## General Osteopathic Council/General Optical Council

## Peer Review Pilot 23 December 2013

#### Case sample

- All cases considered by the Professional Conduct Committee during 2013 in which Unacceptable Professional Conduct was not found.
- All hearings cancelled by the Professional Conduct Committee under Rule 19 of the GOsC (Professional Conduct) (Procedure) Rules 2009 during 2013

### Documents to be provided

- Allegation
- PCC determination
- Transcript of PCC Hearing
- Hearing Bundles
- Case file
- Osteopathic Practice Standards/Code of Practice

### Case number:

#### Registrant's name:

# Peer Review Criteria

Quality of the Trucationation	
Quality of the Investigation	
• Were all concerns investigated?	
• Was the case allowed to go to sleep?	
Evidence collected	
• Were all reasonable efforts made to obtain all relevant evidence?	
<ul> <li>Should expert evidence have been obtained?</li> </ul>	
• Views on the expert report	
<ul> <li>Views on relevance and sufficiency of witness statements</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Views on relevance and sufficiency of other evidence obtained</li> </ul>	
Charges	
<ul> <li>views on the number of allegations/heads of charge</li> </ul>	
• Do the charges fairly reflect the evidence on the statements and the expert's report (if any)?	
• Are the charges comprehensible?	
<ul> <li>Drafting/stylistic points</li> </ul>	
<b>Presentation of the case</b> (from the Transcripts)	
Bundle contents	
Interim Orders	
Should an interim order have been applied for?	

# **Conclusions required:**

- a) quality of the investigation;
- b) evidence obtained;
- c) presentation of the case.
- d) was the case properly brought or should it have been cancelled before a hearing?
- e) did the PCC have all that it needed to make its decision?

Document title	Document Author	Version	Date	Detail of Amendments
GOsC/GOC Peer Review Criteria	David Gomez	1.1	6/12/13	N/A
	Kellie Green	1.2	23/12/13	Added option to enter case number and registrant's name