

**Agenda Item 2**

**Enclosure 1**

**Paper RC 10 / 03**

**REGISTRATION COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the Registration Committee  
meeting held on 29 January 2003**

**From : Secretary to the Committee**

**FOR AGREEMENT AND SIGNING**

184 Kennington Park Road  
London SE11 4BU  
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7582 0866  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7820 9684  
e-mail: [lucinda.pilgrim@hpc-uk.org](mailto:lucinda.pilgrim@hpc-uk.org)

**MINUTES** of the eighth meeting of the Registration Committee of the Health Professions Council held on Wednesday 29 January 2003 at the Evangelical Alliance, 186 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BT.

**PRESENT :**

Miss P. Sabine – Vice-Chairman (Chairing)  
Miss M. Crawford  
Mr P. Frowen  
Dr R Jones  
Mr I Massey  
Miss E Thornton  
Dr A Van der Gaag  
Mr. C. Lea (ex-officio)  
Mr. G. Sutehall (ex-officio)

**IN ATTENDANCE :**

Miss L. Pilgrim – Director, HPC, Secretary to the Registration Committee  
Mr M. Seale – Chief Executive / Registrar, HPC  
Dr P. Burley – Director of Education and Policy, HPC  
Miss C. Harkin – Manager, UK Registration  
Mr R. Dunn – Interim Manager, International Registration  
Ms S. Dawson – Grandparenting Manager, HPC  
Mr G. Ross-Sampson – Project Manager, HPC  
Ms M. Collins – Newchurch

**ITEM 1      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from :- Professor N Brook and Professor R Klem.

**ITEM 2      MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 NOVEMBER 2002**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2002 were agreed as a correct record save for the following amendment :

Item 4 (iv) : The final sentence to read :

" Mr C Lea confirmed that attendance at training days had been budgeted for but the programme dates had been postponed. "

**ITEM 3      MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

**ITEM 4      GRANDPARENTING – PROGRESS REPORT**

Miss S Dawson gave the Committee an up-date. In excess of 10,000 letters had been sent to Educational Institutions, Associations and Journals in order to gauge the numbers of Chiropodists, Paramedics and Physiotherapists who were unregistered. Market Research had shown that there were about 15,000 Chiropodists in the private sector who were unregistered; this group had been the largest to respond. Miss Dawson said that to date she had received only 3,500 responses. This appeared to indicate that (a) people were simply not responding or (b) the numbers of unregistered practitioners were not as large as originally thought. All channels had been exhausted in an effort to get as accurate a figure as possible. Those working 35 hours per week or more were in full time employment; those working less than 35 hours per week were part-time. Miss Dawson said that the requirement in Article 13 (2) of the OIC that a person had to show that he had been " wholly or mainly engaged in the lawful, safe and effective practice . . . . " would have to be extrapolated in to the application form in order to find out if practitioners only worked 2 / 3 days as health practitioners and were engaged in other employment the rest of the time.

Dr Jones advised that Miss Dawson should also contact Chartered Physiotherapists in private practice; there may be members in private practice who were unregistered.

Dr Van der Gaag asked what were the various organisations' views about the disparity in numbers. Miss Dawson said that 3 of the listed organisations felt that their members had responded. SMAE had said that they had trained 5,500 Chiropodists. Miss Dawson confirmed that she was concerned by the disparity in numbers but there did not appear to be any mechanism to force people to apply to be grandparented. She said that the Communications Director was about to target employers in both the private and public sector.

Mr Frowen expressed concern about how the grandparenting process would operate. He asked Miss Dawson to go through the process. Mr Seale said that the issue would be reviewed at the Education and Training (ETC) meeting on 12 February. Miss Sabine said that the ETC would set Standards of Proficiency but any processes to do with registration would be dealt with by the Registration Committee. Mr Seale said

that the paper before the Committee was merely an up-date on the progress of the grandparenting issue. The present meeting was not an appropriate time to discuss the grandparenting process in detail and in addition the relevant information was not presently before the Committee. Mr Seale said however that it was a matter for the Committee what matters it chose to discuss.

