

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 90th meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Tuesday 10 March 2020

Time: 10:30am

Venue: Room K, Health and Care Professions Council, Park House,
184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

Members: Maureen Drake
Luke Jenkinson (from item 6)
Penny Joyce
Sonya Lam
Kathryn Thirlaway
Stephen Wordsworth (Chair)

In attendance:

Claire Amor, Secretary to the Committee
John Barwick, Chief Executive
Nicola Bibbey, Registration Manager
Olivia Bird, Policy Manager
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Richard Houghton, Head of Registration
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Jacqueline Ladds, Executive Director of Policy and External Relations
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Katherine Timms, Head of Policy and Standards

Public Agenda

Item 1 - Chairs welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the Committee, Executive and those sat in the public gallery to the meeting.

Item 2 - Apologies for absence

- 2.1 There were no apologies for absence. Due to travel issues, Luke Jenkinson would arrive late to the meeting.

Item 3 - Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Committee approved the agenda. The Committee agreed to discuss the impact of Covid-19 pandemic on practice placements under any other business.

Item 4 - Declaration of members' interests

- 4.1 Sonya Lam declared an interest in item 11 as she had been involved with the development of the Queen Margaret University Podiatric Surgery programme. The Committee agreed that this interest did not preclude Sonya Lam from participating in the Committee's consideration of item 11.

Item 5 - Minutes of the meeting of 6 November 2019 (ETC 01/20)

- 5.1 The Committee agreed the minutes.

Item 6 - Matters arising (ETC 02/20)

- 6.1 The Committee noted this item.

Items for discussion/approval

Item 7 - Review of the standards of proficiency consultation (ETC 03/20)

- 7.1 The Committee received a paper from the Policy Manager.
- 7.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- the review was focused on aligning the generic standards therefore the review process had been streamlined by considering the standards of all 15 professions at once;
- to support the review the HCPC has undertaken targeted stakeholder engagement which had included an initial paper-based review, a series of workshops in each of the four countries and meetings with stakeholders, including the professional bodies for all professions, to discuss the standards in more depth;
- it was proposed that the consultation take place on a staggered basis using four groups of professions, this would allow stakeholders interested in responding to multiple groups the time and opportunity to do so; and
- the analysis of the consultation results would be presented to the Committee and Council in November and December 2020.

7.3 The Committee welcomed the paper and the work on rationalising and redrafting the standards for consistency.

7.4 The Committee agreed that the new approach to the review should be monitored through the process to evaluate its effectiveness.

7.5 The Committee discussed the EDI impact assessment for the review. It was noted that international applicants were cited a group that could be impacted by the change in standards. The Committee discussed how these groups could be reached as part of the consultation and it was suggested that international regulators and education providers be consulted as well as employers of international applicants.

7.6 The Committee agreed to recommend the consultation document to Council for approval.

Item 8 - Update on SET1 for Operating Department Practitioners (ETC 04/20)

8.1 The Committee received a paper from the Policy Manager.

8.2 The Committee noted the following points

- SET 1 for ODPs was a Diploma of Higher Education. This level had remained unchanged since the ODP register was opened in 2004;
- in recent years stakeholder opinion expressed, appeared to be that the level of practice for ODPs has moved on and that a BSc (Hons) degree level SET 1 would be more suitable;
- in April 2019 the HCPC published a policy statement on the factors taken into account in deciding to propose a change to SET 1;

- in gathering feedback in preparation for the on the SoPs consultation both professional bodies for ODPs raised SET 1 as an issue that needed to be reviewed. The Association for Perioperative Practice advised the HCPC that the three education providers which provide diploma level training only all planned to introduce degree level training in September 2020; and
 - the Executive is of the view that it was clear that the ODP profession had developed, and that the norm for ODP training was now at degree level. It was recommended that the HCPC consult on changing the ODP SET 1 level following completion of the review of the SoPs.
- 8.3 The Committee noted that the timescales for a consultation were dependent on Policy and Standards team resource availability given the significant work required to support the SOPs consultation due to commence in the summer of 2020.
- 8.4 The Executive also expressed concern that consulting at the same time as the SOPs consultation could place burden on stakeholders due to the volume of responses required within a short period. The Executive's preference was to bring a consultation document to the Committee and Council in November and December 2020. The consultation then would run from January to March 2021.
- 8.5 The Committee agreed that stakeholder consensus on raising ODP SET 1 appeared stronger than that for paramedics and that as such a consultation could be held on an affirmatory basis to streamline the timescale.
- 8.6 The Committee asked if there were any public protection implications of not undertaking the review sooner. It was noted that the Executive did not consider there to be a risk given that the lead time required to implement the SET 1 change in current education provision, consulting in the spring of 2021 would still result in the change coming into force in the same academic year as it would if the consultation took place in the autumn of 2020.
- 8.7 The Executive agreed to review the proposed timeline for the consultation for any opportunities to bring the review forward. The Committee would receive an update on this at their June 2020 meeting.

