

**Health Professions Council
Council Meeting 31 May 2007**

REPORTS FROM COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES AT EXTERNAL MEETINGS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The attached feedback forms have been received from the following members of Council, reporting back from meetings at which they have represented the HPC;

Miss Christine Farrell x 2
Professor Sue Griffiths
Mr Pat McFadden
Miss Pam Sabine
Dr Anna van der Gaag x 2

Decision

The Council is requested to note the document. No decision is required.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Background papers

None

Appendices

Copies of feedback forms

Date of paper

21 May 2007

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-03-15	a	CNL	PPR	Reports from Council Representatives at External MeetingsMarch2007	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

Date	Ver.	Dept/Cmte	Doc Type	Title	Status	Int. Aud.
2007-03-15	a	CNL	PPR	Reports from Council Representatives at External MeetingsMarch2007	Final DD: None	Public RD: None

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Christine Farrell
Title of Conference/Meeting	Involving service users in the accreditation of education providers
Date of Conference	20 April 2007
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	40 approx
<p>Issues of Relevance to HPC. Relevant to HPC's own Education & Training and PPI strategies.</p> <p>Two papers were presented, followed by small group discussions. The first paper (mine) set out the international context for innovations in user involvement in health care education programmes. The second paper presented findings from a pilot study by the GCSC about involving users in the approval of a social work degree. This presentation was a useful description of a UK initiative - probably the first example of a project to involve users in regulatory accreditation. Their full report will soon be sent to the people present at the seminar, soon. The GCSC (Graham Ixer) are currently planning a second project to involve users in their course approvals monitoring. However, an important difference exists between the GSCC and other regulators in that their structure and funding mechanisms are different. This meant that they had government money to carry out the project. Other regulators would be using registrant fees to pay for user involvement in accreditation.</p> <p>The small group discussions that followed enabled people to share some questions and concerns about PPI in regulation. In my group, some time was spent on the need to clarify who could be called a user (representativeness is an old chestnut in PPI), and the potential outcomes of collaboration between regulators, users and HEI's. Themes that emerged from other groups at the feedback stage were: the high cost of involving users in accreditation; the need for evidence about the impact and outcomes of PPI in accreditation; and the need for further discussion about methods of involvement.</p> <p>The seminar ended on a positive note with people agreeing that working together means learning together: a good motto for regulators, users and HEI's.</p>	
Key Decisions Taken	
See above	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Sabrina Donaldson, Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU, or alternatively by e-mail to sabrina.donaldson@hpc-uk.org.

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Christine Farrell
Title of Conference/Meeting	Lecture to OT students (3rd year). Brunel University
Date of Conference	3.5.07
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	150
<p>A formal lecture about the HPC. Issues covered included practicalities of registration, fees, standards (proficiency & CPD), the HPC and professional bodies, and the White Paper.</p> <p>Several questions were asked by students afterwards. Questions about registration from abroad, employment difficulties and registration, content of the website including the difficulty of reading some of the material (e.g. the CPD leaflet) due to white print on a dark background). I gave this student a printed version of this leaflet.</p>	
Key Decisions Taken	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Sabrina Donaldson, Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU, or alternatively by e-mail to sabrina.donaldson@hpc-uk.org.

July 2004

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Sue Griffiths
Title of Conference/Meeting	UKRO (Radiation Oncology) Annual Radiation Oncology Conference
Date of Conference	19th to 21st March 2007
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	300 from COR, IPEM, Royal College of Radiologists
Issues of Relevance to HPC The poster presented ‘Retention of Therapy Radiographers : what are the factors and the key issues’ was extremely relevant to parts of the conference where the critical shortage of radiographers and its impact on cancer services and the barriers to increasing this was discussed as part of the subject matter in a planning paper to government ministers. The planning paper proposes strategies including changes to basic training routes, competencies etc. In addition the conference provided me with updated professional/technical information which I will use in an update to a textbook that I am currently updating for radiotherapy students and other learners in the field (previous edition used also by nursing and medical staff). The practice of radiotherapy is undergoing a period of rapid and fundamental change due to a range of technological advances which will change the knowledge and skills needed by therapy radiographers, and influence the training they receive. They will soon be taking many more critical treatment decisions on a frequent daily basis as the medical consultants (Oncologists) will not be well placed to take these decisions. I am grateful to the HPC for the chance to attend this conference.	
Key Decisions Taken	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Sabrina Donaldson, Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU, or alternatively by e-mail to alison.roberts@hpc-uk.org.

March 2007

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Pat McFadden
Title of Conference/Meeting	Joint Royal Colleges Ambulance Liaison Committee
Date of Conference	12.03.2007
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	30
Issues of Relevance to HPC	
<p>This committee considers evidence based practice and recommends change within the UK Ambulance Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems identified with Emergency Care Practitioners working across NHS boundaries in the multi disciplinary role, having to gain CRB checks for each placement. • Concern was expressed that Paramedics are drifting into areas of practice for which they were not primarily trained for. (“Treat and Leave” strategies) • An update on Health professions Council matters was given by Mr McFadden, including a summary of the White Paper – The Regulation of Health Professionals in the 21st Century. • The committee raised enquiries into the apparent high rate of Paramedics within the Fitness to Practice remit and were given an update of the Conduct and Competence Committee’s findings and actions in relation to trends etc. 	
Key Decisions Taken	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That Mr McFadden keeps the committee updated on the implications of the white paper and Fitness to Practice issues. • That the chairman of the committee would liaise with the British Paramedic Association with regards to appropriate training to enable Paramedics to engage with the emerging “treat and leave” strategies. <p>That the committee would make representations to the ambulance higher education group, to ensure that there is a consistency of further training for Paramedics when considering the emergence of new strategies caring for patients in different ways, as identified in the DoH recommendations within the “Taking Healthcare to the Patient” paper.</p>	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Niamh O’Sullivan, Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU, or alternatively by e-mail to alison.roberts@hpc-uk.org

April 2007

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Miss Pam Sabine
Title of Conference/Meeting	Conference – Institute of Chiropodists and Podiatrists
Date of Conference	19th and 20th May 2007.
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	200
Issues of Relevance to HPC The Institute has invited the HPC President to take part in a Q&A session, just prior to the AGM and I attended in place of Dr Anna van der Gaag. I attended the Annual Dinner/Dance on the first night and was able to meet several of the Institute’s members and speak to them individually about some of their concerns, such as the implications of the recent White Paper. The following morning, the Q&A session lasted approximately 35 minutes and I was asked to explain the HPC’s stance on Foot Health Practitioners (FHP’s), conduct, Yellow Pages advertising, and the role of the registrant Council members. It was obvious that the main issue for the Institute members at the moment is that of unregistered practitioners – FHP’s – who are able to carry on working in exactly the same way as they have always done. They believe that these people should be stopped from practising Chiropody/Podiatry in order to protect the public properly. I was also asked whether the HPC had any current plans to regulate FHP’s as a separate profession.	
Key Decisions Taken N/A	

Pam Sabine

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Anna van der Gaag
Title of Conference/Meeting	Joint PPI meeting
Date of Conference	16 April 2007
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	16-20
<p>Issues of Relevance to HPC.</p> <p>Futher action required by PPI Group to invite the CEOs of the RBs to make comments /suggestions about how the PPI Group can work across the RBs on new projects. A letter to CEOs outlining this was agreed as best course of action.</p> <p>Update on PPI work by different regulatory bodies. Many adopting similar approaches using a top down and bottom up model, making reference to the PPI handbook on good practice.</p> <p>Discussed benchmarking role for the PPI group, possibly developing an audit checklist of PPI activities for use across all the RBs.</p> <p>There was a sense that the group had made progress in raising the profile and importance of PPI initiatives, and that many departments were adopting practices which encouraged more stakeholder engagement, and improvements in accessibility.</p> <p>There was a wide ranging discussion of the implications of the White Paper. Lack of immediate and obvious response on public involvement was worrying to some members of the Group, but the consensus as that there was still a great deal of uncertainty around the timetable for the reforms and that this was limiting the response of RBs.</p>	
<p>Key Decisions Taken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Update of PPI Handbook underway ➤ Discussion of how to evaluate the impact of PPI initiatives – project now underway ➤ Seminar series ongoing – 20 April seminar on user involvement in undergraduate programmes ➤ Further deliberations of White paper required 	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU

FEEDBACK SHEET TO BE COMPLETED AFTER THE MEETING

Name of Council Member	Anna van der Gaag
Title of Conference/Meeting	Unison Conference
Date of Conference	24 April 2007
Approximate number of people at the conference/meeting	300
<p>Issues of Relevance to HPC Speech from Andy Burnham not well received – no endorsement by conference delegates of the positive picture of reforms over last 10 years. Came under severe criticism on pay, training budgets, targets, ‘marketization’ of the NHS</p> <p>Conference motions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bullying and harassment in the workplace by patients/families an increasing problem 2. Impact of cost cutting in NHS on paramedic profession – profession has highest incidence of ill health retirement in the NHS 3. Concerns that there is no legislation to ensure safe levels of staffing for nursing profession – staff now putting their own health and safety at risk to deliver care to patients 4. Against NNC fees rise and against professionals paying fees to ensure public protection – think the gov ought to be paying for this. <p>Key messages ; Need for unions to work together to influence government thinking and resist marketisation of NHS</p>	
<p>Key Decisions Taken Interesting to attend – to note the strength of feeling against the government and concerns about staff safety and the difficulties of managing high expectations from patients/families.</p>	

Please complete as much of the above as you can and return by post to Council and Committee Secretariat, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU