

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 91st meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Tuesday 24 March 2020

Time: 11 am

Venue: By teleconference

Members: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson
Penny Joyce
Sonya Lam
Kathryn Thirlaway
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee
Patrick Armsby, Education Officer
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Sharon Potter, University College of Osteopathy (item 5)
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Graham Sharman, University College of Osteopathy (item 5)

Public Agenda

Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members and the Executive to the meeting.

Item 2 - Apologies for absence

- 2.1 There were no apologies for absence.

Item 3 - Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 No public interests were declared. One interest was declared with regards to the private paper 'Education provider concern' the details of which were recorded in the private minutes for the meeting.

Items for discussion/approval

Item 5 - Non-approval recommendation – The University College of Osteopathy – BSc (Hons) Integrated Nutrition and Dietetics, FT (Full time) (ETC 15/20)

- 5.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.
- 5.2 The Chair set out the process that would be followed in considering the non-approval recommendation. It was noted that:-
- the Executive would then lead the Committee through the visitors outstanding conditions. The University College of Osteopathy (UCO) 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;
 - during all stages Committee members would be able to ask questions to clarify their understanding.
- 5.3 The Executive provided the Committee with a brief overview of the approval journey for the programme. It was noted that the programme was visited in September 2019, this visit resulted in conditions to be met before approval could be granted. UCO was unable to provide the visitors with assurance that

the outstanding conditions were met on two occasions. There were no further approval stages for the visitors to undertake and so the Committee was asked to decide to:

- approve the programme;
- 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.

5.4 The Executive proceeded to summarise the visitors' position relating to the two conditions outstanding on the programme as follows:-

- SET 3.6 – the Visitors concluded that insufficient progress has been made to secure practice-based learning for years 2 and 3 of the programme and there was no assurance provided on the ongoing commitment of placement partners. The consequence of this was that the education provider could not guarantee practice based learning provision for all programme learners; and
- SET 5.2 - the Visitors concluded that a suitable range of practice based learning had not been secured, specifically there was no NHS or community health placements secured. The Visitors considered that these settings were essential to ensure learners understand dietetic practice, and therefore some SOPs could not be addressed within the current range of placements. Those placements already secured were considered by the Visitors to be unsuitable to support the achievement of the learning outcomes as intended by the education provider

5.5 The Committee discussed the assurance that was normally expected from providers about the provision of placements in year two and three of a programme. It was noted that the visitors had set out on page 10 of their report suggested documentation required to provide the needed assurance. The Executive added that formal broad agreements on provision would be expected to be available for the Visitor's review.

5.6 The Committee discussed the assessment of the adequacy of the practice placements and if this test could provide a barrier for non-traditional providers gaining programme approval. It was noted that the visitors test the placements against the SETs at a threshold level and that the SETs were designed to be universally applicable to all education provision regardless of the provider profile.

5.7 The Committee agreed that with regards to condition 5.2 which related to the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs, the visitor panel had the required expertise (a registered dietician visitor member) to make this assessment. The Committee itself did not have a dietician member, and therefore the Committee would defer to the panel's judgement that the

placements secured by the provider did not provide learners with the needed learning outcomes to meet the SOPs.

- 5.8 The Committee noted concern that learners would not be able to make an informed choice without know what the year two and three placement provision would be. Therefore there was a student experience risk alongside that of public protection due to learning outcomes not meeting the SOPs
- 5.9 The Committee noted that it had a responsibility should an approved programme close with students part way through their studies to make best endeavours to find alternative programme places for the displaced students.
- 5.10 The UCO was invited to address the Committee on any points they wished to make in addition to their written observations. The Committee noted the following points put forward by the UCO:-
- UCO's challenge to secure the number and range of placements required to meet the conditions stemmed from the hesitance of placement providers to commit to future placement provision. UCO considered that provisional HCPC approval would strengthen their position when trying to secure additional placements;
 - UCO outlined their experience of seeking approval with the General Osteopathy Council (GOsC) noting that the GOsC provided approval with specific conditions to be met within a set time;
 - UCO made a commitment to clearly inform learners on the programme that HCPC registration was not guaranteed whilst the provisional approval was in place; and
 - UCO advised the committee they were investing in their own internal clinics to increase their internal placement provision
- 5.11 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.
- 5.12 Following discussion in the private meeting, the Committee agreed that they would initiate non approval proceedings in respect of the University College of Osteopathy programme: BSc (Hons) Integrated Nutrition and Dietetics (full 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 of the programme (appendix 1).

Item 6 - Reverse the decision to withdraw approval – Middlesex University – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time) (ETC 16/20)

6.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.

6.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- following discussion with the education provider which indicated the programme was no longer running the education provider was advised to submit a programme closure form, which they did;
- the Education and Training Panel agreed to withdraw ongoing approval from the programme; and
- subsequently it transpired that the education provider intended to modify the programme to a four year rather than three year programme. The department received a major change notification form for this.

6.3 The Committee agreed to void its withdrawal of approval decision for the programme 'Middlesex University – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (full time)' dated 6 November 2019. The Committee agreed that the assurance required for the ongoing approval of the modified programme could be obtained most proportionately through the major change process.

Item 7 - Any other business

7.1 There was no further business.

Item 8 - Date and time of next meeting

8.1 10.30am – 11 June 2020 at Park House, SE11 4BU

Item 9 – 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
10	A

Signed

Date

Unconfirmed

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 92nd meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 23 April 2020

Time: 2 pm

Venue: By teleconference

Members: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson
Penny Joyce
Sonya Lam
Kathryn Thirlaway
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Anna Clampin, University of Central Lancashire (item 6)
Niall Gooch, Education Officer
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Maxine Winstanley, University of Central Lancashire (item 6)

Public Agenda

Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members and the Executive to the meeting.

