

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 second meeting of the Approvals Committee of the Health Professions Council held on Friday 25 June 2004 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU.

**PRESENT :**

Professor J. Harper (Acting Chairman)  
Mrs S. Chaudhry  
Mr P. Frowen  
Professor T. Hazell  
Professor C. Lloyd  
Mrs G. Pearson  
Mrs B. Stuart (part)  
Miss E. Thornton

**IN ATTENDANCE :**

Miss L. Pilgrim, Secretary to the Committee  
Mrs. U. Falk, Education and Training Department  
Mr. T. Berrie, Education and Training Department  
Miss N. O'Sullivan, Secretary to the Council  
Ms H. Best, Sheffield Hallam University

**ITEM 1      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Professor N. Brook, Miss P. Sabine and Professor D. Waller.

**ITEM 2      NOMINATION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN**

- 2.1 Professor J. Harper was nominated as Chairman and Mrs G. Pearson was nominated as Vice Chairman. The Secretary confirmed that the nominations would be considered by Council at its meeting on 15 July 2004.

**ACTION: LP**

### **ITEM 3      APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

- 3.1 Miss E. Thornton explained that the Committee would need to urgently consider the draft key decisions document. The Committee agreed that this document would be Item 6 of the Agenda; the other items on the Agenda would follow the revised Item 6 and be numbered accordingly.

### **ITEM 4      MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 MAY 2004**

- 4.1 The minutes were agreed as an accurate record save for the following amendments:

Para 4.3.1

There would be two separate reports following an approval event; (a) an overall report of the event with an agreed set of outcomes; (b) from this report a visitors' report would be produced on a pro forma. The visitors' report would be published on the website.

Para 4.3.2

The 'visitors' report would' in place of 'it would'

Para 4.3.4

The visitors' report would be submitted to the Approvals Committee; at this stage it would note the report and any conditions to be met.

Para 4.3.5

The education provider would respond to conditions and recommendations within an agreed time scale. The visitors' report would confirm the education provider's response and that the education provider had met any outstanding conditions.

Para 4.3.7

... the Committee also noted that the visitors' report would be published ...

Para 4.3.13

... if the evidence assured the panel that there were appropriate quality assurance procedures in place, this would negate the requirement for a visit.

Para 5.2.3

... audits of the report ... There would have to be consistency in reviewing the reports.

Para 6.5

All "other" visitors ...

## **ITEM 5      MATTERS ARISING**

- 5.1            Mrs Falk reported that there were 26 programmes which had been approved before the introduction of benchmarks. These programmes would have to be visited within the next 18 months. The Committee confirmed that programmes which had been approved after the introduction of the benchmarks would continue to be indefinitely approved, subject to satisfactory annual monitoring reports. Mrs Falk confirmed that the list would need further updating and would be presented to the next meeting

**ACTION: UF**

- 5.2            The Committee recommended that visitors should be used to conduct annual monitoring and that this would have to form part of their training.

**ACTION: TB**

## **ITEM 6      DRAFT DECISIONS DOCUMENT**

- 6.1            The Secretary confirmed that the next meeting of the Committee on 12 July 2004 would be a joint meeting with the Education and Training Committee (ETC) for the purpose of considering the draft decisions document.
- 6.2            The Committee was unclear about the basis on which the statements in the document had been made as they did not appear to be in accordance with the policies as set out in the consultation document.
- 6.3            The Committee considered the section of the document that related to the approvals and monitoring processes. The Committee was unclear about the format of the document and the basis on which the decision statements in the document had been made. The Committee requested that the document be redrafted so that the questions as posed in the consultation document were repeated in the draft decisions document; this would aid their comprehension of the latter document.
- 6.4            In addition, for the meeting of 12 July 2004, the Committee requested copies of the responses received to the consultation document, notes taken at the consultation events and copies of the consultation document.

**ACTION: LP**

## **ITEM 7      APPROVALS**

- 7.1            Principles and Process for use in new approvals of programmes

- 7.1.1 The Committee noted that the documents were working documents. It was agreed that Mr Berrie would amend the documents in accordance with the Committee's discussions and they would be reconsidered at the next meeting.

**ACTION: TB**

- 7.1.2 It was agreed that a pro forma for visitors would be designed by Ms Best who had been seconded to HPC. This would be done in collaboration with Mr Berrie and would be presented to the next meeting.

**ACTION: HB/TB**

7.2 Curriculum Guidance

- 7.2.1 Miss Thornton confirmed that there were three main areas where guidance needed to be developed. There were (a) curriculum guidance, (b) approvals and monitoring procedures and (c) visitors.

