

GENERAL OSTEOPATHIC COUNCIL
Minutes of Part I of the 68th meeting of the Education Committee which
took place on Wednesday 13 June 2012 at
Osteopathy House, 176 Tower Bridge Road,
London SE1 3LU

Unconfirmed

Chair: Professor Ian Hughes

Present: Dr Jorge Esteves
 Dr Jane Fox
 Professor Bernardette Griffin
 Mr Brian McKenna
 Mr Liam Stapleton
 Ms Julie Stone
 Ms Alison White

Observer Ms Kim Lavelly

In Attendance: Mr Tim Walker, Chief Executive and Registrar
 Ms Fiona Browne, Head of Professional Standards
 Mr Marcus Dye, Professional Standards Manager
 Ms Kellie Green, Regulation Manager
 Ms Joy Bolt, Professional Standards Officer

Apologies: Mr Jonathan Hearsay
 Mr Robert McCoy

PART I (*items which will be reported to the Public Session of Council at its next meeting*)

ITEM 1: APOLOGIES AND INTERESTS

1. Apologies were received from Jonathan Hearsay and Robert McCoy who had provided comments on various items and these would be incorporated into meeting at the appropriate points.
2. Jorge Esteves was welcomed to his first meeting as a new member of the Education Committee, and Council Member, Kim Lavelly, was welcomed as a guest observer.
3. Members were requested to advise of any interests held at the time when the item was to be discussed.

ITEM 2: MINUTES

4. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed for accuracy and confirmed as a true record.

ITEM 3: MATTERS ARISING

5. There were no matters arising not already covered on the agenda.

ITEM 4: CHAIR AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DEPARTMENT ACTION AND REPORT

6. The Chair had no further comments to make. The Head of Professional Standards presented the department report.
7. The Chair read out the comment requested by Rob McCoy - '*Do we know what the GCC are now proposing for their revalidation?*' The Head of Professional Standards explained that the General Chiropractic Council (GCC) public website indicated that work on revalidation was proceeding and that the Council was committed to putting in place a scheme for assuring continuing fitness to practise. A further consultation on the proposed framework is planned for Autumn 2012. Our understanding was that the planned approach for consultation may be similar to that of the GOsC.

Noted: the Committee noted the report.

ITEM 5: QUALITY ASSURANCE DISCUSSION PAPER

8. The Head of Professional Standards presented the item. The paper built on the discussion at the March Education Committee meeting to, setting out areas for further discussion with within the Committee to develop thinking and to start to focus on areas that might be considered in the Quality Assurance Review.
9. The Head of Professional Standards confirmed that thinking could start from a 'blank page' and asked the Committee to consider what quality assurance really is and why is it necessary. Some explained that the concept of quality assurance may differ if it is not clear what is being assessed; for example, the process for assuring courses, documents or a core curriculum or outcomes would all differ. But it was also explained that the core quality assurance processes in universities were common processes.
10. The Committee discussed the following:
 - The importance of public safety and confidence as part of the purpose of quality assurance.
 - The need to incorporate the views of stakeholders including the public, the OEIs and also to students to ensure quality education.

- It would be important to take into account the wide range of quality standards including, for example the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
 - The variability of OEIs which were situated in a variety of areas including higher education, further education, in the public or independent sector, within a multi-health care faculty or not and the differences in size meant that a diverse approach was necessary to ensure proportionality and consistency.
 - The need to encourage OEIs to demonstrate compliance with standards rather than presenting evidence for a judgement.
 - Consideration of the appropriate level of risk within the Committee's approach to ensure that statutory responsibilities are met in a proportionate way.
 - The need to ensure proportionality and reduce the burden of quality assurance.
 - Outcomes should not be considered in isolation but in the context of the mechanisms delivering the outcomes.
 - A duty to ensure that standards are met, but it also has a duty to enhance standards, therefore it may be sensible to regard quality assurance and quality enhancement as two different subjects but within one process.
11. The Head of Professional Standards requested that the Committee considered the paper further, and then email in any further thoughts about the advantages and disadvantages of different options.

Agreed: the Committee agreed to consider questions about scoping our major review of quality assurance

ITEM 6: EDUCATION COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012

12. The Head of Professional Standards presented the paper. The Education Committee is required to submit a report to the Council each year on the activities it has undertaken. This paper is that draft report for consideration.
13. The Committee discussed the report, and agreed that the membership of the Committee should also be included in the report, together with attendance figures.
14. It was confirmed that Council members' attendance at Committees was also recorded in the GOsC Annual Report, but not those of Education Committee external members.

Agreed: the Committee agreed the Annual Report of the Education Committee 2011-2012.

ITEM 7: OSTEOPATHIC PRACTICE STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION

15. The Professional Standards Manager presented the paper which gave an update on the progress of all of the different workstreams.
16. All of the OEIs have now advised how the Osteopathic Practice Standards (OPS) will be implemented and one RQ review visit has already been completed against it and this will come to the Committee at its next meeting.
17. At its meeting of 14 March 2012, the Committee agreed that prior to the delivery of training to GOsC Registration Assessors, the GOsC would need to review and agree the assessment materials produced by the QAA. The review would be undertaken by the Education Committee as a whole feeding into a smaller sub-group of three members who would meet to give final sign-off of the materials.
18. It was agreed that Jane Fox, Bernadette Griffin and Brian McKenna would meet on Saturday 11 August 2012 to agree the final assessment materials.

Noted: the Committee noted the progress made with the OPS Implementation Strategy

Agreed: the Committee agreed the three members of the Education Committee who will be asked to sign off the assessment materials produced by the QAA.

ITEM 8: STUDENT FITNESS TO PRACTISE: PROFESSIONALISM IN OSTEOPATHY RESEARCH GROUP PILOT

19. The Head of Professional Standards presented the paper and confirmed that two of the OEIs have obtained ethical approval and have received the link to the live survey.
20. The Committee discussed the merits of sharing the survey with the Fitness to Practice Committee and panel members to see if it revealed any inconsistencies.
21. The Committee was informed that the Professional Standards Manager and Regulation Department were working together to produce scenarios linking back to Fitness to Practise findings for registered osteopaths.
22. The surveys would be shared with the Fitness to Practise Committee as well as the outcomes of the pilot when concluded to enable the development of this work to be considered further.

Noted: the Committee noted the progress of the Professionalism in Osteopathy Research Project Pilot.

ITEM 9: FITNESS TO PRACTISE REPORT

23. The Regulation Manager presented the paper which identifies any trends or issues that may have arisen over the past 12 months. The Committee was asked to bear in mind that the number of cases was very small and that care would need to be taken when reviewing the data.
24. The report showed that the outcomes were very similar to that of last year and that there were no surprises contained in it.
25. The Committee commented that two groups of registrants are identified as 'Registrants who graduated during 1990-99' and 'Registrants who graduated between 2000-2009' and that it would be useful to have these groups presented as a percentage of the total registrants, and whether more men are complaining about women or vice versa.
26. The Committee also asked whether it would be possible to indicate the nature of the original complaint; if a treatment complaint was initially made, but on further investigation it was found that there were issues with record and case history keeping, which would be useful.
27. It was confirmed that the information in these findings are fed back to the OEIs and used in a variety of ways in terms of policy development, for example, our CPD Discussion Document. It was agreed that the report would be emailed out to the OEIs.

Noted: the Committee noted the findings that have emerged from the cases analysed for this report.

Agreed: the Committee agreed that the report would be emailed out to the OEIs.

ITEM 10: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

28. No further matters were raised.

ITEM 11: DATE OF NEXT MEETING

29. The date for the next meetings are 20 September and 27 November 2012.