Item 9.i - How we work with professional bodies when approving education and training programmes (ETC 05/20)

- 9.i.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.
- 9.i.2 The Committee noted that the policy statement set out how the role of the professional bodies interacted with the HCPC's education and training programme approval process. The Council discussed the statement at their

December 2019 meeting and agreed that the Committee should consider it for approval.

- 9.i.3 The Committee note that the involvement of the relevant professional body was discussed with the education provider when scoping how far along the programme development was. However, professional body involvement was not a requirement of approval.
- 9.i.4 The Committee noted that the role of professional bodies varied between the 15 professions, with some having more than one professional body and others not having an accreditation role.
- 9.i.5 The Committee discussed the benefits and challenges of professional body involvement in the approval process and agreed that the statement was correctly positioned. The Committee agreed to receive information on issues raised relevant to the policy on an exception basis.
- 9.i.6 The Committee agreed that developing engagement with the professional bodies on education matters outside of the approval process required thought.

Item 9.ii - The role of lay visitors in education quality assurance (ETC 06/20)

- 9.ii.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.
- 9.ii.2 The Committee noted the following points:-
- lay visitors were introduced in 2014 and had been included as a third member of visit panels for most approval visits;
 - their inclusion at that time coincided with the introduction of the service user and carer involvement education standard and the regulation of social workers in England;
 - operational experience of the role of lay visitors was that the role's lack of education specific experience impacts on how fully lay visitors can contribute to assessment considerations; and
 - the Executive planned a review of the role and an exploration of more effective models for the lay visitor involvement.
- 9.ii.3 The Committee noted that the limited contribution from the lay visitor role was a result of the role's specification, which focuses on utilising traditional service user perspectives, without any additional requirements regarding requisite knowledge or experience of education delivery.
- 9.ii.4 The Committee noted that the review would include engagement with current lay visitors' perspectives as well as reviewing other organisations' approaches in the sector.

- 9.ii.5 The Committee agreed that the communication of the decision to lay visitors required consideration noting that the role specification was the limiting factor in terms of added value to the approval process
- 9.ii.6 The Committee agreed that lay visitor involvement in the approval process should be paused from April 2020 and that a review of the use of lay visitors should proceed. The Committee agreed to receive the results of this review later in 2020.

Item 9.iii - Review of education quality assurance update (ETC 07/20)

- 9.iii.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.
- 9.iii.2 The Committee noted the following points:-
- the Executive proposed to undertake two streams of activity as part of next steps to develop the education quality assurance approach, data and developing the quality assurance processes;
 - the data work focus in the short term would be on Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data. As part of this discussions had been held with the GMC and GDC around their use of HESA data and the factors the HCPC would need to consider to use this data;
 - a possible data sharing agreement with HESA would form part of the data work, though the GMC had highlighted the level of investment required to handle, mine and analyse HESA and other data sources further; and
 - to inform development of the quality assurance approach, the Executive would engage with education providers and visitors. Proposals would be presented to the Committee in June 2020 with a view to implementing a piloted approach in the next academic year.
- 9.iii.3 The Committee noted that The GMC had offered to discuss their approach to data and its application at a suitable future Committee meeting. The Committee welcomed this opportunity and agreed that June would be a suitable date.
- 9.iii.4 The Committee discussed the potential to collaborate with the GMC on HESA data access in future given the considerable investment and infrastructure they had in place.
- 9.iii.5 The Committee note the work on data would be part of a wider data and intelligence function to be established dependent on budgetary approval.
- 9.iii.6 The Committee welcomed the update and agreed that insights from data should be used as soon as was feasible to enhance the current approach, noting that the wider review work would take time to fully embed.

Item 9.iv - Education department work plan 2020-21 (ETC 08/20)

- 9.iv.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.
- 9.iv.2 The Committee agreed to receive progress reports on the workplan to note.
- 9.iv.3 The Committee agreed that the key Education Department risks should be appended to the workplan for reference.

