

Park House  
184 Kennington Park Road  
London SE11 4BU  
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7840 9716  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7820 9684  
e-mail: peter.burley@hpcuk.org

**MINUTES** of the fourth meeting of the Education and Training Committee held on Wednesday 16 October 2002 at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

**Present** :

Prof. D. Waller (Chairing)  
Dr. G. Beastall  
Mrs. S. Chaudhry  
Mr. M. Collins (to item 11)  
Miss H. Davis  
Mr. P. Frowen  
Prof. R. Klem  
Prof. C. Lloyd  
Mr. I. Massey  
Ms G. Pearson  
Mrs. E. Thornton

**Also in Attendance**

Dr. P. Burley – Secretary, ETC  
Ms J. Hall – DoH  
Mr. D. Ashcroft  
Mr. P. Baker  
Mr. T. Berrie  
Mrs. J. Brayton  
Ms M. Embleton  
Ms U. Falk  
Mr. P. Graham  
Mr. S. Hill  
Mr. G. Milch  
Ms N. O'Sullivan  
Ms J. Pearce  
Ms L. Pilgrim  
Dr. R. Phillips  
Ms R. Reyes  
Ms S. Stirling

**ITEM 1 02/89 MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 The Chairman welcomed Mr. I. Massey to his first meeting.
- 1.2 The Chairman reported that at the Council discussions on 9 – 10 October it had been agreed that Dr. Raman Kapur should be co-opted onto the Committee on an interim basis. In the meantime the executive should advertise the vacancy and invite applications in a process consistent with the Nolan principles. Dr. Kapur would then be more than welcome to apply for the vacancy on a formal long-term basis.
- 1.3 Apologies were received from :- Prof. N. Brook, Mrs. C. Farrell, Prof. J. Harper, Prof. A. Hazell, Mr. C. Lea, Mr. D. Lorimer, Prof. J. Lucas, Mr. G. Sutehall, and Dr. A van der Gaag.

The Committee wished Prof. Hazell and Ms Farrell a full and speedy recovery.

- 1.4 The Committee noted that this would be Ms J. Brayton's last meeting as secretary to the Physiotherapists JVC. The Committee recorded its appreciation of her work for the Physiotherapists Board and then the Committee.

**ITEM 2 02/90 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On the recommendation of the Chairman,

It was

**RESOLVED (1)**

**that the agenda be approved.**

**ITEM 3 02/91 MINUTES**

- 3.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the third meeting of the Health Professions Council's Education and Training Committee held on 3 July 2002 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.
- 3.2 The notes of the meeting held on 4 September 2002 were received.

**ITEM 4 02/92 MATTERS ARISING**

- 4.1 The Committee received the Secretary's report and thanked Profs Lucas and Harper for their work on the definition of a definitive course document.
- 4.2 It was noted that the restriction of the definitive course document to 50 pages might not always be appropriate. A means of addressing this issue was not to duplicate information available elsewhere to HPC in the definitive course document.

- 4.3 It was reported that the formal meeting with UUK and SCOP as part of the consultation process had not proved feasible, but the Committee had been represented at UUK's annual conference in Aberystwyth in September.

**ITEM 5 02/93 CHAIRMAN'S AND SECRETARY'S REPORTS**

- 5.1 The Chairman favourably reported on the Council away day on 9 – 10 October 2002. Decisions had been taken on the directions the Committee should take and which would be ratified formally at the Council meeting on 13 November 2002.
- 5.2 Mrs. Chaudhry confirmed the value of the LTSN conference as a networking event.
- 5.3 The Committee received the Secretary's report.

**ITEM 6 02/94 PRESENTATION BY Ms J. HALL ON THE DoH  
" PARTNERSHIP EVENTS "**

- 6.1 Ms Hall was welcomed to the meeting and addressed the Committee on DoH's Quality Assurance (QA) strategy and Partnership Events to be held in :
- Leeds, 6 November 2002,
  - Birmingham, 3 December 2002, and
  - London, 6 December 2002.
- 6.2 The Secretary to the Committee would attend all three and other members of the Committee would attend as follows :
- Prof. Lloyd – 6 November
  - Prof. Klem – 3 December
  - Prof. Waller – 6 December

These members would form the core group DoH would liaise with for the time being. The HPC representatives at each workshop would give a 10 minute presentation based on the presentation given at the consultation events.