Miss Sabine said that the Committee would like to see the Grandparenting process document. Miss Crawford said that Grandparenting and International processes would be similar. Grandparenting was not understood, nor was the use of the word "titles". HPC would have to target and seek the assistance of a wider registrant body.

Mr Seale said that once the Rules were passed in March 2003 a draft letter would go out to all Registrants covering, inter alia, the new Grandparenting process and fees. The letter would ask all Registrants to let HPC know of people who were practising but who were not registered. The Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists had indicated that they wanted to assist HPC in this task.

Dr Jones said it should be clarified which committee was responsible for the registration process of Grandparenting applicants. Dr Burley said that Council had delegated this function to the Registration Committee. Mr Seale said that in fact the Education and Training Committee was a statutory practice committee and would advise Council. It was the ETC who had delegated this function to the Registration Committee.

Mr Frowen said that he would be more comfortable if the Grandparenting process mirrored the International Registration Process. Miss Crawford said that the Committee could not look at the Grandparenting process in isolation from the registration process of such applicants. She said that Grandparenting was important too in respect of partners and the training they would require in assessing Grandparenting applications.

#### **ITEM 5      U.K. REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT – BEST PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT**

Miss Harkin said that some of the changes in the U.K. Registration Department had come about in response to a survey carried out in 2002. She took the Committee through the paper at Enclosure 3. The Committee felt that the report was clear and very helpful. Dr Van der Gaag said that it gave a better idea of what the U.K. Registration Department did. She asked whether there were any ways in which Council members could assist the U.K. Department, for example by answering questions on generic or profession-specific issues. Miss Harkin said she would think about ways in which Council members could assist.

Mr Frowen said that he had had a query and had used the system and had found it to be efficient. Mr Lea said that the investment in the new telephone system had been worthwhile. Miss Crawford said that this document was a public document and for this reason names of staff and any of their personal details should be removed.

**ITEM 6      INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT – MOVING TO  
A SINGLE MECHANISM FOR INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION**

Mr Dunn took the Committee through the paper at Enclosure 4. He said that 50 % of staff's time was spent continuously on the telephone. The present system was largely paper based, resulting in delays in the processing of applications. Further, each of the 12 professions presently regulated by HPC required 12 slightly different sets of documentation and workflows before an applicant could become registered.

The Registration process could be speeded up by putting the process on-line and moving to a common set of documentation and workflows and by a rationalisation of the application requirements. Processes would be generic and so could be shared with the Grandparenting process.

Registrant assessors would have to be trained in the light of the changes. Miss Sabine asked if registrant assessors would be required to be IT literate. The Committee felt that this was not an unreasonable requirement. Mr Ross-Sampson said that HPC would provide appropriate training for registrant assessors. The more IT literate registrant assessors were, the better the service provided to registrants.

Dr Van der Gaag said that there should be an alternative to IT because not everybody had access to a computer.

Miss Thornton asked whether there would be reciprocity agreements with other countries. Mr Frowen said that as he understood it HPC could not have reciprocity agreements.

Mr Ross-Sampson said that the International Registration Department was looking into how best to resolve the situation where registrant assessors would be looking at applicants individually but they had all completed the same academic course at the same university. The Committee noted that each application had to be considered on its merits, with the registrant assessors considering, inter alia, (a) the applicant's academic record, and (b) their clinical practice and ability.

**ITEM 7      HPC'S POLICY ON ADDRESSES FOR REGISTRANTS**

Mr Ross-Sampson said that this had been agreed at the Registration Committee meeting on 12 November 2002. The Committee agreed that the following recommendations be put to Council to be adopted as Council policy: That Registrants would be obliged to :

- (i) Provide a home address which would be used by Council as the registered and correspondence address but would not be made publicly available;
- (ii) Provide a work address which would be used by Council as a publicly displayed address which members of the public could view to determine whether a particular registrant practised in their locale;
- (iii) Update Council within xx days of a change in either their home address or work address.

## ITEM 8 FORMAT OF CERTIFICATE

Mr Ross-Sampson discussed the paper at Enclosure 6.

