

## Education and Training Committee

**Minutes of the 57th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:**

**Date:** Thursday 6 June 2013

**Time:** 10:30 am

**Venue:** The Council Chamber, Health and Care Professions Council, Park House,  
184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

**Members:**

Eileen Thornton (Chair)  
Jo-anne Carlyle  
Mary Clark-Glass  
June Copeman  
Helen Davis  
John Donaghy  
Sheila Drayton  
Stephen Hutchins  
Jeff Lucas

Arun Midha  
Penny Renwick  
Robert Smith  
Jois Stansfield  
Hilary Tompsett  
Joy Tweed  
Diane Waller  
Joanna Watson  
Stephen Wordsworth

**In attendance:**

Alison Croad, Policy Officer  
Brendon Edmonds, Acting Director of Education  
Selma Elgaziari, Policy Officer  
Claire Gascoigne, Secretary to the Committee  
Louise Hart, Secretary to Council  
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager  
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager  
Angela Scarlett Newcomen, Communications Officer (Media and PR)  
Gregor Sutherland, Communications Officer (Stakeholder)  
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

## Part 1 – Public Agenda

### **Item 1 - Chair's welcome and introduction**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Carol McCloskey and Sarah Mowl from The Focus Group.

### **Item 2 - Apologies for absence**

- 2.1 There were no apologies.

### **Item 3 - Approval of agenda**

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda

### **Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests**

- 4.1 Members had no interests to declare in connection with the items on the agenda.

### **Item 5 - Minutes of the meeting of 07 March 2013 (ETC 16/13)**

- 5.1 The minutes were accepted as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **Item 6 - Matters arising from previous meetings (ETC 17/13)**

- 6.1 The Committee noted the list of actions agreed at previous meetings.
- 6.2 The Chair gave an update on proposed changes to the Education and Training Committee. It was noted that there had not been a discussion paper at the March Council meeting as anticipated and that currently it was expected that this matter would be discussed in September. The Chair committed to keeping the Committee informed on any developments.

### **Item 7 - Director of Education's report (ETC 18/13)**

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department between March and May 2013, providing updates on ongoing projects, progress against the Department's workplan and statistics on the approval and monitoring processes.
- 7.2 The Committee noted the following points during discussion;
  - since its last report to Committee, the Department has attended 27 visits, reviewing 87 programmes. The majority of these visits were to social worker programmes (74%);
  - to date, the Department has scheduled 61 visits (covering 145 programmes) for the 2013-2014 academic year. The majority of these

visits are to social worker programmes (79%);

- The Department has recently undertaken a review of its complaints process to identify potential enhancements. As a result of the review the operational process and standard documentation have been updated to ensure efficiency and clarity at all stages;
- 26 education providers have now confirmed the closure of 62 social work programmes. Therefore, the Department will undertake 85 visits reviewing 235 programmes over the next three years;
- the current split in the provision of undergraduate and post graduate social work programmes is 117 undergraduate programmes (50%) and 118 post graduate programmes (50%);
- a lay visitor pilot is to be considered by this meeting of the Committee. Should the pilot be approved, recruitment will begin for lay visitors in September 2013; and
- the organisation of the eight education seminars planned for 2013-14 has commenced with two seminars focused on social work and six seminars focused on service user and carer involvement.

7.3 The report included an appendix consisting of a review of operational activities relating to operating department practitioner programmes during September 2010 – November 2012. The Committee noted that there had been significant change in the education landscape for this profession, with degree level qualification now being the main route of entry.

7.4 Also included as an appendix was a report on Education provider feedback 2012–13. The Committee noted that, for the first time, the education provider survey was compiled using an online survey format. In total, 241 individuals responded to the survey. A list of resulting actions, which the Education Department intends to act upon, concluded the report.

7.5 The Committee discussed attendance at Education Seminars. It was noted that these events are not currently promoted to registrants as a CPD activity and that this could be incorporated into the Communications surrounding the events.

7.6 The Committee discussed the statistics available to the Education Department. It was noted that it was not possible for the HCPC to know the exact numbers of students on particular courses, or levels, as maximum course intakes only are recorded as part of the approvals process.

