

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 second meeting of the Professional Liaison Group for Continuing Professional Development held at **1.30 p.m. on Thursday 15 December 2005** at Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London, SE11 4BU.

PRESENT:

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

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr C Bendall, Secretary to the PLG for Continuing Professional Development
Mr M Guthrie, Policy Officer
Mr C Middleton, Director of Communications (part)
Ms C Savage, Manager CPD and Aspirant Groups
Ms R Tripp, Policy Manager

Item 1.05/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Mrs B Stuart.

Item 2.05/11 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2.1 The Group approved the agenda.

Item 3.05/12 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2005

- 3.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the first meeting of the Group should be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

Item 4.05/13 MATTERS ARISING

4.1 Item 4.3 - CPD Commitments made

- 4.1.1 The Group agreed that it should provide guidance to the Director of Communications on the key messages for the communications strategy for CPD.

- 4.1.2 The Group agreed that it would be useful to identify employer's views on CPD by arranging a small group discussion with representatives of employers. The Group noted that this could be linked with the Stakeholder Manager's work with employers' organisations and the Human Resources in the NHS conference. The Group noted that information could also be sent to human resources directors and managers at individual employers.

- 4.1.3 The Group agreed further information on CPD should be sent to individual registrants rather than to employers, to ensure that both self-employed and employed staff were fully informed.

- 4.1.4 The Group noted that registrants were concerned about whether there would be sufficient time, resources and support from employers to enable them to undertake CPD activities. The Group agreed that the communications campaign should emphasise that while activities could take time and require employers to allow staff to participate in activities, they could be inexpensive (e.g. reading a journal, attending a meeting).

- 4.1.5 The Group agreed that the Policy Manager should explain its views to the Director of Communications and that the Director should attend the meeting on 6 February to advise on communications strategies.

Action: RT/CM (by 25 January 2006)

4.2 Item 5.8 - CPD example profiles

- 4.2.1 The Group noted that members had e-mailed suggestions for example profiles to the Policy Manager.

4.3 Item 7.3 - CPD further information contents

- 4.3.1 The Group noted that the Policy Manager would discuss the draft advice on CPD with HPC's legal advisers before it was circulated to professional bodies for their comments.

Item 5.05/14 DRAFT "YOUR GUIDE TO CPD"

- 5.1 The Group received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 5.2 The Group noted that the document attached to the paper was the first draft of a brief overview document suitable for all registrants. The Group agreed that the document should indicate that more detailed information could be found in the guide for registrants undergoing audit and should indicate that example CPD profiles would be available on the websites of the HPC and professional bodies.
- 5.3 The Group agreed that the table showing the dates of the first audit for all 13 professions should be shown as a diagram instead, which should indicate that registrants should maintain a continuous record of activities.
- 5.4 The Group agreed that the explanation of standard 3 should read "Your CPD should contribute to your practice" as there was not always a direct relationship between CPD activities and a registrant's practice.
- 5.5 The Group agreed that the document should state that participation in a scheme run by a professional body or employer might not mean that registrants would meet the standards of CPD.
- 5.6 The Group agreed that the last sentence in the section "Our standards mean that..." should be deleted.
- 5.7 The Group agreed that the first sentence in the section "A flexible approach" should begin "Our standards mean that your CPD..."
- 5.8 The Group agreed that the document should stress that CPD was an ongoing process and that there would be an audit of registrants.
- 5.9 The Group agreed that the document should be entitled "A brief guide to CPD".
- 5.10 The Group agreed that the document should be amended in the light of its discussion and a revised draft should be presented to the meeting of the Group on 6 February.

Action: RT (by 25 January 2006)

Item 6.05/15 DRAFT FURTHER INFORMATION FOR REGISTRANTS UNDERGOING AUDIT

- 6.1 The Group received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.

- 6.2 The Group noted that the document attached to the paper was the first draft of detailed information for registrants undergoing an audit.
- 6.3 The Group agreed that the example of CPD activity given on page 20 of the draft document should be removed as it could give a misleading impression about the number of pieces of evidence which were required. The Group agreed that appendix 1 should acknowledge the importance of the Knowledge and Skills Framework to CPD.
- 6.4 The Group agreed that the document should strongly emphasise that no evidence involving patients, clients or users should be submitted unless there was consent from the patient concerned. The Group noted that, as patient records were the responsibility and property of the registrant's employer, consent should also be obtained from the employer. The Group noted that if evidence was submitted in audio-visual format, the HPC would need to ensure that assessors had access to the necessary audio-visual equipment and this might involve assessors visiting the HPC's offices to watch or listen to recordings.
- 6.5 The Group agreed that the column "Standard exceeded" should be deleted from the table on Assessment Criteria, as it was superfluous.
- 6.6 The Group agreed that the assessment criteria needed to clearly indicate an acceptable number of pieces of evidence, in order to facilitate assessment of profiles.
- 6.7 The Group agreed that, in the column "Standard not met" against standard 2, the reasons given should be included as alternatives (i.e. "Registrant has undertaken no activities; or Registrant's CPD consists of only one type of learning activity; or Registrant's CPD appears to have no relevance to current or future practice, as laid out in the summary of practice").
- 6.8 The Group agreed that the column "Standard met" against standard 2 should refer to "more than one type of learning activity".
- 6.9 The Group agreed that the Policy Manager should make the amendments discussed and e-mail the revised document to members. The Group agreed that members should send any detailed comments to the Policy Manager by early January and that the Policy Manager should incorporate any amendments as far as possible, so that the document could be shared with the professional bodies for their comments. The Group noted that the Policy Manager would ask HPC's legal adviser to check the draft in January.

Action: All members/RT/Jonathan Bracken (by 9 January 2006)

Item 7.05/16 EXAMPLE PROFILES PROJECT

- 7.1 The Group received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. Draft example profiles prepared by some of the professional bodies were tabled.
- 7.2 The Group noted that the HPC had agreed to publish example profiles as a way of making the CPD standards clearer to registrants and to provide examples of activities that registrants could undertake in order to meet the standards. The Group noted that the professional bodies had been asked to compile example profiles for their professions and had responded very positively. Profiles were being prepared and were at different stages for different professions. The Group noted that, at the suggestion of a professional body representative, a meeting had been scheduled for 3 February, to which the professional bodies taking part in the project would be invited to discuss their work.
- 7.3 The Group noted that it had been suggested that joint or "generic" profiles could be produced by professional bodies. The Group agreed that generic profiles could be produced, but this should not be at the expense of excluding profession-specific profiles which many registrants would find useful.
- 7.4 The Group agreed that the Policy Manager should e-mail the draft profiles to members for their comments, which would then be collated and fed back to the professional bodies.

Action: RT/All members (by 9 January 2006)

- 7.5 The Group noted that the meeting on 3 February would be used to discuss overall views on generic and profession specific profiles and also the example profiles which had been produced.

Item 8.05/17 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 8.1 The Group received a paper for information from the Executive.
- 8.2 The Group noted that it would need to address how the CPD process would take account of the individual circumstances of registrants and their ability to meet the requirements of HPC.

Item 9.05/18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 9.1 There was no other business.

Item 10.05/19 DATES OF SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS

- 10.1 The Group agreed that it would meet the professional bodies on Friday 3 February 2006 at 10.30 a.m.
- 10.2 The Group agreed that its members would meet on Monday 6 February 2006 at 10.30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN

DATE