The recommendation made about "titles" was that only protected titles that registrants were entitled to use would be shown on registration certificates. The part or subsection of the Register in which they were registered would not be shown on registration certificates.

Mr Frowen said that there may be some exceptions under the Medicines Act, 1968, where a registrant may have a certificate to show that they are qualified to prescribe medicines. Mr Seale said that the issue was being raised as a Parliamentary question in the House of Commons. It would be best to leave the issue until the question had been answered by the House of Commons.

The recommendation about qualifications was that as the Register would not record approved or non-approved qualifications, these would not appear on registration certificates. However, information about qualifications would be captured in the IT registration system for internal use.

The recommendation about salutations was that HPC would record a registrant's salutation on its Register. However, in the interests of the safety and well-being of the public and in particular to avoid appearing to endorse any particular salutation as being related to a registrant's practice of an HPC-regulated profession, salutations would not be displayed on registration certificates.

The Committee agreed that the following recommendation be put to Council to be adopted as Council policy : That Council approve the following form of words for Certificates :

"This is to certify that  
FirstName MiddleName1toN LastName  
is registered with the Health Professions Council and is entitled to practise using the following titles:  
Title1  
Title 2  
Title 3  
...  
TitleN"

Mr Sutehall said that some professionals included letters after their names to indicate that they were state registered. Mr Seale said that the concept of " State Registration " would disappear on 1 April 2003. What would be protected was the title—for example the title of " physiotherapist " would be protected and if a health professional was not registered they would not be able to call themselves a " physiotherapist ". " State registration " would not mean anything after 1 April 2003.

## ITEM 9 ACTIVITY REPORT

The Secretary pointed out that the Committee should note the statistical information already provided by the Chief Executive in his regular reports to Council, so that that information was not duplicated. However, there may be some overlap.

The Committee felt that Mrs Collins' paper was a good starting point. Mr Ross-Sampson said it was important for Committee members to feedback to the Executive as soon as possible their ideas for the sort of statistical information the Committee would require.

Miss Crawford said that the International Registration Department could provide information on the number of applicants from the European Community. It would also be worth monitoring the speed and efficiency with which applications were processed.

Miss Thornton said that in addition to monitoring the numbers of applications, there should be monitoring of the quality of applications, for example the reasons why applications were refused. This would assist in monitoring any patterns.

Mr Dunn suggested that statistical data could be compiled on where applicants had trained and their country of origin.

Dr Van der Gaag asked whether the information would be collected by profession. Miss Crawford said that information collated on a profession by profession basis would be important because the Committee might need to look at a particular issue with one professional body but not with another.

Mr Seale suggested that the Executive management reports be used to put together relevant information which the Committee would want. This information would be compared to that which the Chief Executive gave to Council at its meetings.

**ITEM 10     MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 12 NOVEMBER 2002 AND 27 NOVEMBER 2002**

The Committee noted these.

**ITEM 11     REGISTRATION UNDER THE PROFESSIONS SUPPLEMENTARY TO MEDICINE ACT, 1960**

The Committee noted that Council had approved the following :

1. That applications for registration or restoration to the register under the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act, 1960 would be determined by Council;
2. That consideration of such applications would be delegated to a committee comprised of the Chairman of the Registration Committee and two other members of Council, one of whom should be a registrant from the same part of the 1960 Act register as the applicant;
3. That the Committee should report any decision to refuse registration or restoration to the next meeting of Council.

**ITEM 12     ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

In accordance with Council's decision that the Committee should report to Council any decision to refuse registration or restoration, the Committee would be notifying Council of the decision not to restore Ms J Heyer to the Physiotherapists Register. This decision had been taken on 21 January 2003 when a Panel had met to consider an application by Ms J Heyer for restoration to the Physiotherapists Register. The Panel had decided that it could not recommend her restoration to the Register due to her inability to prove good character. The Panel recommended that Ms Heyer apply for restoration to the Register after a substantial period of non-offending.

**ITEM 13     DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on 6 March 2003 at 10.00 a.m. at HPC, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU.

**CHAIRMAN**