

Education and Training Committee

Public minutes of the 52nd meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 8 March 2012

Time: 10:30 am

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

Members:

Eileen Thornton (Chair)	Arun Midha (items 1-10)
Gerald Armstrong-Bednall	Penny Renwick (items 1-14)
Jo-anne Carlyle	Jeff Seneviratne
June Copeman	Robert Smith
John Donaghy	Jois Stansfield
Helen Davis	Annie Turner
Stephen Hutchins	Joy Tweed
Jeff Lucas	Stephen Wordsworth
Stuart Mackay	

In attendance:

Mary Chambers, Kingston University (Items 1-10)
Alison Croad, Policy Officer
Anna van der Gaag, Chair of the Council
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Abigail Gorringe, Director of Education
Claire Harkin, Customer Services Manager
Jonathan Jones, Publishing Manager
Steve Rayner, Secretary to the Committee
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager
David Waddle, Customer Services Manager
James Wilson, Customer Services Manager

Part 1 – Public Agenda

Item 1 Chair's welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee and members of the public gallery to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Committee congratulated Helen Davis on being named as the first Professor of Orthoptics in the UK, by the University of Sheffield.

Item 2 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from Mary Clark-Glass, John Harper, Deep Sagar, Diane Waller and Marc Seale, Chief Executive.

Item 3 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 There were no declarations.

Item 5 Minutes of the meeting of 17 November 2011 (ETC 01/12)

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

Item 6 Matters arising from previous meetings (ETC 02/12)

- 6.1 The Committee noted the list of actions agreed at previous meetings.

Item 7 Director of Education's report (ETC 03/12)

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department (the Department) between November 2011 and February 2012 and providing updates on ongoing projects.
- 7.2 Included as an appendix was a report on the education seminars held in 2011. The report provided a summary and analysis of the feedback collected.

Social work

- 7.3 The Committee noted that increasing time and effort was being spent on work connected to the transfer of the register for social workers in England. The Department was currently planning the seminars for social worker education providers.
- 7.4 The Committee noted the Director's report.

Item 8 Education department work plan 2012-13 (ETC 04/12)

- 8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive setting out the draft Education Department work plan for 2012-13. The paper included a progress report on the work plan for 2011-12.
- 8.2 The workplan had been developed building on discussions of the Committee during its strategy day on 17 November 2011. Those areas of work which did not appear in the 2011-12 work plan had been included in the final section - work for 2013-2014.
- 8.3 The Committee noted that the changes anticipated from the education process and systems review project were entirely internal. The changes would be in how data and systems were used and managed by HPC employees and Partners, and not in the approval and monitoring processes themselves.
- 8.4 The Committee noted that the HPC Executive team undertook a major project prioritisation process on a regular basis. This process provided oversight of organisational risk against on-going and upcoming major projects across the range of the HPC's activities, and resources were committed accordingly. Oversight of the risk register was the remit of the Audit Committee.
- 8.5 The Committee noted that the Department was planning new positions to respond to the increase in development and project work across the department.
- 8.6 The Committee approved the work plan 2012-13.

Item 9 Leadership (ETC 05/12)

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive regarding the concept of clinical leadership, and its relationship with HPC regulation and specifically the standards of proficiency.
- 9.2 The Committee had discussed the addition of a leadership element to the generic standards of proficiency as part of its general review of the standards, and had received a presentation on the NHS Clinical Leadership Competency Framework at the last meeting.

- 9.3 The paper drew together conclusions of these discussions and analysis of the appearance of the concept of leadership in the wider policy environment.
- 9.4 The Committee held a discussion during which the following points were made:
- 9.4.1 The construct and the meaning of leadership were changing in the wider policy arena. With the traditional definition of leadership, it was viable to argue that it was not a threshold standard for many of the professions on the HPC register. Nevertheless, the definition was being broadened to reflect changing demands of the workforce.
 - 9.4.2 Arriving at a definition of leadership was crucial in understanding, and communicating, the HPC's position on leadership.
 - 9.4.3 The concept of leadership was already inculcated in the HPC's standards.
 - 9.4.4 The NHS Institute was promoting a package of clinical leadership. The term 'clinical' did not fit with many of the professions on the HPC register. In considering the relationship of HPC standards to the framework, the Committee should be particularly careful only to apply these concepts to the professions for which they were most relevant.
- 9.5 The Committee noted that consultation on draft profession specific standards of proficiency was an opportunity for stakeholders to provide thoughts on whether the inclusion of a specific standard on leadership would be necessary to ensure safe and effective practice for particular professions.
- 9.6 The Committee agreed that a position statement should be developed to:
- (a) clearly set out the Committees position on the Clinical Leadership Competency Framework;
 - (b) provide an explanation of the relationship between the framework and the standards of education and training; and
 - (c) provide guidance on what this might mean for education providers.

