " communications skills ".
- 25.3 It was agreed that this would be for the March meetings of the Registration and Education and Training Committees.

25.4 This approach to the development of tests for knowledge of English was approved.

**ITEM 26 03/26 PROGRESS REPORT ON PROCEDURES FOR GRANDPARENTING APPLICATIONS**

26.1 The Secretary reported that this work would be developed along the lines set out in the report for submission to the Registration Committee on 6 March and ETC on 26 March 2003.

26.2 After discussion, it was agreed that this approach to developing the work on grandparenting be approved.

**ITEM 27 03/27 CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT : PROFESSIONAL LIAISON GROUP**

27.1 The Secretary / Chief Executive introduced this report explaining that the Committee was being asked to implement the decision taken by the Council on 21 January 2003. This would be the first Professional Liaison Group to be established. The composition could be developed and adjusted as needed by the preliminary membership.

27.2 The Committee noted that the medical model was simply an example of how CPD could be approached, not a recommendation.

27.3 How far the PLG would link into registration and competence would be a matter for future development.

27.4 It was

**RESOLVED (4)**

**that the CPD PLG be established as set out in the report.**

**ITEM 28 03/28 APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND QUORUM**

It was agreed to take agenda item 29 at this point noting that the meeting would be inquorate thereafter.

**ITEM 29 03/29 APPROVAL 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 ]

29. It was agreed to recirculate these papers for discussion of any issues of principle at the next meeting.

**ITEM 30 03/30 CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The formal meeting closed after this item and the recommendations made by those members still present were to be recorded.

**ITEM 31 03/31 REGISTERS OF APPROVED COURSES, QUALIFICATIONS, INSTITUTIONS AND TESTS OF COMPETENCE AND ENGLISH**

- 31.1 The Secretary introduced this report and explained that this was the document to comply with the HPO. There were no tests of competence on knowledge of English to report yet. It would be an evolving resource. If approved by the Committee it would be posted on the HPC web-site.
- 31.2 It was suggested that the data be recirculated to secretariat staff to recheck for accuracy.
- 31.3 It would come to the next meeting.

**ITEM 32 03/32 COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Held over to the next meeting.

**ITEM 33 03/33 UP-DATE ON DH " PARTNERSHIP " INITIATIVES**

Held over to the next meeting.

**ITEM 34 03/34 MINUTES OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE ON 29 JANUARY 2003 AND MATTERS ARISING FOR ETC**

In the light of the Committee being inquorate, it was suggested that all members be asked to agree the minutes for forwarding to Council outside the meeting.

**ITEM 35 03/35 SCHEDULE OF UNDERTAKEN AND PROSPECTIVE VISIT**

This would have been reported for information only and for inclusion in the annual report in due course.

**ITEM 36 03/36 DIRECTORS' VISITS TO COURSES**

This would have been reported for information only.

**ITEM 37 03/37 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ITEM 38 03/38 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

38.1 The next scheduled meeting would be at 10.30 am on 26 March 2003.

38.2 In the light of the Committee now being inquorate, members suggested that the next meeting start earlier, contain only urgent business and that those attending schedule a whole day for it.

**ITEM 39 03/39 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**

**PCMinutesDraft Minutes Seventh meeting of ETC on 12 February 2003**