7.7 The Committee noted the report.

## **Item 8 - Presentation from 'The Focus Group' - findings of SCPE research (ETC 19/13)**

- 8.1 The Committee received a presentation from The Focus Group on the outcomes of research with registrants and service users regarding the accessibility and understanding of the HCPC's Standards of conduct, performance and ethics.
- 8.2 The Committee noted that as part the HCPC's current review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics, the Executive commissioned the market research organisation 'The Focus Group' to carry out research with registrants and service users. The focus of the research (carried out using focus groups, workshops, and telephone interviews with participants) was on examining how the standards are used, their accessibility to registrants and service users, and how ethical principles set by the HCPC are translated into understanding and practice.
- 8.3 The Committee noted that two other pieces of research are to be completed, followed by the use of professional liaison groups and finally consultation.
- 8.4 The Focus Group researchers, Carol McCloskey and Sarah Mowl, presented a summary of their findings to the Committee. The Presentations covered the following areas;
- Methodology
  - Analysis
  - The findings with regards to registrants, service users, the individual standards, other issues and accessibility
  - Overall recommendations for change
- 8.5 The Committee noted that research indicated that social workers felt the standards were traditional and healthcare based, which did not align with their working experience. In particular, standard 9 on consent was not always relevant to social work. However, the same group recognised that the standards needed to be overarching. Similarly, some professions, such as operating department practitioners and biomedical scientists, felt that the standards were very patient facing which was not relevant to them.
- 8.6 An additional finding was that registrants are concerned about their continued professional development and managerial support during a period of budget cuts. It was felt that reduced funding would affect registrant's abilities to adhere to the standards. It was felt that the HCPC needed to engage more with employers to encourage registrant support. An additional recommendation was to develop a standalone 'whistleblowing' standard, along with guidance around the use of social media for registrants.
- 8.7 The Committee discussed the finding that the HCPC had a very low public profile. It was suggested that this issue could be explored during a Council seminar, due to the disbandment of the Communications Committee.
- 8.8 The Committee thanked The Focus Group for their work in this area and noted that the research was part of an evidence base that would inform the review of

the Standards.

### **Item 9 - Service user and carer involvement in education and training programmes - consultation responses and decisions (ETC 20/13)**

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper set out the Service user and carer involvement in education and training programmes consultation responses and decisions.
- 9.2 At the Education and Training Committee's meeting on 7 March 2013, the Committee considered a discussion paper from the Executive on the key issues arising from the service user involvement consultation and a draft of the consultation analysis document.
- 9.3 The Committee noted that the attached consultation analysis document has been updated to include a section explaining the HCPC's decisions as a result of the consultation feedback.
- 9.4 The Committee discussed the terminology 'run' in relation to service user involvement in education programmes on page 32 of the report. It was felt that this was too prescriptive and that the term 'contribute to the programme' would be more suitable. It was also agreed that quality assurance should be included in the list of areas for involvement. It was also suggested that the definition of the phrase 'carer' should include those who look after individuals with care needs.

**ACTION: Policy Manager** to make requested amendments to the revised standard and guidance.

- 9.5 The Committee agreed to recommend the text of the revised standard and guidance, and the text of the consultation responses document for publication on the HCPC website, to the Council subject to minor editing amendments and legal scrutiny.

### **Item 10 - Service user and carer visitors as part of visit panels (ETC 21/13)**

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive setting out proposals for the use of service user and carer visitors as part of visit panels.
- 10.2 At the Education and Training Committee's meeting on 7 March 2013, the Committee discussed proposals for a pilot of 'service user/carers visitors' as part of approval visit panels. The Committee considered that the purpose and value of a service user/carers visitor needed to be explored further and the Executive agreed to present further research on the role of service user and carers visitors to the Committee to inform their decision on the proposal.
- 10.3 The background to the proposal for these visitor roles was discussed. The

Committee noted that the Professional Standards Authority's standards of good regulation require that in quality assuring education and training programmes, regulators should ensure that: 'students'/trainees' and patients' perspectives are taken into account as part of the evaluation'. In its 2011-2012 report, the PSA said that the HCPC did not meet this standard, but noted progress in consulting on a new standard of education and training and in considering the outcomes of a pilot of visitors from a lay background.

