

Agenda Item 12(i)

Enclosure 8

**Health and Care Professions Council
25 September 2019**

**Unconfirmed minutes of the Education and
Training Committee of 11 September 2019**

To note

**From Stephen Wordsworth, Chair of the
Education and Training Committee**

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 88th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Wednesday 11 September 2019

Time: 11:30am

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

Members: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson
Sonya Lam
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee
Roz Allison, Head of Communications
John Barwick, Executive Director of Regulation
Olivia Bird, Policy Manager
Dr Andy Bridgen, University of Huddersfield
James Coughtrey, The College of Podiatry
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Dr Joanne Garside, University of Huddersfield
Jacqueline Ladds, Executive Director of Policy and External Relations
James Pickard, The College of Podiatry
Susan Taylor, The College of Podiatry
Katherine Timms, Head of Policy and Standards

Public Agenda

Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee, Executive and those sat in the public gallery to the meeting.

Item 2 - Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Penny Joyce.

Item 3 - Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 Sonya Lam declared an interest in item 6 as she had been involved with the development of the Queen Mary University Podiatric Surgery programme. The Committee agreed that this interest did not preclude Sonya Lam from participating in the Committee's consideration of item 6.

Item 5 - Minutes of the meeting of 5 June 2019 (ETC 15/19)

- 5.1 The Committee approved the minutes of the 87th meeting of the Education and Training Committee.

Items for discussion/approval

Item 6 - Non-approval recommendation - University of Huddersfield Podiatric Surgery (ETC 16/19)

- 6.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.
- 6.2 The Chair set out the process that would be followed in considering the non-approval recommendation. It was noted that:-
 - the Executive would provide a verbal summary of the events leading up to the recommendation;
 - the College Of Podiatry (CoP) would be asked to verbally address the Committee in relation to their submission included in the paper, which focused on the application of the HCPC approval process, and the broader impact of a decision to not approve this programme;
 - the Executive would then lead the Committee through the visitors outstanding conditions. The University of Huddersfield (UoH) would be provided with the opportunity to address the Committee on each condition regarding their response;

- the Committee would then withdraw into private session to determine their decision which would be reported back in public session. The Committee's decision would be based on the documentary evidence submitted in advance of the meeting included in the Committee paper; and
- during all stages Committee members would be able to ask questions to clarify their understanding.

6.3 The Executive provided the Committee with a brief overview of the approval journey for the two programmes. It was noted that the programmes had been visited twice and that a number of conditions remained outstanding. There are no further approval stages for the visitors to undertake and so the Committee was asked to decide to:

- approve the programmes;
- commence non-approval proceedings; or
- direct the Executive to undertake any other course of action it deems necessary to inform its decision regarding the approval of the programmes.

6.4 The Chair invited the representatives from the CoP to verbally address the Committee on any observations they had on the application of the HCPC approval process, and the broader impact of a decision to not approve this programme. The Committee noted the following points:-

- it was felt that the approach of the visitor panel had been at odds with the CoP's many other experiences of HCPC programme approval processes, being considerably more onerous and requiring a level of detail considered unnecessary;
- the tone of some of the questioning had felt to be hostile and overstepping the visitor panel's remit;
- some of the questioning displayed a lack of understanding of the current level of Podiatry practice;
- at several points during the two visits, the visitor's ability to provide a neutral viewpoint came into question. The decision to recommend non approval felt pre-determined;
- the change in HCPC Executive during the process was felt to have impacted on the effective line of communication between approval events; and
- the Podiatry profession was vulnerable with declining numbers of new students embarking on training. Podiatric surgery was seen as an aspirational route for new graduates and so non-approval could further

discourage potential students, and in the longer term impact on service provision.

- 6.5 The Committee noted that in their written submission, the CoP had referred to a visitor 'making offers to the course team in conflict with his role as an independent assessor of the programme'. It was noted that this referred to offering to put the provider in touch with suitable examiners or others who could provide 'advice'. At the event, the HCPC Executive noted that this was not advice that the visitor could provide.
- 6.6 The Executive noted that visitors report includes a detailed explanation for the reasons underpinning the visitors findings, including where they have reached positions which are inconsistent with findings made earlier in the process. They added that the change in HCPC Executive during the process was not unusual and the handover had been thorough.
- 6.7 The Committee noted it would consider if the observations provided by CoP on the application of the HCPC process impacted materially on the visitors' recommendation for non-approval as part of the decision making process.
- 6.8 The Executive proceeded to summarise the visitors' position relating to the conditions outstanding on the two programmes, beginning with the Annotation of existing Podiatrists practising Podiatric Surgery programme. The following observations were made by UoH in addition to those submitted in their written response:-

Annotation of existing Podiatrists practising Podiatric Surgery

- 6.8.1 Condition C.5 – the programme learning outcomes were focused on the HCPC standards. Clear guidance would be given to assessors and candidates that the standards of conduct performance and ethics (SCPE) would be a required part of the portfolio. Candidates would be required to reflect on the SCPE and their application to podiatric surgery practice and provide case studies of this reflection.

In addition it was noted that all candidates on the programme would be experienced and practising podiatrists registered with the HCPC. As part of HCPC registration they were already required to follow SCPE and undertake continuing professional development.

- 6.8.2 Condition E.4 - candidates were already working in highly regulated environments. Additionally admission to the programme required fellowship. To gain fellowship applicants were required to be observed in clinical practice, as well as third party verification of the quality of their practise.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Director of Regulation confirmed there was no evidence to suggest the fitness to practise concern risk profile of podiatric surgery was any higher than for other professions which did not require observed practise of clinical skills for approval.

