

Standards of Proficiency PLG
24th March 2006
Standards of proficiency: draft standards

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

At its meeting on 7th March 2006, the PLG considered a paper detailing the feedback received from the professional bodies.

Standards are appended for the 12 professions whose standards are subject to the PLG's review. Additional documents are also appended which show proposals for the existing generic standards, and a further draft of the generic standards, some of which have been amended to remove the verb constructions discussed at the last meeting.

Decision

The PLG is invited to consider and make decisions in relation to the draft standards appended.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Background papers

The most relevant evidence and information considered by the group at previous meetings is included in the papers as reference material.

Appendices

As detailed overleaf

Date of paper

10th April 2006

Standards of proficiency: draft standards

The following standards are appended:

- (i) Existing generic standards (amended in light of discussion of PLG at last meeting)

Draft standards:

- (ii) Generic standards
- (iii) Arts therapists
- (iv) Biomedical Scientists
- (v) Clinical Scientists
- (vi) Chiropodists and Podiatrists
- (vii) Dietitians
- (viii) Occupational therapists
- (ix) Orthoptists
- (x) Paramedics
- (xi) Physiotherapists
- (xii) Prosthetists and Orthotists
- (xiii) Radiographers
- (xiv) Speech and Language Therapists

Rationale

The following is suggested as a rationale for considering changes to the standards and is based upon the background information and evidence considered by the PLG.

The role of the standards are as necessary threshold standards for the safe and effective practice of a profession. Changes to the standards should be necessary:

- (i) to reflect standard safe and effective practice or changes in the scope of practice of a profession;
- (ii) to reflect the standard content of undergraduate curricula;
- (iii) to reflect changes in current use of terminology or to correct use of terminology; and;
- (iv) to correct errors or omissions in the existing standards or to add emphasis to areas of the existing standards.

The PLG may wish to consider the following questions when considering each standard:

- (i) Is the amendment/ addition/ change to the standards necessary?
- (ii) Is the standard a necessary threshold competence standard? (i.e.: is the standard set at an appropriate level; is the standard aspirational or aimed at good or best

practice; is the standard a conduct standard rather than a threshold ability and better located in the standards of conduct, performance and ethics?)

- (iii) If challenged, could HPC clearly explain why the standard was necessary?
- (iv) Is the level of detail correct? (with particular reference to the generic standards, is the level of detail appropriate so that the standard is flexible and applicable to all professions?)
- (v) Is there sufficient evidence to justify a change to the standards? (i.e: the evidence indicating a change is proportionate to the extent of the change proposed)

ERROR: undefinedfilename
OFFENDING COMMAND: c

STACK: