

THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL

Chief Executive and Registrar: Mr Marc Seale

Park House
 184 Kennington Park Road
 London SE11 4BU
 Telephone: +44 (0)20 7840 9710
 Fax: +44 (0)20 7840 9807
 e-mail: colin.bendall@hpc-uk.org

PROFESSIONAL LIAISON GROUP FOR CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MINUTES of the third meeting of the Professional Liaison Group for Continuing Professional Development held at **10.30 a.m. on Friday 3 February 2006** at The Evangelical Alliance, Whitefield House, 186 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BT.

PRESENT:

Miss E Thornton (Chairman)
 Mrs S Chaudhry
 Professor C Lloyd
 Mr P McFadden
 Mr A Mount
 Ms G Pearson
 Miss P Sabine
 Ms J Sheridan (part)
 Dr Anna van der Gaag

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr M Batt	British Chiropodists and Podiatrists Association
Mr C Bendall	Secretary to the PLG for Continuing Professional Development
Mr C Burrows	Institute of Chiropodists and Podiatrists
Mr R Davis	British Chiropodists and Podiatrists Association
Mr V Fletcher	Alliance of Private Sector Practitioners
Mr M Guthrie	Policy Officer, Health Professions Council
Ms M Harmin	Association of Professional Music Therapists
Ms C Hubbard	British Association of Dramatherapy
Ms V Huet	British Association of Arts Therapists
Ms L Hughes	British and Irish Orthoptic Society
Ms S Kellie	British Dietetic Association
Mr S Kelly	Society and College of Radiographers
Mr J Martin	British Paramedic Association
Ms J Mooney	Society of Chiropodists and Podiatrists
Ms J O'Gorman	Alliance of Private Sector Practitioners
Ms J O'Sullivan	Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Mr M Paynton	British Chiropodists and Podiatrists Association

Mr D Pearson	Association of Clinical Scientists
Ms P Rasanayagam	Institute of Biomedical Science
Mr M Seale	Chief Executive and Registrar, Health Professions Council (part)
Ms R Tripp	Policy Manager, Health Professions Council
Ms S Woolf	Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists

Item 1.06/1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Ms A Hook (College of Occupational Therapists), Mrs C Farrell and Mrs B Stuart.

Item 2.06/2 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Chief Executive welcomed attendees to the meeting and thanked the professional bodies for their work to date in developing example CPD profiles and for sending representatives to the meeting. He explained that it was important that the professional bodies continued to be involved in the development of draft CPD profiles.
- 2.2 The Chairman explained that, during the HPC's consultation on Continuing Professional Development (CPD), there had been requests for further information and advice on certain areas. In "Key decisions from our consultation on Continuing Professional Development", the HPC had made a number of commitments to provide further information. The Chairman explained that the Professional Liaison Group (PLG) had held two meetings on 26 September and 15 December 2005. As part of its work, the PLG had considered draft versions of a short guide to CPD and an additional, more detailed guide, intended for registrants undergoing audit and other interested parties.
- 2.3 The Chairman explained that the aim of the meeting was to encourage discussion and share thoughts about the example draft profiles. The Chairman noted that the PLG was due to meet again on 6 February and would discuss the views which were expressed.

Item 3.06/3 GENERIC AND PROFESSION SPECIFIC PROFILES

- 3.1 There was a general discussion about whether generic profiles would be more useful at this stage than profession-specific profiles. Some attendees felt that generic profiles could be used by all professions as a baseline from which to prepare profession-specific profiles. Some attendees also felt that it was necessary for clear assessment criteria to be produced before profession-specific profiles could be prepared. It was noted that there would be similar roles across the professions (e.g. returners to practice; managers; senior clinicians; educators) which would facilitate preparation of generic profiles.

- 3.2 Other attendees felt that profession-specific profiles would be more relevant and useful to members of their professions, particularly in professions with a variety of disciplines such as biomedical scientists and clinical scientists. It was noted that profession-specific profiles could help to reduce interested parties' uncertainty about CPD.
- 3.3 The Chairman explained that the PLG had felt that registrants would find profession-specific profiles more useful but had not dismissed the idea of generic profiles.