- 10.4 Appendix one provided the Committee with an outline of the approaches of other regulators in this area. It was noted that all of the regulators involve 'lay visitors' but the experience which is required varies and the role of visitors is not normally circumscribed.
- 10.5 The Committee noted that the currently the HCPC has four lay visitors, however, there is no formal 'lay visitor' role as distinct from the role of 'visitor' and 'lay visitors' are seldom used. In order to explore the value of this role a pilot was previously conducted. This pilot involved adding visitors from lay backgrounds as a third member of approval visits over a six month period. The result of this was that the Committee concluded that there was no clear evidence that lay visitors added additional value to the approval process above that normally expected of any visitor.
- 10.6 Following this pilot, the Committee agreed that the visitor role brief should be adapted to remove the requirement for specific education experience so that a service user and carer perspective could be attracted and that a second pilot should be considered.
- 10.7 The Committee noted the specific arguments put forward for the added value of involving service users and carers as part of visit panels, these included the HCPC's commitment to involvement, the integrity of the process and a broader perspective.
- 10.8 The Committee agreed that a service user/carers visitor role should be a full member of the visit team, but that the challenge would lie in training so that these visitors feel confident enough to fully contribute.
- 10.9 It was felt the term service user/carers visitor was not appropriate and that the brief should be extended to be a lay visitor. It was noted that this broad role would need to be developed, along with plans for a review of their effectiveness, as it was felt that a pilot was not needed. The Committee noted that the HCPC has prior experience of recruiting lay partners for its fitness to practice process.

**ACTION: Director of Education** to develop the role of 'lay' visitor, and plans for a review of this role.

- 10.10 The Committee agreed to a 'do and review' exercise to determine the effectiveness of lay visitors, along with a request for an in depth lay visitor role brief from the Executive.

## **Item 11 - Outcomes of the consultation on criteria for approving AMHP programmes (ETC 22/13)**

- 11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper set out the results of the HCPC's consultation on criteria for approving AMHP programmes
- 11.2 A public consultation on the draft criteria took place between January 2013 and April 2013 with 56 responses received. 34 of these responses were received from individuals and 22 from organisations. A summary of the responses, and the HCPC's decisions as a result, are being presented to the Committee for approval to Council with the intention that they be published and become effective from the 2013-2014 academic year
- 11.3 The Committee noted that the HCPC had worked with the AMHP leads within the College of Social Work on the proposals, as there was not AMHP experience within the Council.
- 11.4 The Committee discussed the removal of the areas listed in the bullet points at section 4.22 of the paper, and section 7.11 on substance misuse. Whilst there were some concerns at removing these points from the criteria, the Committee noted that the HCPC had been mindful of not going beyond the scope of mental health legislation in this area, and that it was necessary to provide criteria at a threshold level and not beyond. It was noted that the legislation does not put an emphasis on substance misuse above other issue and so for the HCPC to do so would be inappropriate. Legal advice had already been sought on the reviewed criteria.
- 11.5 The Committee agreed that the paper should be approved to Council, but that explanatory notes should be provided on sections 7.9 and 7.11 of the appendix, and the bullet points at 4.22 of the paper.
- 11.6 The Committee agreed to recommend the approval of the criteria for approving AMHP programmes as set out in appendix one and the text of the consultation responses document, to Council, subject to formal legal scrutiny and the amendments requested at 7.11.

## **Item 12 - Results of consultation on standards of proficiency for chiropodists and podiatrists (ETC 23/13)**

- 12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper presented the results of the consultation on the standards of proficiency for chiropodists and podiatrists.
- 12.2 The Committee noted that the HCPC is currently reviewing its profession specific standards of proficiency. This review follows the Council's approval of new generic standards of proficiency in March 2011.
- 12.3 Following the second round of professional body reviews, a consultation took

place between 17 December 2012 and 2 April 2013 on the draft standards for chiropodists and podiatrists.

- 12.4 The Committee noted that decisions on the revision of the standards were also informed by the chiropodist/podiatrist member of the Education and Training Committee and Council.
- 12.5 The consultations attracted 25 responses of which 23 responses (91%) were made by individuals and 20 (87%) were HCPC registered professionals
- 12.6 The Committee requests that standards under the generic standard<sup>14</sup> be reordered to provide a more logical, chronological overview of the process involved. It was requested that the cover paper to Council should emphasize the ongoing consultation that has fed into the paper.

**ACTION: Policy Officer** to make requested amendments to the consultation document.

- 12.7 The Committee agreed to recommend the paper to Council for approval subject to discussed amendments.