Item 2 - Apologies for absence

- 2.1 There were no apologies for absence.

Item 3 - Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 No public interests were declared. One interest was declared with regards to the private paper 'Education provider concern' the details of which were recorded in the private minutes for the meeting.

Item 5 - Public minutes of the Education and Training Committee meetings of 10 and 24 March 2020 (ETC 18/20)

- 5.1 The Committee approved the public minutes of its meetings of 10 and 24 March 2020

Items for discussion/approval

Item 6 - Non-approval recommendation - University of Central Lancashire, MSc Speech and Language Therapy, full time accelerated (ETC 15/20)

- 6.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.
- 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 then lead the Committee through the visitor's outstanding conditions. The University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) 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;
 - 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 programme. It was noted that the programme was visited in September 2019, this visit resulted in conditions to be met before approval could be granted. Following the education provider's first conditions response, the visitors required a second response. After reviewing the additional evidence provided by the education provider through both conditions responses, the visitors consider that two conditions are not met by the programme. There were no further approval stages for the visitors to undertake and so the Committee was asked to decide to:
- approve the programme;
 - 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 programme.
- 6.4 The Committee agreed to first consider the education providers observations on the application of the approval process, set out in appendix three of the report. The purpose of this was to determine if the issues raised impacted on the visitors' reasoning to not approve the programme to an extent that the findings were flawed.
- 6.5 The Committee noted UCLan's observation that they were required to submit significantly more evidence than during their previous experience of HCPC programme approval. The Committee noted that the Executive had not undertaken a comparative review to similar programmes. The level of evidence required would be determined by the individual circumstances of a programme.
- 6.6 The Committee noted it was difficult for them to judge if the volume of evidence required was excessive having not been party to that evidence, however the Committee noted the education provider's comments on the concise style of their documentation and that revisions were ongoing during the visit period.
- 6.7 The Committee noted the requirement for full assessment briefs to be provided. The Committee considered that this was above what would normally be expected from education providers. Requiring the number of hours of study was particularly granular detail not normally seen as the assurance focus should be on learning outcomes.
- 6.8 The Committee noted the education providers perception that the visit was more confrontational in style than they had previously experienced, and that learners on the programme had felt 'interrogated'. They noted that the Education Officer present on the visit had not raised concerns about the tone of the visit at the time. The Committee agreed that it required assurance that

these observations had been raised with the Visitors to reflect on and that their perspective was sought.

- 6.9 The Committee concluded that the education providers observations on the application of the process did require consideration by the Executive and appropriate follow up.
- 6.10 The Executive proceeded to summarise the visitors' position relating to the two conditions outstanding on the programme.
- 6.11 The Committee discussed the visitor's comments about module content. The Committee felt that the visitors were considering separated modules to identify learning outcomes and therefore the SOPs, rather than taking into account learning outcomes from across the programme. The Committee noted that at the time of the visit the programme was still developing and this could have resulted in the view that key clinical areas were not sufficiently covered.
- 6.12 The UCLan was invited to address the Committee on any points they wished to make in addition to their written observations. The Committee noted the following points put forward by the UCLan:-
- UCLan's module descriptors were concise by design, they had felt the Visitors were focused on where something would sit in a module rather than how the curriculum would deliver learning outcomes. UCLan provided the Visitors with a scheme of work later in the process to try and impart this understanding;
 - practice element documentation was mapped against the SOPs;
 - the registered speech and language therapist programme lecturer noted that hearing impairment was an important focus in the programme and was covered in the second year. She felt the visitors had missed that specific clinical conditions were embedded in the modules so learners could build on theoretical knowledge; and
 - UCLan had significant experience of HCPC the approval process and the visit in this instance had not felt constructive in comparison.
- 6.13 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.
- 6.14 Following discussion in the private meeting, the Committee agreed that UCLan would be provided with an additional opportunity to demonstrate the outstanding conditions were met. The Committee's reasons for reaching this

decision are contained within the decision notice issued in respect of the programme (appendix 1).

Item 7 - COVID-19 impact on implementing SET 1 for paramedics (ETC 20/20)

7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.

7.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- in March 2018, the Committee agreed that the SET 1 threshold level of award for paramedics should be raised to degree level for cohorts from September 2021 onwards;
- the pandemic has impacted the ability for student paramedics to continue on currently approved programmes due to being brought into the service to support the COVID-19 response and the unavailability of practice based learning and academic delivery; and
- this could result in potential workforce shortages throughout the UK, which has been raised by the Scottish Government.

7.3 The Committee agreed that it was important to take a pragmatic approach to this issue and to understand the needs of each health service in managing this issue going forward. The Committee also did not wish to undo the positive work done by the health and education sectors since March 2018 to introduce degree level entry training for the paramedic profession.

7.4 The Committee directed the Executive to work directly with each health service to understand what, if any adjustment in lead in time is needed to ensure the paramedic workforce can be maintained both during and following the pandemic response. Any localised extensions to the timeline for SET1 change would be risk based. The Committee noted that the Executive would be mindful of the differences in provision across the four countries.

7.5 The Committee asked the Executive to strengthen the position statement to reinforce the HCPC's commitment to the SET 1 change for paramedics and to clearly set out that the HCPC expects providers to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the September 2021 introduction. With this amendment the Committee agreed to publish the position statement set out in appendix one of the paper. It was noted that the Executive would discuss the position statement with the College of Paramedics.

Item 8 - Any other business

8.1 There was no further business.

Item 9 - Date and time of next meeting

Item 10 – 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
11	A

Signed

Date