ACTION: Director of Policy and Standards to develop a draft position statement and accompanying guidance for the next meeting of the Committee.

Item 10 Service user involvement in the design and delivery of education and training programmes leading to registration with HPC (ETC 06/12)

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive providing a research report, and accompanying HPC analysis on the

concept of involving service users in the design and delivery of approved programmes.

- 10.2 The Committee had discussed the topic on a number of occasions, most recently at its meeting of March 2011, following which the research had been commissioned.
- 10.3 The Committee noted that there were two key policy drivers for the work – requirements around service user involvement (SUI) in the CHRE standards, and the importance of service user involvement in the social work field.
- 10.4 The Committee held a discussion on the paper, during which the following points were made:
- 10.4.1 Service users were already involved in the developmental processes of a great many HPC approved programmes. Nevertheless, this involvement was not consistent either in approach or in measurement. Any implementation would need to be protracted to ensure that education providers had time to develop the necessary systems and expertise for compliance.
- 10.4.2 Any requirements should not be overly prescriptive. The focus for any standard should be on providing information on the evidence the HPC would be looking for when assessing compliance, rather than describing systems.
- 10.4.3 A standard would be a way forward in collecting evidence to measure the effectiveness of service user involvement. It would also ensure parity for those Education Providers already committing resources to collect his data.
- 10.4.4 In addition to considering the concept of SUI, the committee should consider the involvement of SUI in three separate areas individually:
- in delivery;
 - in assessment; and
 - in programme and policy design.
- 10.4.5 Anecdotal evidence from the consensus workshop which formed part of the research indicated that services users were very supportive of their involvement in education. This reflected an increasing expectation that citizens should be involved in the decisions of public organisations.
- 10.4.6 The diversity of people's concept of SUI was a big issue. The use of service users may be mainstream in the mental health arena, but the methods and outcomes of SUI were very variable. The HPC would need to pay clear attention to the implications of this diversity.

10.4.7 Thought could be given to encouraging early adopters, or to running a pilot scheme, to help develop the HPC's position on SUI.

10.4.8 Some of the HPC's professions did not have direct access to, or contact with, service users.

10.5 The Committee agreed:

(a) to the principle that a consultation should be held on amending the standards of education and guidance to make service user involvement an express requirement in the design and delivery of education programmes leading to registration;

(b) that work to develop a standard with a longer than normal lead-in period should be planned to allow the implications of the standard to be explored in the annual Education seminars; and

(c) that additional information based on the research should be distributed to approved programme providers.

ACTION: Director of Policy and Standards to prepare a further paper for consideration at the meeting in June 2012, based on its discussions and decisions in paragraph 10.5 above.

Item 11 Profession specific standards of proficiency consultation (ETC 07/12)

11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive which provided proposed changes to the profession specific standards for six professions regulated by the HPC, and a draft consultation on proposed changes.

11.2 The standards were being reviewed in incremental groups as part of a rolling process designed to ensure that they remained relevant to the scopes of practise for the professions, and continued to ensure a threshold level for safe and effective practice.

11.3 The Committee noted that the order of the standards had been developed to ensure consistency across the professions. The order was not necessarily consistent with the order of importance for each standard to each profession.

11.4 The Committee recommended that the Council approve the consultation document and draft standards of proficiency for arts therapists, dietitians, occupational therapists, orthoptists, physiotherapists, and radiographers (subject to minor editing changes and formal legal scrutiny).

ACTION: Policy Officer to submit the Committee's recommendation to the Council at its meeting on 29 March 2012.

Item 12 Responses to the consultation on draft standards of proficiency for social workers in England (ETC 08/12)

12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive which provided a summary of the responses received to a consultation on draft standards of proficiency for social workers in England. The paper included recommendations for changes to the draft standards resulting from the consultation.

12.2 In July 2010, the government published the 'Liberating the NHS: Report of the arms-length bodies review' report. This report outlined the government's intentions to abolish the General Social Care Council (GSCC) in England and transfer its regulatory function to the HPC. The Health and Social Care Bill which set out the detail of the transfer was published in January 2011.

12.3 As part of the preparations for the transfer of the register the Council was required to approve standards of proficiency for social workers in England. The HPC had set up a professional liaison group (PLG) of key stakeholders to help prepare the standards, which were included within the text of the consultation document.

12.4 The Committee noted that the standards had been developed alongside the professional capability framework for social workers, which was being developed by the Social Work Reform Board. Work was being done with the College of Social Work to ensure consistency with the standards.

