

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 92nd meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Thursday 23 April 2020

Time: 2 pm

Venue: By teleconference

Members: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson
Penny Joyce
Sonya Lam
Kathryn Thirlaway
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Anna Clampin, University of Central Lancashire (item 6)
Niall Gooch, Education Officer
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Maxine Winstanley, University of Central Lancashire (item 6)

Public Agenda

Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members and the Executive to the meeting.

Item 2 - Apologies for absence

- 2.1 There were no apologies for absence.

Item 3 - Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda.

Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 No public interests were declared. One interest was declared with regards to the private paper 'Education provider concern' the details of which were recorded in the private minutes for the meeting.

Item 5 - Public minutes of the Education and Training Committee meetings of 10 and 24 March 2020 (ETC 18/20)

- 5.1 The Committee approved the public minutes of its meetings of 10 and 24 March 2020

Items for discussion/approval

Item 6 - Non-approval recommendation - University of Central Lancashire, MSc Speech and Language Therapy, full time accelerated (ETC 15/20)

- 6.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.
- 6.2 The Chair set out the process that would be followed in considering the non-approval recommendation. It was noted that:-
- The Executive would then lead the Committee through the visitor's outstanding conditions. The University of Central Lancashire (UCLan) would be provided with the opportunity to address the Committee on each condition regarding their response;
 - the Committee would then withdraw into private session to determine their decision which would be reported back in public session;
 - during all stages Committee members would be able to ask questions to clarify their understanding.

- 6.3 The Executive provided the Committee with a brief overview of the approval journey for the programme. It was noted that the programme was visited in September 2019, this visit resulted in conditions to be met before approval could be granted. Following the education provider's first conditions response, the visitors required a second response. After reviewing the additional evidence provided by the education provider through both conditions responses, the visitors consider that two conditions are not met by the programme. There were no further approval stages for the visitors to undertake and so the Committee was asked to decide to:
- approve the programme;
 - commence non-approval proceedings; or
 - direct the Executive to undertake any other course of action it deems necessary to inform its decision regarding the approval of the programme.
- 6.4 The Committee agreed to first consider the education providers observations on the application of the approval process, set out in appendix three of the report. The purpose of this was to determine if the issues raised impacted on the visitors' reasoning to not approve the programme to an extent that the findings were flawed.
- 6.5 The Committee noted UCLan's observation that they were required to submit significantly more evidence than during their previous experience of HCPC programme approval. The Committee noted that the Executive had not undertaken a comparative review to similar programmes. The level of evidence required would be determined by the individual circumstances of a programme.
- 6.6 The Committee noted it was difficult for them to judge if the volume of evidence required was excessive having not been party to that evidence, however the Committee noted the education provider's comments on the concise style of their documentation and that revisions were ongoing during the visit period.
- 6.7 The Committee noted the requirement for full assessment briefs to be provided. The Committee considered that this was above what would normally be expected from education providers. Requiring the number of hours of study was particularly granular detail not normally seen as the assurance focus should be on learning outcomes.
- 6.8 The Committee noted the education providers perception that the visit was more confrontational in style than they had previously experienced, and that learners on the programme had felt 'interrogated'. They noted that the Education Officer present on the visit had not raised concerns about the tone of the visit at the time. The Committee agreed that it required assurance that

these observations had been raised with the Visitors to reflect on and that their perspective was sought.

- 6.9 The Committee concluded that the education providers observations on the application of the process did require consideration by the Executive and appropriate follow up.
- 6.10 The Executive proceeded to summarise the visitors' position relating to the two conditions outstanding on the programme.
- 6.11 The Committee discussed the visitor's comments about module content. The Committee felt that the visitors were considering separated modules to identify learning outcomes and therefore the SOPs, rather than taking into account learning outcomes from across the programme. The Committee noted that at the time of the visit the programme was still developing and this could have resulted in the view that key clinical areas were not sufficiently covered.
- 6.12 The UCLan was invited to address the Committee on any points they wished to make in addition to their written observations. The Committee noted the following points put forward by the UCLan:-
- UCLan's module descriptors were concise by design, they had felt the Visitors were focused on where something would sit in a module rather than how the curriculum would deliver learning outcomes. UCLan provided the Visitors with a scheme of work later in the process to try and impart this understanding;
 - practice element documentation was mapped against the SOPs;
 - the registered speech and language therapist programme lecturer noted that hearing impairment was an important focus in the programme and was covered in the second year. She felt the visitors had missed that specific clinical conditions were embedded in the modules so learners could build on theoretical knowledge; and
 - UCLan had significant experience of HCPC the approval process and the visit in this instance had not felt constructive in comparison.
- 6.13 The Committee adopted 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 the following; 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 Council's functions. Minutes of this discussion were constrained within the private minutes of the meeting.
- 6.14 Following discussion in the private meeting, the Committee agreed that UCLan would be provided with an additional opportunity to demonstrate the outstanding conditions were met. The Committee's reasons for reaching this