- 7.2.2 Miss Thornton reported that Professor Brook had recommended that the Committee could use the Approval Guidelines for the Partnership Approvals being finalised by the Department of Health (DH). A draft of these guidelines would be available to the Committee at its next meeting.

**ACTION: LP**

- 7.2.3 The Committee agreed that the three main areas where guidance was needed and recommended that the guidance should be made available to education providers.

**ACTION: TB/CS**

- 7.2.4 The Committee noted that the professional bodies might own the copyright of curriculum guidance. It was agreed that the Chief Executive should urgently find out from the professional bodies whether they would allow the HPC to use the curriculum guidance. The HPC would give full acknowledgement.

**ACTION: MJS**

7.3 New Approvals

- 7.3.1 The Committee noted that there were two new programmes which wished to commence in Spring 2005 and would require HPC approval. The Committee recommended that the Executive should confirm who they needed to liaise with at the institutions, contact them and agree a timetable and a programme for an approval event in early October 2004.

**ACTION: CS**

- 7.3.2 The Chief Executive would need to advise which member of the Executive would be coordinating approvals events and which member of the Executive would attend the approvals event on behalf of the HPC. The Committee felt that these members of the Executive would require training

**ACTION: MJS**

- 7.3.3 At this stage the Committee confirmed its consent to the continuation of the meeting beyond the three hour limit laid down in the Standing Orders.
- 7.3.4 The Committee considered whether an education provider had a right to object to members of the visitors' panel due to attend an approvals event. The Committee felt that the education provider could object to members of the visitors' panel. If this was not the case the Committee's integrity would be compromised.
- 7.3.5 The composition of the visitors' panel would have to be determined. The Committee felt that in constituting the visitors' panel full use should be made of the expertise of lay people.
- 7.3.6 The Committee recommended that the documents required for the approvals event should be those listed in the consultation document. The Committee emphasised that liaison was between the education provider and the HPC.
- 7.3.7 Miss Thornton and Professor Lloyd offered their help in choosing the physiotherapist and occupational therapist representatives who would be on the visitors' panel. The Committee requested sight of the relevant documentation to be used at the approvals event before it was sent to the institutions. It also requested that the membership of the visitors' panel be brought to the next meeting. The process being devised should be used as a blue print for future approvals events.

**ACTION: CS**

- 7.3.8 Mr Frowen raised the issue of approval of the Chiropody programme being run at the University of Plymouth. The programme was not currently approved by the HPC. It was agreed that Mr Frowen would forward relevant information to the Secretary and the issue would be considered by the Committee at its next meeting.

**ACTION: LP**

- 7.3.9 The Committee noted that it would be dealing with any matters handed over by the JVCs, JQACs and PRETWGs. The Committee requested that a synopsis of all hand over matters should be prepared. This issued would be considered by the Committee at a future meeting.

**ACTION: TB**

## **ITEM 8      ANNUAL MONITORING**

### **8.1      Pro forma Annual Monitoring Report**

- 8.1.1 The paper put to the Committee defined the areas that an education provider would be expected to report on. The areas mirrored HPC's SETs. The Committee confirmed its agreement to the areas for exceptional reporting as detailed. It suggested that there should be an additional heading under which educational providers could make any relevant comments. It was agreed that Miss Thornton and Professor Lloyd would prepare a further paper for consideration by the Committee at its next meeting.

#### **ACTION: ET/CL**

### **8.2      Audit of Annual Monitoring Reports**

- 8.2.1 The Committee recommended that visitors should audit the annual monitoring reports; they would complete a pro forma. This would be one of the pro formas to be designed by Ms Best.

### **8.3      Periodic Review**

- 8.3.1 The Committee noted that HEIs generally undertook periodic reviews of their programmes in accordance with the QAA Code of Practice. These generally took place every five years. It was recommended that the HPC should participate in these events. This should be seen as a further development to the HPC's monitoring processes and would not be the same as an Approval Event. These would take place, as indicated in the Consultation Document, when a programme was subject to a major change. The number of visitors participating in a review and the remit and the reporting mechanism would require to be considered at a further meeting.

## **ITEM 9      ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **9.1      The University of Strathclyde**

- 9.1.1 The Committee noted that the final year of the BSc (Hons) in Prosthetics and Orthotics had two six month clinical placements. There had been an industrial dispute and arrangements for the first clinical placement examination had had to be revised. The Committee agreed that the first clinical placement examination should proceed, with the students being examined at four stations instead of at the original six stations.

## **ITEM 10      DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

10.1 The next meeting will be held on Monday 12 July 2004 at 10:30a.m.

10.2 Further meetings will be held on the following dates:

I. Tuesday 7 September 2004 at 11a.m.

II. Thursday 18 November 2004 at 11a.m.

III. Wednesday 2 February 2005 at 11a.m.

**CHAIRMAN**