

Agenda Item 21

Enclosure 8

Paper ETC 8/02

Shadow Health Professions Council

Education and Training Committee

**C.P.S.M. RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION ON
INFORMATION NEEDS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE**

From C.P.S.M. via the Secretary

FOR INFORMATION

**THE COUNCIL FOR
PROFESSIONS SUPPLEMENTARY TO MEDICINE**

Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

Telephone 020 7582 0866 Fax: 020 7820 9684

Registrar: M D Hall OBE GM

Our ref: CDB/AH/432943

19/12/2001

Dear Ms Creasey,

INFORMATION ON QUALITY AND STANDARDS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

This is an interim response on behalf of the Registrar at CPSM and Registrar and Chief Executive Designate for the (Shadow) Health Professions Council (SHPC) to your consultation paper 01/66.

In the time available the various committees, Councils, and Boards at CPSM and SHPC will not have been able to give the paper the proper consideration it deserves by 21 December 2001, and further response may follow.

It is assumed that this consultation applies to England only and that equivalent consultations will be held for the other three UK Home Countries in due course. If this is not the case, clarification of the position outside England would be much appreciated.

There are some specific issues relating to some of your questions for health-funded professions in England which will be the subject of testing and evaluation in the 2001/2 "prototype academic reviews" under the guidance of a DoH / QAA Steering Group. You should refer your paper to that Steering Group for its comments c/o Ruth Howkins at QAA.

A very specific editorial point emerged at the seminar on 30 November 2001. The intention in 49(b) is that external examiners should retain editorial control of precised text. This intention is not explicit beyond peradventure in the text as published. This could be addressed by rewording the first sentence, "To require HEIs to publish summaries of their reports prepared by the external examiners themselves for publication".

Please come back to me for any further clarification.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Burley
Deputy Registrar and Head of Education CPSM

Ms Emma Creasey
Higher Education Funding Council for England
Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane
BRISTOL BS16 1QD

Questions

1. This should be agreed with the stakeholders concerned in advance. " One size " may not fit all. In the specific health context the DoH/QAA Steering Group should be asked to look at this.
2. For health SRBs programme/course specific information is essential. If it is not provided in general QA systems, then the SRBs will need to devise their own separate procedures to capture it.
- 3 – 8. For all these questions, the response must be that the proposals will be satisfactory only if the needs of SRBs can be accommodated within them.
9. HESA data to date has not been specific to health programmes. Aggregated data is of no use or value to CPSM / HPC, and disaggregated data currently has to be sought separately and will continue to have to be sought.
- 10–11. The issue about external examiners' reports for CPSM has been that HEIs have on occasion refused to release adverse reports and forced the Boards concerned to conduct their own separate investigations to obtain the information needed. CPSM's experience suggests great scepticism of the value of a report where the HEI has been allowed to precis and edit it for its own purposes. It is understood that external examiners must retain editorial control over their data, but this is not explicit in the paper. There is information which is properly confidential but also properly essential to external stakeholders. CPSM's experience suggests a presumption in favour of full publication with appropriate safeguards. However, CPSM would want to see recommendations on this arising from the evaluation of the current round of " prototype reviews " for Allied Health Professions' courses; CPSM would be reluctant to take a final view at this stage.
12. To date student feedback questionnaires have operated at too general a level for CPSM purposes, so the same considerations arise as for Q.2. The Boards take evidence direct from students, and there is a presumption in favour of HPC continuing this.
13. As for 2. All the information encompassed in paras. 59 - 64 may have been needed by CPSM. The question of publication – as opposed to appropriate sharing – is for each HEI. CPSM needed to be able to observe teaching.
14. It is hoped that some recommendation on this may emerge from the evaluation of the prototype reviews. In the meantime it rests with the DoH/QAA Steering Group. Inappropriate scheduling of publication or choice of published material would force SRBs to ask for the information anyway but out of sequence.
15. As for 14.
16. This is for employers, and especially Workforce Development Confederations in England.