### **Item 13 - Results of consultation on standards of proficiency for prosthetists and orthotists (ETC 24/13)**

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper presented the results of the consultation on the standards of proficiency for prosthetists and orthotists.
- 13.2 Following the second round of professional body reviews, a consultation on the draft standards for prosthetists and orthotists took place between 17 December 2012 and 2 April 2013. The Committee noted that decisions on the revision of the standards were also informed by the prosthetist/orthotist member of the Education and Training Committee.
- 13.3 27 responses to the consultation were received. 21 responses (84%) were made by individual professionals registered with the HCPC, 5 (18%) were made by other individuals and 2 (11%) were made on behalf of organisations. The British Association of Prosthetists and Orthotists did not respond to this consultation.
- 13.4 The Committee agreed to recommend the paper to Council for approval.

### **Item 14 - Consultation on standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners (ETC 25/13)**

- 14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper formed a consultation paper and draft standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners

- 14.2 The Committee noted that following a third round of professional body reviews, the HCPC is now ready to consult publicly on the draft standards for operating department practitioners.
- 14.3 The Committee agreed to recommend the paper to Council for approval subject to minor editing changes and legal scrutiny.

**Item 15 - Annotation of the Register - qualifications in podiatric surgery (ETC 26/13)**

- 15.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive setting out the proposed Register annotation for podiatric surgery.
- 15.2 At its meeting on 10 May 2012, the Council, following a recommendation from the Education and Training Committee, decided that the HCPC should annotate qualifications in podiatric surgery on its Register.
- 15.3 The Committee noted that the qualification is currently the Certificate of Completion in Podiatric Surgical Training, although work is taking place in Scotland to develop a comparable qualification. The HCPC will annotate its register with both qualifications. This is currently anticipated to start in spring 2014.
- 15.4 The Committee noted that a decision on how this annotation will be described is required, so that this can be communicated to stakeholders in good time and be included within the consultation document setting out the draft standards.
- 15.5 The Committee agreed to recommend to Council that the annotation of qualifications in podiatric surgery should be described as 'podiatric surgery'.

**Item 16 - Professional Indemnity Insurance guidance consultation (ETC 27/13)**

- 16.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The paper formed a consultation document and draft guidance on 'Professional indemnity cover and your registration'.
- 16.2 The Committee noted that this consultation seeks the views of stakeholders on draft guidance for registrants about a statutory requirement for healthcare professionals to have appropriate professional indemnity cover as a condition of their registration with the HCPC.
- 16.3 The Department of Health launched its consultation on this new requirement in February 2013 and Council agreed the HCPC's response at their meeting on 27 March 2013. The proposed statutory requirement to have appropriate professional indemnity cover is not to extend to social workers in England.
- 16.4 The HCPC plans to consult on its guidance on this new requirement between

June and August of 2013, with the results of the consultation to be brought to Committee and Council for consideration at its September 2013 meeting.

- 16.5 The Committee noted that a stakeholder event will be held by the HCPC focusing on Professional Indemnity Insurance. Professional bodies have been invited to attend. The Committee felt that the limitations of professional indemnity insurance in relation to fitness to practice proceedings for misconduct should be touched upon.
- 16.6 The Committee agreed that the invitation to contact the HCPC about insurance should be removed from page 5 of the guidance.
- 16.7 The Committee agreed to recommend the paper to Council for approval. It was noted that Council approval would be sought electronically due to time scales.

The Committee noted the following items:

**Item 17 - Education System Build Major Project progress update (ETC 28/13)**

**Item 18 - Policy and Standards Department Work Plan 2013-2014/12 (ETC 29/13)**

**Item 19 - Standards of conduct, performance and ethics review - update on timescales and progress (ETC 30/13)**

**Item 20 - Update on guidance for disabled people wanting to become health and care professionals (ETC 31/13)**

**Item 21 - Update on standards for prescribing (ETC 32/13)**

**Item 22 - Standards of proficiency review - update on publication of standards for physiotherapists and radiographers (ETC 33/13)**

**Item 23 - Royal College of Psychiatrists – recommendation (ETC 34/13)**

**Item 24 - Any other business**

24.1 there was no further business.

**Item 25 - Date and time of next meeting:**

10.30 am, 12 September 2013

## **Resolution**

The Committee agreed to adopt 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 one or more of the following;

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason for Exclusion</b>
20	c, d, g, h

**Summary of those matters considered whilst the public were excluded**

The Committee discussed the initiation of a withdrawal of approval process relating to an education provider.

**Chair .....Eileen Thornton.....**

**Date ...12/09/2013.....**