6.8.3 Condition E.10 - UoH confirmed that external examiners were required to be either a HCPC annotated podiatrist practising podiatric surgery or hold an equivalent regulated professional qualification which they considered met the requirement of the SET.

Master of Podiatric Surgery

6.8.4 Condition - B.1 - UoH confirmed that an error in the training places schedule had been amended. UoH expanded that all programme entrants required a training post for admission, this approach followed that accepted for supplementary prescribing approved courses. Quality assurance of the placement would be undertaken once an application was made by a trainee. At present applications were not open as the HCPC approval decision was awaited first. However all placement quality assurance would be completed before the programme started if approved.

6.8.5 Condition B.10 – UoH advised that the issues raised by visitors related to the admissions information were previously raised through a recommendation, and they understood that this did not need to respond to as part of the second conditions response. On this point they noted that they would be making these updates shortly. UoH also noted that candidates did not need to access the PASCOM system through the programme, but that it might be used to provider information and evidence around learning

6.8.5 Condition D.2 – UoH advised they had received letters of assurance as to the sustainability of the training posts from the Chief Executives of all relevant Healthcare Trusts.

6.8.6 Condition D.4 - HoD confirmed that their placement audit tool was based on the HEE Practice Placement Quality Assurance (PPQA) audit tool, which was widely acknowledged as the industry standard and used in many HCPC professions.

6.8.7 Condition E.7 - UoH observed that entry to the programme required entrants to be employees of a Trust in a training post, and so subject to their employment contract. The University's regulations would be followed for deferral and re-joining the programme, again this would still require employment in a training post.

6.8.8 Condition E.10 - UoH noted their observations for this condition for the annotation programme were applicable to the Masters programme.

6.9 The Committee adopted 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 the following; 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 Council's functions. Minutes of this discussion were constrained within the private minutes of the meeting.

6.10 Following discussion in the private meeting, the Committee advised that they had decided to approve the University of Huddersfield programmes: Master of Podiatric Surgery (Part time), and HCPC Annotation of existing Podiatrists practising Podiatric Surgery (Part time). A decision notice with full reasoning would be issued subsequently. The Committee's reasons for reaching this decision are contained within the decision notice issued in respect to each programme (appendix 1).

Item 7 - Standards of proficiency review (ETC 17/19)

7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.

7.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- at its March 2019 meeting, Council agreed not to use Professional Liaison Groups for the review as in previous reviews, but to instead seek feedback on the standards through stakeholder engagement;
- stakeholder engagement to date had included a series of workshops in Belfast; Cardiff; Edinburgh; and London and meetings with stakeholders to discuss the standards in more depth;
- a stakeholder survey had been issued receiving 48 responses;
- the feedback received during this stakeholder engagement would be used to draft revised standards later in the year; and
- the gathered stakeholder feedback would be used to produce new draft standards for all 16 professions. Public consultations would then take place on a rolling basis.

7.3 The Committee discussed the effectiveness of the new approach. It was noted that stakeholder feedback rates were positive.

7.4 Member Sonya Lam noted that she had attended the workshop in Edinburgh and had found the depth of discussion to be encouraging.

7.5 The Committee agreed that the paper should be shared with Council, with the addition that the new approach had achieved its aims.

Item 8 - Social media guidance amendments (ETC 18/19)

8.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.

8.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- in September 2018 the HCPC published a blog post highlighting the Social media guidance, the benefits of social media, and the importance of confidentiality;
 - amendments to the guidance are proposed to elevate the text on confidentiality, and outline further key considerations around various social media tools; and
 - the draft guidance had been shared with key stakeholders for their feedback and updated in response to this.
- 8.3 the Committee welcomed the inclusion of an equality, diversity and inclusion assessment in the paper. The Committee agreed that consideration of elder service users understanding of social media when gaining consent should be included.
- 8.4 The Committee noted that, as guidance, the language could not be strengthened beyond its current tone, as this would become a standard.
- 8.5 The Committee discussed a scenario where a registrant maintained a social media hobby page unrelated to their practice and service users engaged with that page separately from any professional relationship. It was noted that the advice in the guidance was a recommendation and that a case-by-case assessment of suitability needed to be made by each registrant.
- 8.6 The Committee agreed to recommend the revised guidance to Council for approval.

Item 9 - Establishing equivalence to SET 1 threshold (ETC 19/19)

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper from the Executive.
- 9.2 The Committee noted the following points:-
- the statement clarifies the legal framework for the application of SET 1 and the visitors' role in assessing how programmes meet SET 1 through the approval process; and
 - the statement outlines the additional requirements to be placed on education providers to establish equivalence to a specified SET 1 qualification, where the qualification proposed for approval differs to that which is normally required.
- 9.3 The Committee noted that the intended audience for the policy statement was education programme providers.
- 9.4 The Committee agreed the policy statement.

The Committee noted the following items;

Item 10 - Education data set (2017-18 academic year) (ETC 20/19)

Item 11 - University of Bedfordshire – BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy and BSc (Hons) Physiotherapy – approval process update (ETC 21/19)

Item 12 - Any other business

12.1 There was no further business.

Item 13 - Date and time of next meeting

13.1 10.30am – 6 November 2019 at Park House, SE11 4BU

Item 14 – Resolution

The Committee is invited to adopt the following:

‘The Committee hereby resolves that the remainder of the meeting shall be held in private, because the matters being discussed relate to the following;

- (a) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or application for registration;
- (b) information relating to an employee or office 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 Council;
- (f) action being taken to prevent or detect crime to prosecute offenders;
- (g) the source of information given to the Council 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 Council’s functions.’

Item	Reason for Exclusion
15	h
16	a
17	a
18	h

Chair

Date