12.5 The Committee noted that some respondents to the consultation had exhibited confusion between the structure and purpose of the standards and the current code of conduct model used by the GSCC. The communications strategy to explain the changes between the two systems was hugely important.

12.6 The Committee recommended:

(a) that the Council approve the consultation summary; and

(b) that the Council approve the standards of proficiency for social workers in England (subject to minor editing changes and formal legal scrutiny).

ACTION: Policy Manager to submit the Committee's recommendation to the Council at its meeting on 29 March 2012.

Item 13 Responses to the consultation on the threshold level of qualification for entry to the Register as a social worker in England (ETC 09/12)

13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive that provided a summary of the responses received to a consultation on

setting a threshold level of qualification for entry to the HPC Register for social workers in England.

13.2 The Committee noted the consultation responses document, and that the consensus was that the proposed threshold qualification was at the right level.

13.3 The Committee recommended:

- (a) that the Council approve the consultation summary (subject to minor editing changes and formal legal scrutiny); and
- (b) that the Council set the threshold level of qualification for social workers in England as a bachelor degree with honours.

ACTION: Policy Manager to submit the Committee's recommendation to the Council at its meeting on 29 March 2012.

Item 14 Annotation of the Register – qualifications in podiatric surgery (ETC 10/12)

14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding the use of discretionary powers to annotate the Register to identify registrants with a post-registration qualification in podiatric surgery.

14.2 The paper provided information on the HPC's power and the Council's stated position on annotation of the register. It also provided evidence for and against annotation of the Register to identify registrants with a post-registration qualification in podiatric surgery.

14.3 The Committee held a discussion of the paper, during which the following points were made:

14.3.1 The scope of practice for podiatric surgeons was significantly different to that of a podiatrist. The beginning of autonomous practice as a podiatric surgeon could be seen to be a threshold level for safe and effective practice.

14.3.2 It was extremely alarming that there were people practicing as podiatric surgeons who did not have the relevant qualifications.

14.3.3 The power to annotate would not allow the HPC to regulate the title of podiatric surgeon..

14.3.4 Of those already practicing as podiatric surgeons, many operated within clinical governance frameworks in the NHS or elsewhere. Nevertheless, there was no independent oversight of the qualifications leading to practice.

14.3.5 Whilst not necessarily as effective as full statutory regulation, with a protected title, there were undoubtedly outcomes to annotation of the register that would improve public protection. These included the ability to set standards for education and training and facilitate the ability of service users to make informed choices about treatment through information available on the HPC Register

14.4 The Committee agreed in principle to annotate the qualification in podiatric surgery on the register.

ACTION: Policy Manager to provide a paper on the implications of annotation, and the process to annotate, to the next meeting of the Committee.

Item 15 Lay visitor pilot (ETC 11/12)

15.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding the outcome of a pilot of lay visitors to education programmes, and the HPC's position on lay involvement in decisions to approve programmes.

15.2 The area of work had been developed initially as a response to the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (CHRE) performance review 2007/8 and had been discussed by the Committee on a number of occasions. The Pilot had been commissioned by the Committee at its meeting of 16 September 2010.

15.3 The Committee noted that the work to amend the standards of education and training around service user involvement would go some way to achieving the HPC's responsibility to ensuring public involvement and engagement in the quality assurance of approved programmes.

15.4 The Committee noted that there was no clear evidence in the report that lay visitors from an education background added value to the approval process.

15.5 The Committee agreed in principle that meetings with service users as part of approval visits could be a valuable assurance mechanism for approved programmes. This should be investigated following the development of the HPC standard.

15.6 The Committee agreed:

- (a) that the definition of lay visitor should be redrafted, to remove the requirement that lay visitors have educational experience, and to attract the service user perspective;
- (b) that a second pilot should be considered, taking into account the work on amending the standards of education and training to make service user involvement a requirement in the design and delivery of approved programmes; and

- (c) that options to increase lay visitor involvement in particular circumstances should be considered, taking into account the work on redrafting the definition of lay visitor and the implications this may have for their role and scope on visiting panels.

ACTION: Director of Education to provide a paper on lay visitor and service user involvement in decisions to approve programmes, taking into account the Committees discussions in 15.5 and 15.6 above. This paper will be discussed at the Committee meeting in September 2012, so that the discussions and decisions on amending the standards of education and training and guidance (planned for June 2012) can be taken into account.

Item 16 Organisational name change – consequential amendments to standards and guidance documents (ETC 12/12)

- 16.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding a project to make amendments to HPC standards and guidance in the light of the change of name to the Health and Care Professions Council. The changes would be subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill.
- 16.2 The Committee noted the proposed changes to the standards and guidance documents.
- 16.3 The Committee agreed that a consultation on such changes would not be meaningful, or an acceptable use of resources, given that the change to the name of the organisation was to be determined by legislation.
- 16.4 The Committee recommended that the Council should not conduct a consultation on changes to HPC standards and associated guidance documents which were a consequence of the change of name to the Health and Care Professions Council.