Item 9.v - Education annual data set 2018-19 academic year (ETC 09/20)

- 9.v.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Education.
- 9.v.2 The Committee asked how confident the Executive was that the HCPC would achieve the Education PSA standards. It was noted that the Executive had provided a comprehensive response to the PSA's targeted questions relating to education and that the Executive expected the HCPC to achieve these standards.
- 9.v.3 The Committee discussed the statistic on page 8 of the report that a third of programme applications were withdrawn following the visit but before the visitor's report had been finalised. This was due to providers not wanting to content of the conditions or findings of the report to be in the public domain. This still required considerable resource however.

Item 10. Expert advisors to Visitors (ETC 10/20)

- 10.1 The Committee received a paper form the Education Manager and Partner Manager.
- 10.2 The Committee noted the following points:-
 - the allocation of Visitors with appropriate knowledge and understanding of new and emerging area of practice can be challenging, especially in the clinical science profession
 - recruiting visitors with these specialisms significantly extends the programme approval process;
 - the Executive proposed to create the role of Expert Advisor to resolve this issue. This role would review electronic documentation remotely to make a recommendation about how a curriculum mets the relevant proficiency standards; and

- this recommendation would be considered by an experienced clinical science Visitor who would consider it as part of their wider review of a programme.

10.3 The Committee noted that the competency framework was applicable to all HCPC regulated professions.

10.4 The Committee agreed to the creation of the role and approved the competency framework.

10.5 The Committee requested information on the use and effectiveness of Expert Advisors when this occurred.

Item 11. Review of the process to approve podiatric surgery programmes (ETC 11/20)

11.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.

11.2 The Committee noted the Executive's review of the programme of work undertaken to approve podiatric surgery training programmes.

11.3 The Committee advised that NHS Education Scotland had also undertaken a review of this area and the Executive should review it for applicable learning.

11.4 The Committee asked if the HCPC was better informed as a result of the challenges experienced. It was noted that recent enhancements to the approval process were not in place at the time in question and that the Executive's approach now is to work much closer with the provider earlier in the approval process.

11.5 The Committee considered that the lessons learnt from podiatric surgery approvals were applicable to possible future advance practice regulation.

11.6 The Committee noted that the Executive was considering how to monitor podiatric surgery programmes as the current monitoring process may not be suitable.

Item 12. Registration Department performance report April 2019 to December 2019 (ETC 12/20)

12.1 The Committee received a paper from the Head of Registration.

12.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- all of the department's service standards were achieved for the period April 2019 to December 2019 with the exception of UK applications, emails, telephone calls and postal correspondence;

- the shortage of fully trained Registration Advisors attributed to service standards not being met as well as actively prioritising available resource to fulfil the department's regulatory functions; and
 - during the reporting period, 32 candidates were successfully recruited to Registration Advisor roles which represents 84% of the Registration Advisor budgeted headcount..
- 12.3 The Committee discussed the one working day service standard for responding to emails, the Committee considered this was a high standard which could be extended when advertised externally, and be an internal target of one working day instead.
- 12.4 The Committee discussed the re-registration process in light of the Covid-19 pandemic and the intention to call retired professionals to re enter the workforce. It was noted that the HCPC was in close contact with DHSC regarding this and that legislation was expected to be passed with enabled a temporary separate register to be established for these returners.

The Committee noted the following items;

Item 13. Reviewing our approach to quality assuring Higher and Degree Apprenticeships from 2018-19 (ETC 13/20)

Item 14 - Any other business

- 14.1 The Committee noted that the Council of Deans of Health Wales and HEIW had discussed concerns that the Covid-19 re allocation of workers to front line response could have an impact on practice placements for current students. There were concerns that this could lead to future workforce shortages if students were unable to graduate.
- 14.2 The Committee noted that programme leads had been contacted by the HCPC to provide the HCPC's statement on Covid-19 regulatory responsiveness, this enabled a level of flexibility to ensure students were not prevented graduating by the response effort.

Item 15 - Date and time of next meeting

- 15.1 10.30am – 11 June 2020 at Park House, SE11 4BU

Item 16 – 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
17	A

Signed

Date

Education and Training Committee

Minutes of the 91st meeting of the Education and Training Committee held as follows:

Date: Tuesday 24 March 2020

Time: 11 am

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
Patrick Armsby, Education Officer
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Education
Jamie Hunt, Education Manager
Sharon Potter, University College of Osteopathy (item 5)
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Graham Sharman, University College of Osteopathy (item 5)

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.