- 6.3 On the stakeholders identified (and invitations issued) Ms Hall commented that not all AHP professional bodies could be invited to all workshops, but the Allied Health Professions Forum (AHPF) had been invited centrally.
- 6.4 It was clarified that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) being referred to in this context was the one signed between the DoH and Shadow HPC. DoH had informed HPC that it considered that this MoU ran for the duration of the first transitional period, although this might be a moot point. In any case the MoU did not commit HPC to anything more than dialogue with DoH and QAA. Any subsequent MoU would fall within the scope of the HPC policy generally on MoUs as agreed at the Council meeting on 19 September 2002. The Committee was sceptical of a need for an MoU prospectively and it was felt that DoH should evaluate the eventual guidances, requirements, and criteria to be published by the Committee before re-approaching the Committee on this.

- 6.5 The approximate direct and indirect costs were estimated to be in the region of £4,000 but it was impossible to be exact at this point as it would be dependent upon numbers attending the Partnership Events. HPC was being asked to be joint funders in collaboration with the NMC and DoH.
- 6.6 It was agreed that these decisions would form a precedent for the other UK countries.
- 6.7 The benefit for HPC would be the involvement with the other stakeholders and the ability to influence the direction of policy.
- 6.8 It was agreed to support the initiative in principle and to remit a request to Finance & Resources Committee.
- 6.9 The Committee thanked Ms Hall for her presentation.

**ITEM 7 02/95 " FUNDING LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT FOR THE HEALTHCARE WORKFORCE – DoH CONSULTATION PAPER " – PROPOSED RESPONSE**

- 7.1 The Committee considered items 7 and 8 together and received the Secretary's briefings on them.
- 7.2 The Committee welcomed the very many positive and beneficial developments proposed in the paper which should lead to improvements in the quality of education and training. The comments in detail on the papers should be seen in the light of overall approbation for the proposals.
- 7.3 It was agreed that the relevant responses received by HPC in its consultation exercise – especially on CPD – should be forwarded to DoH to strengthen HPC's comments on issues such as funding for CPD.
- 7.4 The Committee thanked Prof. Lucas for his work on these papers since the discussion on 4 September 2002.
- 7.5 It was

**RESOLVED (2)**

**that the Committee submit responses to DoH following the advice offered to it and the points raised in discussion.**

**ITEM 8 02/96 " MINIMISING ATTRITION FROM NHS FUNDED PRE-REGISTRATION COURSES "**

See item 7 above.

**ITEM 9 02/97 STANDING ORDERS FOR THE PRE-REGISTRATION AND TRAINING WORKING GROUPS**

- 9.1 The Executive presented Standing Orders (SO) for discussion and adoption. It was agreed that the implication of those SOs was that business was open and documents public unless specifically made private. This would be a major change from procedures under the PSM Act.
- 9.2 This should be drawn to the subordinate bodies' attention.
- 9.3 It was

