

Education and Training Committee

Public minutes of the 51st meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 17 November 2011

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 |
| Gerald Armstrong-Bednall | Penny Renwick |
| Jo-anne Carlyle | Jeff Seneviratne |
| Mary Clark-Glass | Robert Smith |
| June Copeman | Jois Stansfield |
| Helen Davis | Annie Turner |
| John Harper | Joy Tweed |
| Stephen Hutchins | Diane Waller |
| Jeff Lucas | Stephen Wordsworth |
| Stuart Mackay | |

In attendance:

David Christopher, Head of Education Development
Alison Croad, Policy Officer
Ruth Cooper, PA to the Director of Operations
Anna van der Gaag, Chair of the Council
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Abigail Gorringe, Director of Education
Amanda Hargood, Education Officer
Paul Long, Clinical Leadership Competency Framework Project Director, NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement
Steve Rayner, Secretary to the Committee
Greg Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

Part 1 – Public Agenda

Item 1 Nomination of Chair

- 1.1 In accordance with the standing orders, the Committee was asked to nominate a Chair to preside at the meeting, and for meetings of the Committee for the following two years.
- 1.2 Eileen Thornton was nominated as the Chair of the Committee.

ACTION: Secretariat to submit the Committee's recommendation to the Council.

Item 2 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies were received from John Donaghy and from 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 8 September 2011 (ETC 64/11)

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

Item 6 Matters arising from previous meetings (ETC 65/11)

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

Item 7 Director of Education's report (ETC 66/11)

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Director of Education detailing the work of the Education Department (the Department) between September and November 2011 and providing updates on ongoing projects.
- 7.2 The Committee noted the update on the Education Department 2011-12 workplan. The update included performance against projected targets.

Education Seminars

- 7.3 The programme of seminars for education providers was progressing well according to informal feedback. Analysis of formal feedback collected at the seminars would be provided as part of the Directors report to the next meeting of the Committee.
- 7.4 The Committee noted that the increase in student fees may be increasing pressure on placements. It would be useful to see whether this pressure was reflected in the feedback, and whether particular professions appeared to be affected. It would be useful to see a breakdown of professions attending (and applying to attend) the seminars.
- 7.5 The Committee noted the Director's report.

Item 8 Clinical Leadership Framework (ETC 67/11)

- 8.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive regarding the project being run by the NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement (the Institute) to build leadership competency in healthcare professionals – the Clinical Leadership Competency Framework (CLCF) project.
- 8.2 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, most recently at its meeting of March 2011.
- 8.3 The paper comprised: an outline of the HPC's previous consideration of CLCF principles in relation to the HPC's standards; the HPC's current work in that area; a chart mapping the HPC's standards against CLCF principles; and a briefing on the framework itself from the Institute.
- 8.4 The Committee received a presentation from the Director of the CLFC Project, Paul Long. The presentation comprised the following key points:
 - 8.4.1 The Institute acknowledged the engagement of the Executive with the project to date, and explained that the HPC was seen by the Institute as a key strategic lever for change.
 - 8.4.2 It was a strategic objective of Government to drive up 'leadership' across health care.
 - 8.4.3 The public inquiry into the role of the commissioning, supervisory and regulatory bodies in the monitoring of Mid Staffordshire Foundation NHS Trust was likely to include a reference to 'leadership'.

- 8.4.4 The Institute was in conversation with all Health regulators, professional bodies and related bodies such as the Council of Deans.
 - 8.4.5 One of the outcomes of the project was likely to be that higher education institutions (HEIs) would be required to demonstrate that leadership had been written into curricula for clinical health care professional courses.
 - 8.4.6 The CLCF had been developed in cooperation with the other UK countries.
 - 8.4.7 Leadership was also incorporated within the draft Education Outcomes Framework (EOF), a framework which would be used by Health Education England (HEE), a body with responsibility for workforce planning, education and training across the NHS in England.
- 8.5 The Committee held a discussion of the CLCF, during which the following points were made:
- 8.5.1 Some professions had significantly more hierarchical cultures than others. The Committee was interested to find out how the framework mapped out across professions with such different cultures.
 - 8.5.2 The framework was intended to be based on the concept of shared leadership – it was a composite set of behaviours that can come from any professional, particularly in multi-disciplinary teams.
 - 8.5.3 Whilst acknowledging the concept that the workforce needed leadership skills, the difficulty the Committee faced in including leadership in the generic standards of proficiency was that the HPC sets threshold standards for the professions. Leadership may not be an appropriate threshold standard for all of the HPC's professions.
 - 8.5.4 The framework was intended to provide the first common agreement on the definition of the term 'leadership'.
 - 8.5.5 The use of the term 'clinical' would be problematic in finding a relevance or synergy with some of the professions regulated by the HPC. Not all of the professions worked exclusively within the NHS, and not all of the professions included elements within their scope of practice that could be described as 'clinical'.
 - 8.5.6 The Committee was interested to learn how the development of leadership related to the reduction of leadership positions across the whole of the health and care sector. The Committee was also