Item 4.06/4 DRAFT "YOUR GUIDE TO CPD" AND DRAFT "CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND YOUR REGISTRATION"

- 4.1 The Chairman asked the meeting to discuss draft documents "Your Guide to CPD" and "Continuing Professional Development and Your Registration". The meeting broke into three discussion groups, which each provided feedback to the whole meeting.
- 4.2 One discussion group felt that both documents were moving in the right direction but felt that more examples should be included and that the language should be softened. It was felt that the assessment criteria should be included in "Your Guide to CPD" and that there was no need to include a list of the 13 professions regulated by the HPC in the draft documents.
- 4.3 The second discussion group agreed that, overall, both documents were welcome and helpful, but should place more emphasis on an outcomes-based approach and should include more detail on the timing and requirements of the CPD audit process (e.g. when the process would end; who would act as assessors; assessors' training and qualifications; the appeals process). The group noted that the professions had different levels of development for their CPD schemes and that professionally-led CPD schemes would need some adjustments to meet the requirements of different organisations (professional bodies, the HPC and the NHS Knowledge and Skills Framework).
- 4.4 The third discussion group felt that both documents were on the right lines and had the right tone, but felt that a précis of the longer document should be included in the shorter document (e.g. details of what sort of evidence should be collected). The group also felt that there should be a checklist for registrants compiling their CPD profile. The group felt that the documents should emphasise the need for reflection by registrants on their practice and should explain the appeals process and who would monitor the CPD audit process.

- 4.5 The Chairman explained that, if registrants were not renewed following a CPD audit, it was likely that their cases would be considered through the HPC's existing registration appeals system.

Item 5.06/5 DRAFT EXAMPLE PROFILES

- 5.1 The Chairman asked the meeting to discuss the draft example profiles which had been prepared by some of the professional bodies. The meeting broke into three discussion groups to share their experience of drafting profiles and to consider whether the drafts were good examples.
- 5.2 The first group agreed that the profiles drafted by the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists were of high quality but were above threshold level and did not provide evidence to show how the registrant's CPD activities had benefited the service user. The group noted that the Royal College had a highly developed CPD system whereas other professions took different approaches. The group noted that the draft profiles had produced in different styles. The meeting agreed that any example profiles should be prepared in different styles which would meet the HPC's requirements. The group noted that there were some concerns about how the audit process would ensure that at least one member of the relevant profession audited profiles. The Chairman explained that it was likely that CPD assessors (who would be HPC Partners) would be brought together to review profiles.
- 5.3 The second group noted that CPD Standards 3 and 4 overlapped to some extent and it was likely that some evidence in a profile would relate to both standards. The group felt that reflection would come more easily to some professions than others and that it would be helpful to encourage registrants to look at example profiles for other roles and professions and to provide examples of profiles that met the standards and those which did not.
- 5.4 The third group agreed that examples of profiles that did not meet the standards would be useful, together with an explanation of why a particular profile did not meet the standards. The group suggested that profiles should be anonymised when they were sent to assessors and agreed that assessors would have to declare a conflict of interest if they believed that they knew the registrant who was the subject of the audit. It was noted that this would be more likely in the smaller professions.
- 5.5 The Chairman explained that all the comments from the meeting would be considered by the PLG and that the Policy Manager would, as far as possible, incorporate the points made into the draft documents. The Chairman invited representatives of the professional bodies to make any further comments to the Policy Manager by 17 February 2006. She

explained that it was hoped that the finalised documents would be produced by April 2006. The Chairman explained that the PLG would consider the most appropriate way to proceed with the development of example profiles.

- 5.6 The Chairman thanked the professional bodies for their work to date on the example profiles. She thanked the representatives who had attended the meeting.

CHAIRMAN

DATE