Items for discussion/approval

Item 5 - Non-approval recommendation – The University College of Osteopathy – BSc (Hons) Integrated Nutrition and Dietetics, FT (Full time) (ETC 15/20)

- 5.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.
- 5.2 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 visitors outstanding conditions. The University College of Osteopathy (UCO) 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.
- 5.3 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. UCO was unable to provide the visitors with assurance that

the outstanding conditions were met on two occasions. 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 programmes.

5.4 The Executive proceeded to summarise the visitors' position relating to the two conditions outstanding on the programme as follows:-

- SET 3.6 – the Visitors concluded that insufficient progress has been made to secure practice-based learning for years 2 and 3 of the programme and there was no assurance provided on the ongoing commitment of placement partners. The consequence of this was that the education provider could not guarantee practice based learning provision for all programme learners; and
- SET 5.2 - the Visitors concluded that a suitable range of practice based learning had not been secured, specifically there was no NHS or community health placements secured. The Visitors considered that these settings were essential to ensure learners understand dietetic practice, and therefore some SOPs could not be addressed within the current range of placements. Those placements already secured were considered by the Visitors to be unsuitable to support the achievement of the learning outcomes as intended by the education provider

5.5 The Committee discussed the assurance that was normally expected from providers about the provision of placements in year two and three of a programme. It was noted that the visitors had set out on page 10 of their report suggested documentation required to provide the needed assurance. The Executive added that formal broad agreements on provision would be expected to be available for the Visitor's review.

5.6 The Committee discussed the assessment of the adequacy of the practice placements and if this test could provide a barrier for non-traditional providers gaining programme approval. It was noted that the visitors test the placements against the SETs at a threshold level and that the SETs were designed to be universally applicable to all education provision regardless of the provider profile.

5.7 The Committee agreed that with regards to condition 5.2 which related to the achievement of the learning outcomes and SOPs, the visitor panel had the required expertise (a registered dietician visitor member) to make this assessment. The Committee itself did not have a dietician member, and therefore the Committee would defer to the panel's judgement that the

placements secured by the provider did not provide learners with the needed learning outcomes to meet the SOPs.

- 5.8 The Committee noted concern that learners would not be able to make an informed choice without know what the year two and three placement provision would be. Therefore there was a student experience risk alongside that of public protection due to learning outcomes not meeting the SOPs
- 5.9 The Committee noted that it had a responsibility should an approved programme close with students part way through their studies to make best endeavours to find alternative programme places for the displaced students.
- 5.10 The UCO 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 UCO:-
- UCO's challenge to secure the number and range of placements required to meet the conditions stemmed from the hesitance of placement providers to commit to future placement provision. UCO considered that provisional HCPC approval would strengthen their position when trying to secure additional placements;
 - UCO outlined their experience of seeking approval with the General Osteopathy Council (GOsC) noting that the GOsC provided approval with specific conditions to be met within a set time;
 - UCO made a commitment to clearly inform learners on the programme that HCPC registration was not guaranteed whilst the provisional approval was in place; and
 - UCO advised the committee they were investing in their own internal clinics to increase their internal placement provision
- 5.11 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.
- 5.12 Following discussion in the private meeting, the Committee agreed that they would initiate non approval proceedings in respect of the University College of Osteopathy programme: BSc (Hons) Integrated Nutrition and Dietetics (full time). A decision notice with full reasoning would be issued subsequently. The Committee's reasons for reaching this decision are contained within the decision notice issued in respect of the programme (appendix 1).

Item 6 - Reverse the decision to withdraw approval – Middlesex University – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (Full time) (ETC 16/20)

6.1 The Committee received a paper from the Education Manager.

6.2 The Committee noted the following points:-

- following discussion with the education provider which indicated the programme was no longer running the education provider was advised to submit a programme closure form, which they did;
- the Education and Training Panel agreed to withdraw ongoing approval from the programme; and
- subsequently it transpired that the education provider intended to modify the programme to a four year rather than three year programme. The department received a major change notification form for this.

6.3 The Committee agreed to void its withdrawal of approval decision for the programme 'Middlesex University – BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science, FT (full time)' dated 6 November 2019. The Committee agreed that the assurance required for the ongoing approval of the modified programme could be obtained most proportionately through the major change process.

Item 7 - Any other business

7.1 There was no further business.

Item 8 - Date and time of next meeting

8.1 10.30am – 11 June 2020 at Park House, SE11 4BU

Item 9 – 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
10	A

Signed

Date

Unconfirmed