

Agenda Item 4

Enclosure 2

Paper ETC 66/02

Education and Training Committee

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER
NOT APPEARING ELSEWHERE ON THE AGENDA AND NOT TO BE
HELD OVER TO 27 NOVEMBER 2002**

From the Secretary

for information

Notes of a Meeting of Education and Training Secretariat Staff held on Monday 21 October 2002

<u>Present</u>	Dr P Burley	-	Chairing, HPC
	Mr D Lorimer	-	Chiropodists JQAC
	Ms J Brayton	-	CSP, JVC
	Ms S Stirling	-	RCSLT, JVC
	Ms M Embleton	-	COR, JVC
	Mr D Ashcroft	-	SCP
	Dr S Gosling	-	CSP
	Ms U Falk	-	HPC
	Prof D Waller	-	HPC (Chairman, ETC)
	Dr I Illott	-	COT
	Mr G Milch	-	HPC
	Ms L Pilgrim	-	HPC
	Ms N O'Sullivan	-	HPC
	Mr T Berrie	-	HPC
	Mr G Ross-Sampson	-	HPC

1. Introduction and Welcome, and Apologies for Absence

1.1 The Director of Education and Policy at HPC welcomed those attending and formally introduced Prof. Diane Waller, Chairman of the Education and Training Committee.

1.2 The following changes had taken place in relevant staff at the professional bodies :

COT : Dr I Illott would be leaving. Ms A Lawson-Porter would be Group Head of Education and Practice.

CSP : Ms J Brayton would be leaving the CSP shortly and Ms J Carey would be servicing the JVC on an interim basis. Ms T Bury (Research Officer) would be leaving shortly. Since the last meeting Ms F Kitsell had been appointed Director of Learning and Development.

SCP : Ms H de Lyon would be leaving as Chief Executive on 1 November 2002. Interviews were being held for a successor.

COR : A new post of policy development would be established.

1.3 Apologies for absence were received from : Ms R Reyes and Ms C Savage.

2. Notes of the Meeting held on 19 June 2002 and Minutes and Notes of ETC Meetings held since then (and matters arising not included elsewhere on the Agenda)

- 2.1 The notes were received.
- 2.2 The issue of documentation for the ETC was raised, and was then discussed at a number of points below.*
- 2.3 A matter arose from the ETC minutes from 16 October 2002 for information, but which was not discussed. ETC was anxious that the advisory bodies open their proceedings to the public in line with general HPC practice (and documents be placed on web sites), but this had the corollary that proper procedures for confidentiality needed to be observed when matters discussed were about identifiable individuals, financial matters, actual or potential quasi-judicial proceedings, or other such matters specified in HPC's Standing Orders.

3. Information Received since the last Meeting

- 3.1 The meeting noted Prof Lucas's work on " Definitive Course Documents " and the comments expressed by ETC.
- 3.2 The meeting received the common templates and formats for approvals being developed at HPC.
 - 3.2.1 It was agreed to progress this work and continue to develop it. It would also relate to the nature of reporting generally to ETC.
 - 3.2.2 A number of minor points emerged for clarification :
 - neither the Boards previously, nor HPC prospectively, could approve parts of courses separately from the whole course (and award) nor approve courses in one profession in deference to the wishes of other professions or stakeholders; each approval had to be specific to the profession, award and course, and mindful of HPC's duty of care to the public,
 - the Privy Council criteria for when a course had to be treated as new provision for the purposes of Section 4 of the PSM Act were very prescriptive and ETC might be able to review those and lighten some burdens,
 - ETC needed to decide if it did require full course documents and visits reports needed to be available at meetings,*
 - progressing inter-professional issues would be deferred to the AHP " Value Statement " and related work,
 - documents received by secretariat staff should be forwarded promptly to Ms Falk,
 - The HPC secretariat would continue to deal with the Privy Council, but the individual secretariat members should continue to notify institutions of continued approval under Section 5 and minor changes under Sections 4 and 5.

* See note at end.

3.2.3 It was agreed that Ms S Stirling should prepare a glossary of relevant terms for ETC activity and the meeting thanked her for her offer.

4. Up-Date on HPC Business and the Consultation Exercise

4.1 HPC Executive reported on how HPC's business plan was proceeding with particular reference to ETC's decision that this group should look at the issues around commonality and consistency of terminology and procedures. This group would operate at the same level as the other groups, but would be in a position to be initiating much of the work for the Committee as a whole.

4.2 Mr Ross-Sampson and Dr P Burley drew attention to the three categories of work needed by ETC :

- Operating Manuals,
- Leaflets / Brochures,
- Guidances.

Guidance notes would cover policy and legal guidance, leaflets and brochures would deal with publicity and communications, and operating manuals dealt with processes.

The publication of all the criteria, standards, guidances and requirements prescribed in the HPO would fall within these categories. The main task falling to this group would be the operating manuals. The (Committee Members') Pre-Registration Education & Training Group would have responsibility for the brochures and leaflets.

The proposed leaflet on JVCs would be more of a statement of broad approach and intent on collaboration between HPC and professional bodies generally rather than a replication of a " JVC Handbook ".

4.3 The Director of Education and Policy reported that the outcome of the consultation and the current direction of HPC thinking was to maintain the close working relations with the professional bodies in their role as Learned Societies and where there was no conflict of interests. This meant that joint working would continue, but the Executive wanted arrangements to be more coherent and consistent than at present. Discussions would be taking place at Chief Executive level as an outcome of the consultation to discuss the future HR strategy for this work.

4.4 It was agreed that ETC should proceed on the basis of :

- continued joint working with the professional bodies;
- all professions to enjoy such joint working (and AHPF and HPC should use their good offices to promote this for professions not yet fully engaged with it),
- needing to clarify if joint working should be on the basis of joint " Advisory " and / or " Assurance " procedures rather than joint " Validation " procedures (see also 4.9 below) and
- recommendations on (re-)approvals (or not) of specific provision always reaching the Committee via a subordinate body able to exercise peer professional scrutiny and judgement.

4.5 Mr. Ross-Sampson confirmed that HPC would be retaining a consultant to produce the documentation needed by ETC and they could start work in early December.

- 4.6 In terms of existing documents and sources of information for the operating manual(s) the following points emerged :
- it needed to be clarified with QAA if the current Subject Benchmarks (SB) also covered registrable Masters qualifications,**
 - SBs were not the only source of information and curriculum frameworks, National Occupational Standards, and such documents should also be used and looked at by the consultant, and
 - The AHP values statement could form the point of departure for a common framework for the operating manual.
- 4.7 The nature of a " report " needed to be clarified. At present a variety of sources of information were used. Some were owned and generated by the institutions being visited. It was confirmed that ETC needed to have confidence in the information submitted to it. It was recognised, though, that insisting on its own (and joint with the professional bodies) visitors writing their own reports duplicating other sources of information would be counter productive and counter to the spirit of the Order. It was agreed that all relevant sources of information should count as a " report " for the purposes of the Order, but noting that HPC could always exercise its own power and discretion – with the professional bodies – if it had doubts about the information available to it.
- 4.8 The Council needed to confirm that it wished to delegate the appointment and operation of visitors to ETC (as a formality in the Order).
- 4.9 An important issue of principle was established in the context of " advisory " as against " validation " committees. This was that HPC – working with the professional bodies – should be seen to approve (and re-approve) provision on its own authority and at its own expense as an independent regulator. This meant that the traditional " tri-partite " validation arrangements brokered in the 1980s by the then Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) – whereby the visited institution bore all the costs of validation, including those for HPC and professional body visitors – should be reviewed. This had significant financial implications, which needed to be reported back to the professional bodies still using the CNAA model. At the same time, HPC and the professional bodies together needed to retain and develop integrated working with the other stakeholders. This integrated working was embedded in the AHP " value statement " and was consistent with current UK Health Department policies. Moving away from integrated working with HEIs should not be considered as a desirable option. The Chiropodists were developing a model of working with validation events which achieved both proper integration and proper distance, and this could be shared with other professions. Deciding if a common approach could be viable would be one of the consultants' main tasks.
- 4.10 Those JVCs etc which were up-dating procedures should continue to do so.

** Subsequent to the meeting it was clarified with QAA that the contract with DoH had required the SBs in the AHPs to cover :

- fitness for award,
- fitness for practice,
- fitness for purpose, and
- any relevant HE qualification between Dip HE and Masters.

There was no intention that their use should be limited to judgements about the fitness for award exclusively of BSc (Hons) courses.

- 4.11 A decision was needed by ETC to underpin the processes for not approving a new provision and for withdrawal of approval from existing provision. This was the time scales to be allowed for institutions to respond. A balance had to be struck between urgency and reasonableness (as would be tested against the Human Rights Act). This period would be reflected into the various processes.
- 4.12 Another issue on failure to approve was whether a visit was needed or if a paper based assessment of a course could find it so far adrift from the subject benchmark that approval was inappropriate and unrealistic.
- 4.13 It was recognised that the DoH and QAA work around partnership workshops, evaluation of prototype reviews, a post-registration qualifications framework, and so on would have a major implication for how HPC and the professional bodies would take their work forward. It was confirmed that a long term potential outcome of these initiatives could be the alignment of an HEI's internal timetables to schedule all the review/re-approval activity to co-incide and then to be conducted collaboratively with the other stakeholders in a system which would remain robust but be hugely more economical.
- 4.14 On a purely practical level, any work which could be done to edit, distill, or analyse the twelve existing uni-professional guidances on education and training would be useful. The consultants (with a copy to Mr Ross-Sampson) would need to receive :
- AHPF values statement and paper on the modernisation agenda,
 - the Subject Benchmarks or equivalents,
 - curriculum development documents,
 - either all or a representative sample of JVC / JQAC handbooks, and
 - QAA's Academic Reviewers Handbook.
- 4.15 The meeting noted HPC's initial analysis of the results of the consultation exercise. Since then the Secretary of ETC had added and circulated a commentary on the feedback. The main points were that :
- DoH had clarified that HPC did not have the power to approve non-UK qualifications, only UK qualifications awarded for successful completion of provision either within or outside the UK; this removed a whole area from the consultation exercise;
 - on admission requirements to approved provision (health, good character, and academic) ETC would defer to the Conduct and Competence Committee for broad criteria on good health and good character. For all three areas responses had been mutually exclusive. HPC, therefore, had the discretion to develop the requirements on their merits with a presumption in favour of a lighter touch and delegation to the providing and awarding bodies, which had duplicatory powers here in any case;
 - no response had suggested a deliberate decoupling of HPC's QA procedures from those of other stakeholders while many had urged closer and more integrated working. This was consistent with the general direction this work had been taking and HPC desired;
 - on the general production of standards, criteria, and requirements respondents had urged an inclusive approach and one not reliant entirely on QAA's Subject Benchmarks. This also tallied with ETC's wishes; and

- the questions as framed on CPD had not elicited data of much value. CPD would be returned to at a later date.

No one disagreed with these broad pointers to the feedback and how ETC should respond to it.

5. **DoH Consultation Papers**

The meeting noted the linked DoH consultation papers on Funding for Learning and Development and Minimising Attrition, with particular reference to a definition of, and issues around, attrition.

6. **Outline Proposal for a " Brochure " On Quality Assurance**

The meeting received an extract from NMC's publicity on QA. The meeting agreed that this could form a point of departure for a template and /or common framework for HPC generally. It was noted that the NMC had used a similar diagrammatic format for course approval work as the HPC executive was using for HPC processes generally. This advice would be forwarded to the ETC members' sub-group on pre-registration education and training.

7. **Council of Nursing Deans**

Dr Burley reported that the Council of Nursing Deans on 17 October 2002 had discussed whether to initiate a strategy of seeking to explore extending their remit to the AHPs. The decision had been taken in principle and would lead to a round of consultations with interested parties. A report would be made to the AGM in January. A major issue would be around the current constitution of the Council, which described Learned Society functions or nursing.

8. **Briefing for the Council of Validating Universities (CVU) Workshop on Overseas Collaboration Development**

Dr Burley reported on attending this workshop on 18 October 2002. The briefing and its implications for education commissioning would be placed on CVU's web-site. Delegates had undertaken to report back to HEI staff planning courses and liaising with commissioning authorities.

9. **JVC / JQAC / JAC / ETC Reporting Year and Nature of Reporting**

- 9.1 The meeting discussed the issue of a common reporting date. It was established that for most professions a " copy date " of March would be realistic and appropriate.
- 9.2 It was agreed that annual reporting needed to cover the type and volume of activity undertaken. The editorial comment and analysis of issues would need to be brief for each profession as forwarded to ETC. Any given subordinate body might need a longer and more analytical annual report for its internal purposes.
- 9.3 This would need to be reported to and confirmed by ETC.

10. DoH Modernisation Agenda and AHPF " Values " Statement

10.1 The meeting received the AHPF values statement and an up-dating paper on responses to DoH modernisation agendas.

10.2 Workforce Development Confederations (WDC) were dissatisfied with the way the regulatory and professional bodies were approaching education and training approvals. This partly arose from Ministers having decoupled the timetable for the modernisation of education and training. There would be a need to adapt approval (and re-approval) mechanisms to reflect the changes in the environment caused by the DoH's modernisation agenda. There was concern that in England WDCs were forcing the pace and presuming that change would automatically be approved and need not be submitted through the normal channels. (HPC had made a robust response here already). There was concern that uncritical and hasty development of modernisation programmes could lead to HPC having to refuse to approve them.

10.3 Some other issues emerging for discussion included how to deal with Foundation Degrees, how to encompass support workers and different levels of practice, how to promote more effective working between HEIs and WDCs and undue regionalisation of what should otherwise be national issues.

11. HEFCE INVITATION TO CONTRIBUTE TO A REVIEW OF RESEARCH ASSESSMENT

Prof Waller introduced this tabled item and pointed out how important it was for the AHPs because of the implications of the Research Assessment Exercise for the funding of courses.

It was agreed that Prof Waller should contact the Chairman of the AHPF research forum (Dr Sandy Mather).

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Group would need to meet again, but not until after the meeting of ETC on 27 November 2002. It was agreed to look at holding a meeting in the week beginning 16 December 2002.

Secretary's Note on Documentation for ETC Meetings and Agendas

Subsequent to the meeting the Chairman has asked that the next relevant agenda be formulated for each approval as follows :

- template précis of information on the provision concerned,
- record of a discussion and recommendation in the appropriate subordinate body,
- a copy of the fuller visit report (or equivalent) to be available at the meeting, but not circulated in advance, and
- the course documentation to be available in the currently designated office but not brought to the meeting.