ACTION: Publishing Manager to submit the Committee's recommendation to the Council at its meeting on 29 March 2012.

Item 17 Organisational name change – consequential amendments to communication materials (ETC 13/12)

- 17.1 The Committee received a paper to note from the Executive regarding a project to make amendments to HPC communications material in the light of the change of name to the Health and Care Professions Council. The changes would be subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill.
- 17.2 The Committee noted the proposed changes to communications materials.

Item 18 Organisational name change – consequential amendments to HPC admission forms (ETC 14/12)

18.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding proposed amendments to HPC admission forms in the light of the change of name to the Health and Care Professions Council. The changes would be subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill.

18.2 The Committee approved the amendments to the admission forms (subject to the passage of the Health and Social Care Bill).

ACTION: Customer Services Manager to submit the HPC admission forms to the Council at its meeting on 29 March 2012.

Item 19 English language proficiency (ETC 15/12)

19.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding proposed changes to the current tests/qualifications accepted for the purposes of satisfying the Council's English language requirements. This was to ensure that the HPC is able to adequately monitor the comparability of acceptable tests.

19.2 The papers included information on the current requirements, and recommended changes based on analysis of currently accepted tests and qualifications.

19.3 The Committee agreed:

(a) To cease (effective from 1 April 2012) accepting the following tests / qualifications:

- Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC)
- Cambridge ESOL Certificate of Proficiency in English (CPE)
- Cambridge ESOL Certificate in Advanced English (CAE)
- Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA) – Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examinations (HKCEE) Syllabus B Grade A
- Cambridge IGCSE First Language English – 0522, at grade C or above
- Cambridge IGCSE Second Language English – 0511, at grade C or above

(b) To accept (effective from 1 April 2012) only the following tests / qualifications:

- International English Language Testing System (IELTS)

- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Internet Based Test (IBT)

Item 20 CPD annual report (ETC 16/12)

20.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding an audit of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) process, comprising data collected by the executive in 2009-10.

20.2 The document was the second such report.

The Committee noted that, a piece of research had been commissioned to produce a multi variant analysis of the data in the CPD report. The results of this analysis would feed into work to review the CPD standards and audits in the future and inform the content of future reports.

20.3 The Committee approved the annual report for publication, subject to minor editorial amendments and legal scrutiny.

The Committee agreed that the report should be compiled every two years rather than annually.

Item 21 Transfer of regulatory functions from the GSCC to HPC (ETC 17/12)

21.1 The Committee received a verbal update from the Council Chair regarding the project to transfer regulatory function from the GSCC to the HPC.

21.2 At the Council meeting on 14 October 2010, the Council agreed that there would be a standing item on every Council and Committee agenda, whereby the Executive would update the meeting on the progress of the project. As the project was developing rapidly, a verbal report on progress would be made to each meeting.

21.3 The College of Social Work (TCSW) had been launched in January. Membership fees for the College had been set at £60.

21.4 The social work education grant helped education providers meet the costs of arranging and managing placements for students and involving service users in their programmes and was currently administered by the GSCC. The decision on the future of the grant had not yet been made, but there was a working assumption was that it would be administered by the TCSW after they held on public consultation to this effect in 2011.

The Committee noted the following items:

Item 22 Fees associated with undertaking overseas approval visits (ETC 18/12)

Item 23 Education Systems and Process review update (ETC 19/12)

Item 24 Revised renewal process (ETC 20/12)

Item 25 Health and character declarations enclosure (ETC 21/11)

Item 26 Panel decisions December 2011 to March 2012 (ETC 22/11)

Item 27 Committee and Panel meeting dates in 2012 (ETC 23/11)

Item 28 Date and time of next meeting

28.1 10.30 am - Tuesday 12 June 2012

Item 29 Any other business

Public Honour

29.1 The Committee offered its congratulations to the Chair on her investiture as Commander of the British Empire for services to healthcare education and training.

Part 2 – Private agenda

The Committee was invited 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;

- (5) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Committee or the Council;
- (7) the source of information given to the Committee in confidence;
- (8) 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.’

Summary of those matters considered whilst the public were excluded

Item 30 24/12 Education provider complaint

30.1 The Committee received a paper for consideration from the Executive regarding a complaint received against an education provider. The Committee discussed the complaint, and made recommendations to the Executive.

Item 31 Any other business

31.1 There was no further private business.

Chair

Date