**RESOLVED (3)**

**that the Standing Orders be adopted.**

**ITEM 10 02/98 FORMAT OF THE COMMITTEE'S RESPONSE TO THE FEEDBACK FROM THE HPC CONSULTATION EXERCISE**

- 10.1 Mr. S. Hill (Newchurch) introduced the tabled paper setting out an uncritical preliminary analysis of the main thrust of responses to the consultation exercise received relevant to ETC. These formed the agenda for the issues the Committee needed to address. The paper was received.
- 10.2 The secretary reported that as part of the consultation exercise DoH had clarified that the HPO did not allow for approval of non-UK qualifications, only courses or parts of courses delivered outside the UK which led to a UK award. This was an activity the Boards at CPSM had already been conducting and HPC inherited their procedures and expertise. It was agreed that the issues here should be more widely publicised within HE, and that this should be done via the Council of Validating Universities.
- 10.3 Most of the responses to Part IV of the HPO were from organisations rather than individuals, except for CPD where there was a huge number of individual responses. There were wide variations between responses from different professions here reflecting differences in their circumstances.
- 10.4 It was clarified that the reference to numbers of hours for CPD in the questionnaires had not produced a useful result for the Committee. It had been the wrong question to ask in retrospect.
- 10.5 It was recognised that the term "CPD" was in itself misleading. The potential for confusion had been exacerbated by the legal advice that the CPD scheme could not encompass a test for registrants' competence nor could compliance with the eventual CPD guarantee competence nor non-compliance demonstrate incompetence.
- 10.6 The Committee decided to defer to wider HPC discussions and publications and the work of the Executive on the detail and format of response to the consultation feedback and the range of brochures needed.

10.7 By the end of its next (additional) meeting on 12 November 2002 the Committee and the Executive would have to have decided what brochures were needed and who would take responsibility for them. The Committee would also need to decide how to respond to the comments made in feedback to the discussion. (The Committee did not need to respond to comments which suggested behaving ultra vires to the HPO).

10.8 In order to take the work forward it was agreed to appoint sub-groups as follows :-

**Pre-Registration Education and Training**

Paul Frowen  
John Harper  
Carol Lloyd  
Jeff Lucas  
Eileen Thornton  
Anna van der Gaag

**CPD** :

Graham Beastall  
Tony Hazell  
Gill Pearson  
Christine Farrell  
Michael Collins

**(Internal) Procedures** :

To be remitted to the Secretariat group (with Chairman) – meeting on 21 October 2002.

**Placements**

Ian Massey  
Helen Davis  
Gordon Sutehall  
(with Jodi Binning to be approached)

**Standards Requirements and Criteria to be established and published**

Diane Waller  
Helen Davis  
Shaheen Chaudhry  
Rosemary Klem

10.9 It was agreed that the groups should seek to transact their business by e-mail. Each group should, however, seek to hold a meeting before 12 November 2002. The Executive should circulate papers and briefings to them as soon as possible.

**ITEM 11 02/99 BUSINESS PROCEDURES FOR HPC BROCHURES AND MANUALS AND APPOINTMENT OF " PARTNERS "**

- 11.1 The Executive introduced the papers (including a tabled paper). Members were reminded that in discussion on 4 September 2002 they had agreed with the strategy and that work should start as soon as possible. It had been recognised that complete alignment between 12 different procedures might never be achievable, and certainly not by 1 April 2003 (with a copy date in February). It had been noted that the brochures would be dynamic and changed as the processes evolved. The members had felt that the Council should appoint visitors in due course. Members had felt that the catch-all term " partners " might be confusing when applied to visitors and noted that Council would be discussing this. These views were confirmed.
- 11.2 It was agreed that the education and training secretariat staff be asked to continue to develop the project plan in the light of the AHPF " values " paper earlier in 2002.
- 11.3 In all other respects this item had been dealt with under the previous item. [ See also item 18.2 below ].

**ITEM 12 02/100 NOTES OF THE MEETINGS OF PRE-REGISTRATION EDUCATION AND TRAINING WORKING GROUPS, JOINT VALIDATION COMMITTEES AND JOINT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEES HELD SINCE 4 SEPTEMBER 2002**

Recommendations approved by ETC at its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2002 is as follows:

**12.1 ARTS THERAPISTS**

On the advice of the JQAC following a postal meeting and after scrutiny of the documentation:-

**12.1.1 Approval of New Courses under Section 4(1)(a) and (b) and Institutions under Section 4(1)(c) of the PSM Act 1960**

University of Edinburgh

- a. under the terms of Section 4(1)(a)(b) and (c) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the course of training to be offered by, the examinations set by and the qualification awarded by the University of Edinburgh, and the institution itself, be approved as meeting the standards and requirements for State Registration, and
- b. under the terms of Section 4(2) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Working Group recommends that the Health Professions Council send its recommendation to the Privy Council that it be requested to determine approval of the application by the University of Edinburgh to offer the registrable course and qualification as set out below:-