interested to learn how this driver related to the Government's intention to move away from statutory registration.

- 8.5.7 The CLCF was not about creating leadership posts. It was about developing leadership skills in every clinician.
- 8.5.8 The Institute was working with the CHRE to work the CLCF into the design of voluntary registers.
- 8.5.9 The Committee noted that, whilst the HPC's authority largely came from setting the standards for entry to the register, the concept of embedding 'leadership' (in relevant professions) sat comfortably within the HPCs responsibilities around continuing professional development (CPD).
- 8.5.10 The Institute intended that the framework should be implemented at all stages of career development, and across every profession.
- 8.5.11 The Committee noted that, if the framework was going to be implemented across the medical and nursing professions, it was right that the HPC should acknowledge and engage with the development of the framework.
- 8.5.12 The HPC should be extremely careful about how it communicates about its engagement with the development of the framework.
- 8.5.13 The Committee was concerned with the risk that the wrong form of communication regarding the HPC's engagement with the framework could imply that the professional regulatory system did not work in its current form. The Committee noted that the framework was designed to fix an issue within the NHS, and not necessarily an issue with the professions individually.
- 8.5.14 This communication issue showed the complexity of dealing with 15 different professions, some of which operated outside the NHS.
- 8.5.15 The Committee noted that the recent revision of the generic standards of proficiency illustrated that consensus between the registrant professions was complex, but achievable.
- 8.5.16 The Committee noted that if the professional bodies changed their curriculum frameworks to take account of the CLFC, changes to the HPC's standards were not strictly necessary. Standard 4.2 of the standards of education and training ensured that the Education providers reflected the relevant curriculum framework in their programmes.
- 8.5.17 The Committee noted that a review of the profession specific standards was due to take place in 2012-13.

- 8.6 The Committee agreed that, whilst it supported the principle of embedding leadership skills in the education and training of health care professionals, due to the complexities inherent in a multi-professional regulator, the HPC's route would necessarily be different to that of other regulators.
- 8.7 The Institute acknowledged that it would be difficult to find a one size fits all approach. It noted that there were ways that the HPC could support the framework implicitly, for instance by citing the word 'leadership' in guidance and policy documents or by publishing examples of 'leadership', and how the concept relates to HPC standards.

Item 9 Social Workers – recognition and reciprocity of training and registration in the UK (ETC 68/11)

- 9.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion from the Executive setting out proposals for arrangements for reciprocal agreements between the HPC and the other three UK care Councils.
- 9.2 The proposals had been drafted to ensure that, from the opening of the register, social workers who qualified or registered in England would be eligible to apply for registration in the other UK countries, and vice-versa, without unnecessary barriers.
- 9.3 The Committee noted section 2 of the report, which provided the legislative context for reciprocity arrangements. The Committee noted that the HPC had a general duty to cooperate with the other three UK care Councils.
- 9.4 The Committee noted that, whilst five years was a sensible period to after which review the synergy between standards published by the Care Councils, the Councils should continue to consult each other as changes were developed.
- 9.5 The Committee noted that the response from the Scottish Social Services Council to the new standards of proficiency had been positive and supportive.
- 9.6 The Committee noted that the Code of Practice for Social Care Workers, jointly published by the four care councils had been one of the documents the standards of proficiency had been mapped against.
- 9.7 The Committee recommended that the Council:
- (a) agree that it is unnecessary to seek to directly approve programmes delivered in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (as outlined in section 4 of paper ETC/68/11);
 - (b) recognise programmes approved by the SSSC, CCW and NISCC as conferring eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC (on the basis of the conclusions outlined in section 4 of paper ETC/68/11);

- (c) recognise registration with the SSSC, CCW and NISCC as conferring eligibility to apply for registration with the HPC (on the basis of the conclusions outlined in section 4 of paper ETC/68/11); and
- (d) agree the points above subject to ongoing review and a formal review planned to commence within five years of the opening of the Register of social workers in England (on the basis of the conclusions outlined in section 4 of paper ETC/68/11).

ACTION: Director of Policy and Standards to submit the Committee's recommendations, as outlined in paragraph 9.7 above, to the Council at its meeting of 6 December 2011.

Item 10 ETC scheme of delegation (ETC 69/11)

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive which provided proposed changes to the arrangements for the administration of lists of approved programmes.
- 10.2 The proposals focussed on amending the Committee's scheme of delegation to provide further clarify on the role of the Director of Education in updating the list of approved programmes for the purpose of factual accuracy.
- 10.3 The paper also recommended amending the standing orders to allow provide further clarity on the role of the Committee, sitting in Panel, to withdraw approval from a programme which no longer has, or is no longer admitting, students.
- 10.4 The Committee noted that it would be useful to have a reminder of the process of the administration of Panel meetings, including the legal context for decisions. It would also be useful to include analysis of exceptional cases and recurring issues for discussion.

ACTION: Secretary to the Committee to submit a paper on the administration of Panel meetings to the meeting of 8 March 2012.

10.5 The Committee made the following recommendations:

- (a) that the following amendment be made to Paragraph 4.2(m) of the Education and Training Committee Scheme of Delegation (amendment in italics):

“maintaining and publishing the Council's list of approved courses of education and training, qualifications and institutions. (This is a function which has been delegated to the Committee by the Council without authority to sub- delegate, [*but that does not prevent the*

Director of Education from correcting the list to ensure that it remains factually accurate)”; and

- (b) that the Council agree the following addition to Paragraph 9.2 of the Committee Standing Orders (amendment in italics):

“(d) consider and, if thought fit, withdraw approval from any course, qualification or institution which the Panel is satisfied no longer admits or recruits students.”

ACTION: Secretary to the Committee to make the changes to the Education and Training Committee Scheme of Delegation as outlined in paragraph 10.5(a) above.

ACTION: Head of Education Development to submit the Committee’s recommendations, as outlined in paragraph 10.5(b) above, to the Council at its meeting of 6 December 2011.

Item 11 Responses to the consultation on HPC proposals for post-registration qualifications (ETC 70/11)

11.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive providing responses to the consultation on criteria the HPC should use when considering whether to record post registration qualifications on the register. The paper included a draft policy statement on the practice.

11.2 The Committee had considered the topic of annotation of the register a number of times, most recently at its meeting of 8 September 2011.

11.3 The Committee commended the Executive for a clear and well written policy and paper.

11.4 The Committee noted that the first two bullet points in paragraph 6.26 of the consultation response document could be merged.

11.5 The Committee recommended that the Council:

- (a) approve the text of the consultation responses document (subject to minor editing amendments; and
- (b) approve the text of the policy statement.

ACTION: Policy Manager to submit the Committee’s recommendations, as outlined in paragraph 11.5 above, to the Council at its meeting of 6 December 2011.

Item 12 Consultation on an amendment to the Health Professions Council (Registration and Fees) Rules Order of Council 2003 (ETC 71/11)

- 12.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive outlining proposals to consult on an amendment to the Health Professions Council (Registration and Fees) Rules Order of Council 2003 (the Rules) in order to set the registration cycle for social workers in England, effective from the transfer of the register.
- 12.2 The Committee noted that the HPC was not obliged to consult on the amendments, but that this followed the same procedure HPC had followed when taking on new professions in the past.
- 12.3 The Committee noted that the consultation would take place between December 2011 and March 2012.
- 12.4 The Committee noted that the consultation would feed in to the Department of Health's (DH) work to develop consequential amendments to existing legislation stemming from the Health and Social Care Bill.
- 12.5 The Committee noted that, for completeness, it would be helpful to include an explanation of the roles of the HPC and the DH in the consultation. It was particularly important to outline that it was the DH that laid the rules, but that the HPC were running the consultation in order to be consistent.
- 12.6 The Committee noted that it would be helpful for the consultation to include further explanation in paragraph 4.2 of the difference between anniversary payments, and regular renewal cycles. It was particularly important to explain that every registrant would move to the fixed term registration cycle, and would be expected to pay the HCPC before the deadline regardless of when they had renewed their registration.
- 12.7 The Committee recommended that the Council:
- (a) consult on a proposal the Health Professions Council (Registration and Fees) Rules Order of Council 2003 (the Rules) be amended to provide for the registration cycle for social workers in England; and
 - (b) approve the text of the consultation document.

ACTION: Policy Officer to submit the Committee's recommendations, as outlined in paragraph 12.6 above, to the Council at its meeting of 6 December 2011.

Item 13 Practitioner Psychologists - list of approved programmes (ETC 71/11)

- 13.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive regarding revisions to the published list of practitioner psychologist programmes approved by the HPC.
- 13.2 The paper provided proposed changes to the list of approved programmes resulting from information received by the Education Department from the

British Psychological Society. The Committee had considered similar changes to the list at previous meetings.

- 13.3 The Committee accepted the amendments to the historically approved programmes outlined in Appendix 1 of paper ETC 72/11.

Item 14 Closure of approved programmes (ETC 73/11)

14.1 The Committee received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive providing a list of approved programmes which the Department have recently learnt have closed, or are closing. These programmes either have no students, or have students but are no longer recruiting additional cohorts.

14.2 At its meeting on 27 September 2007 the Committee agreed the process for withdrawal of ongoing approval from closed programmes to ensure that education providers could not re-establish training programmes which led to HPC registration.

14.3 The Committee agreed:

- (a) that the programmes listed in Appendix 1 of paper ETC 73/11, which have submitted their consent, have their ongoing approval status withdrawn; and
- (b) that the programmes listed in Appendix 2 of paper ETC 73/11, which have not submitted their consent, receive notification of the Committee's intent to withdraw approval and are given 28 days to provide any representations; and
- (c) that the programme in Appendix 3 of paper ETC 73/11, which has submitted no representations having been informed of the Committee's intention to commence withdrawal proceedings, have its ongoing status withdrawn.
- (d) that the outcome of the correspondence to the programmes listed in Appendix 2 of paper ETC 73/11 be considered by a future Education and Training Panel, as implied in 10.5 above, subject to Council agreeing to a change in the Committee's standing orders.

ACTION: Director of Education to write to the providers of programmes listed in appendices 1, 2 and 3 of paper ETC 73/11 with the Committee's decisions.

Item 15 Transfer of regulatory functions from the GSCC to HPC (74/11)

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

15.2 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.

Legislative timetable

15.3 The Committee noted that the Bill was currently in Committee stage in the House of Lords. The section including the transfer of the register from the GSCC had been cleared without amendment. The DH had confirmed at the oversight group that the transfer of the register would take place on 31 July 2012.

Social Work Regulation Oversight Group

15.4 It was clear from conversations with representative of Social Work bodies that there was a lack of understanding about the fees structure. The HPC would need to focus on communicating the change in arrangements to social workers, in particular that failure to pay the fee would result in removal from the register.

15.5 The College of Social Work (CSW) was due to launch on 29 November. CSW was proceeding with the launch without having reached agreement with the British Association of Social Workers (BASW). The oversight group had made it clear to both bodies that an agreement was preferable.

15.6 In the first year the CSW would be funded by the tax payer, and would charge membership fees going forwards.

Transition project

15.7 The HPC and GSCC Executives continued to work together, sharing intelligence and using it to plan for the transfer of the register.

The Committee noted the following papers:

Item 16 Review of the Health Professions Council temporary declaration form for visiting European health professionals (ETC 75/11)

Item 17 Profession specific standards of proficiency review update (ETC 76/11)

Item 18 Independent prescribing for physiotherapists and podiatrists (ETC 77/11)

Item 19 Student fitness to practise and registration (ETC 78/11)

Item 20 Education systems and process review (ETC 79/11)

Item 21 Health and character declarations (ETC 80/11)

Item 22 Education and Training Committee Panel decisions (ETC 81/11)

Item 23 Report from Committee representative at external meetings (ETC 82/11)

Item 24 Date and time of next meeting

24.1 10.30 am - Thursday 8 March 2012

Item 25 Any other business

25.1 There was no further business.

Chair

Date

UNCONFIRMED