decision are contained within the decision notice issued in respect of the programme (appendix 1).

Item 7 - COVID-19 impact on implementing SET 1 for paramedics (ETC 20/20)

7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.

7.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- in March 2018, the Committee agreed that the SET 1 threshold level of award for paramedics should be raised to degree level for cohorts from September 2021 onwards;
- the pandemic has impacted the ability for student paramedics to continue on currently approved programmes due to being brought into the service to support the COVID-19 response and the unavailability of practice based learning and academic delivery; and
- this could result in potential workforce shortages throughout the UK, which has been raised by the Scottish Government.

7.3 The Committee agreed that it was important to take a pragmatic approach to this issue and to understand the needs of each health service in managing this issue going forward. The Committee also did not wish to undo the positive work done by the health and education sectors since March 2018 to introduce degree level entry training for the paramedic profession.

7.4 The Committee directed the Executive to work directly with each health service to understand what, if any adjustment in lead in time is needed to ensure the paramedic workforce can be maintained both during and following the pandemic response. Any localised extensions to the timeline for SET1 change would be risk based. The Committee noted that the Executive would be mindful of the differences in provision across the four countries.

7.5 The Committee asked the Executive to strengthen the position statement to reinforce the HCPC's commitment to the SET 1 change for paramedics and to clearly set out that the HCPC expects providers to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the September 2021 introduction. With this amendment the Committee agreed to publish the position statement set out in appendix one of the paper. It was noted that the Executive would discuss the position statement with the College of Paramedics.

Item 8 - Any other business

8.1 There was no further business.

Item 9 - Date and time of next meeting

Item 10 – Resolution

The Committee is invited to adopt the following:

‘The Committee hereby resolves that the remainder of the meeting shall be held in private, because the matters being discussed relate to the following;

- (a) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or application for registration;
- (b) information relating to an employee or office holder, former employee or applicant for any post or office;
- (c) the terms of, or expenditure under, a tender or contract for the purchase or supply of goods or services or the acquisition or disposal of property;
- (d) negotiations or consultation concerning labour relations between the Council and its employees;
- (e) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Council;
- (f) action being taken to prevent or detect crime to prosecute offenders;
- (g) the source of information given to the Council in confidence; or
- (h) 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 Council’s functions.’

Item	Reason for Exclusion
11	A

Signed

Date

Education and Training Committee

Programmes previously recommended for approval subject to conditions where the visitors have recommended non-approval:

Programme name	MSc Speech and Language Therapy
Education provider	University of Central Lancashire
Mode of delivery	FT (full time) accelerated
Assessment ref	APP02062
Date of decision	23 April 2020

Panel: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson
Penny Joyce
Sonya Lam
Kathryn Thirlaway
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

Decision
That the programme, which was previously recommended for approval subject to meeting conditions, and now the visitors are recommending that the conditions are not met, is provided with a further opportunity to demonstrate how the remaining conditions are met.
Reasons
Visitors recommended that the programme was not approved, as they were not satisfied that two conditions were met. The Committee considered this recommendation, alongside observations from the education provider. Given the nature of the outstanding issues, and the additional observations and information provided to the Committee which had not been received by the visitors, the Committee agreed that there was a realistic prospect of the education provider meeting the conditions given another opportunity. The Committee agreed that the education provider would be invited to make any additional submissions as it chose and that these submissions, along with those already made to the Committee, would be shared with the visitors and an additional speech and language therapist visitor with education delivery experience, to determine if the outstanding conditions had been met.

Signed:..... **Panel Chair**