<b>In</b>	Music Therapy
<b>Type of Course</b>	Full Time
<b>Institution of Training/Education</b>	Moray House School of Education
<b>Qualification</b>	PgD in Music Therapy (Nordoff-Robbins)
<b>Awarded by</b>	University of Edinburgh
<b>Length of course</b>	Three years
<b>Date of event</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> May 2002
<b>With effect from</b>	August 2002
<b>Participants in approval process</b>	Health Professions Council University of Edinburgh

12.1.2 **Continued Approval of Institutions (and associated clinical placements), courses, Examinations and Qualifications under Section 5 of the PSM Act**

University of Sheffield

Continued approval of the University of Sheffield, as being properly organised and equipped, for conducting the approved course Postgraduate Diploma in Art Psychotherapy.

12.2 **SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPISTS**

On the advice of the Joint Validation Committee and following scrutiny of the documentation:-

12.2.1 **Continued Approval of Institutions (and associated clinical placements), courses, Examinations and Qualifications under Section 5 of the PSM Act**

Manchester Metropolitan University

Continued approval of the four-year joint honours: BSc (Hons) Psychology and Speech Pathology, and the three-year single honours: BSc (Hons) Speech Pathology and Therapy until the academic year 2006/7.

12.2.2 City University

The Committee authorised the Chairman to take action on its behalf to ensure that appropriate accommodation was adequate and appropriate for the proposed additional in-take of students after 2002.



### 23.2.3 University of Central England

The Committee authorised the Chairman to take action on its behalf to ensure that the outstanding condition made at validation was met (item 23/02 of the notes of the JAC on 16 September 2002).

## 12.3 **PARAMEDICS**

12.3.1 The Committee received the notes of the meeting held on 23 September 2002. Mr. Massey / Mr. Berrie reported on a meeting with professional and other bodies held on 14 October 2002.

12.3.2 Two related issues were arising for the profession. The first was to manage the process of developing degree courses and seek to introduce some national coherence into it. The second was to identify who, or which body, might be able to play this role for the profession in the absence of a Subject Association and given that the British Paramedics Association did not yet function as a learned society. An avenue being explored was to set up a Paramedic Forum.

## 12.4 **RADIOGRAPHERS**

On the advice of the Joint Validation Committee and following scrutiny of the documentation:-

### 12.4.1 **Continued Approval of Institutions (and associated clinical placements), courses, Examinations and Qualifications under Section 5 of the PSM Act**

#### Suffolk College

That the BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography and the BSc (Hons) Oncology and Radiotherapy Technology and associated Clinical Placements continue to be approved for the purpose of State Registration.

### 12.4.2 **Approval of New Courses under Section 4(1)(a) and (b) and Institutions under Section 4(1)(c) of the PSM Act 1960**

#### University of Teesside

The Committee received the tabled paper and oral report and the JVC guidance on Masters courses. At the validation visit a number of conditions had been made and queries raised. Subsequent meetings had been held between the JVC and the University. Revised documentation had been submitted. The JVC was now satisfied that all the conditions had been made, but not all the queries raised had been answered.

The Committee noted that the approval was for a Masters course but which led to two exit points and registrable qualifications – at MSc and at PGDip.

- a. under the terms of Section 4(1)(a)(b) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the course of training to be offered by, the examinations set by and the qualification awarded by the University of Teesside, and the institution itself, be approved as meeting the standards and requirements for State Registration, and
- b. under the terms of Section 4(2) of the Professions Supplementary to Medicine Act 1960, the Working Group recommends that the Health Professions Council send its recommendation to the Privy Council that it be requested to determine approval of the application by the University of Teesside to offer the registrable course and qualification as set out below :-

<b>In</b>	Radiography
<b>Type of Course</b>	Full-time
<b>Institution of Training/Education</b>	University of Teesside
<b>Qualification(s)</b>	MSc Allied Health Professional Studies (with eligibility for State Registration – Diagnostic Radiography) PgD Allied Health Professional Studies (with eligibility for State Registration – Diagnostic Radiography)
<b>Awarded by</b>	University of Teesside
<b>Length of Course</b>	Two years
<b>Date of Event</b>	20 <sup>th</sup> March 2002
<b>With effect from</b>	February 2003
<b>Participants in approval process</b>	Health Professions Council College of Radiographers University of Teesside.

The Committee authorised the Chairman to take action to confirm approval of the course when the outstanding queries had been clarified.

**ITEM 13 02/101 HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND'S TEACHING QUALITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE'S INTERIM REPORT AND CONSULTATION**

- 13.1 The Committee received the Interim Report and JM Consulting's letter of 20 September 2002.
- 13.2 It was agreed that the report be referred in the first instance to the AHPF competence project which needed to make recommendations about the competence of teaching staff as part of its wider remit.

- 13.3 In discussion about entry qualifications to teaching in HE, the Committee felt that these should be kept as open and flexible as possible. The Committee would not support an approach of prescriptive lists of approved qualifications here.

**ITEM 14 02/102 MINUTES OF THE REGISTRATION COMMITTEE ON 25 SEPTEMBER 2002**

The Committee received and approved the minutes as appropriate.

**ITEM 15 02/103 UP-DATE ON THE D<sub>o</sub>H PROTOTYPE REVIEWS AND PROGRESS ON SUBJECT BENCHMARKING**

The Committee received the two reports.

**ITEM 16 02/104 UP-DATE FROM THE LEARNING FOR PARTNERSHIP NETWORK**

Noted.

**ITEM 17 02/105 DIGEST OF RELEVANT CURRENT INITIATIVES**

Noted.

**ITEM 18 02/106 ANY OTHER BUSINESS :**

**18.1 JOINT FUNDING BODIES' REVIEW OF RESEARCH ASSESSMENT – INVITATION TO CONTRIBUTE**

18.1.1 The Committee received the tabled paper and the invitation to contribute.

18.1.2 The Chairman introduced the paper saying that it was a core issue because of the implications for funding decisions on courses arising from the Research Assessment Exercise.

18.1.3 The Chairman was authorised to respond to the invitation to contribute in liaison with other members, and being mindful of the professional bodies' roles here. It was agreed to include this topic on the secretariat group meeting on 21 October 2002.

**18.2 STANDARDS OF PROFICIENCY**

18.2.1 Members requested an up-date on progress here and expressed concern over the progress to date.

18.2.2 It was clarified that a one day conference was to be held on 31 October 2002 where the exercise was designed to coalesce and move forward at the two levels of cross-professional considerations and the uni-professional standards.

- 18.2.3 There was very clearly a potential difficulty emerging that when the work had been initiated the " project plan's " timetable was not so explicit as it now was, and the specific urgency and timetabling of these standards had not been appreciated by those with the expertise to produce them. This would need to be raised with QAA.
- 18.2.4 Mr. Seale promised that the executive would submit an up-dated project plan with its timetable to each committee as it met from now on.
- 18.2.5 The Committee asked the Council and the Executive to note its concern that undue haste of implementation of the project plan generally might create impossible work-loads for members and officers. Mr. Seale acknowledged this and promised to make additional resources available if that would resolve difficulties.

#### **ITEM 19 02/107 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 19.1 The Committee noted that the next meeting would be an additional one on 12 November 2002 to coincide with a meeting of the Registration Committee (that Committee starting at 10.30 am). The two Chairmen would liaise on whether any business was joint and propose a schedule for the day.
- 19.2 The Committee confirmed dates of meetings in Spring 2003 as 12 February and 26 March 2003.
- 19.3 For the remainder of 2003 the Committee suggested to the Executive that it should meet as follows on a cycle of around three weeks before each Council meeting or an appropriate earlier date :-
- 14 May,  
30 July,  
24 September,  
19 November.
- 19.4 Meetings would be at 10.30 am, on Wednesdays, and in Park House unless otherwise notified.
- 19.5 The Executive would produce a definitive list of 2003 meetings in due course.

**CHAIRMAN**