



General Osteopathic Council

Education and Registration Standards Committee

Minutes of the Education and Registration Standards Committee Part I held on 27
February 2014 at 9.30

Unconfirmed

Chair: Professor Colin Coulson-Thomas

Present: Dr Jorge Esteves
Dr Jane Fox
Professor Bernardette Griffin
Mr Robert McCoy
Mr Brian McKenna
Ms Alison J White
Mr Liam Stapleton

In attendance: Mr Tim Walker, Chief Executive and Registrar
Ms Fiona Browne, Head of Professional Standards
Mr Matthew Redford, Head of Registration and Resources
Mr Marcus Dye, Professional Standards Manager
Ms Gina Baidoo, Senior Professional Standards Officer
Mr David Gomez, Head of Regulation

Item 1: Apologies

1. No apologies made

Item 2: Minutes and matters arising

2. The minutes of the Education and Registration Standards Committee meeting of 19 September 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed.

Item 3: Quality assurance review

3. The Professional Standards Manager introduced the item and advised the Committee that a number of stakeholders had been consulted to find out their thoughts on the current process.
4. The Professional Standards Manager highlighted two main areas that were identified as part of the review, which were, the need to provide more guidance around submitting feedback and complaints and also making it clearer on what institutions need to report around the *Osteopathic Practice Standards* (OPS).

5. The Committee felt that the excellent paper was very clear and that the questions posed in the consultation had been worded in a way that made them easy to respond to. They felt that the document may benefit from further consideration about the following:
 - a. Further focus and definition about the identification and dissemination of good practice.
 - b. Exploration of the balance of assurance but also driving standards up.
 - c. Quality and quality of care in clinical teaching.
 - d. The distinction between quality assurance (that GOsC do) and quality management/assurance (that OEIs do) in terms of understanding risk considering the extent to which we do rely on OEI mechanisms now and the extent to which we may rely on them in the future.
 - e. Articulation of the underlying principles in the document at the beginning e.g. intention to reduce duplication but also an open question exploring whether there are any principles that have been missed.
 - f. Long-term objectives and if this was something that could be made more specific.
6. The Committee also suggested consideration about the method for the consultation perhaps targeting a specialist audience with focus groups as part of the method used.
7. **Noted:** The Committee noted the on-going enhancements to our quality assurance processes.
8. **Agreed:** The Committee agreed to recommend that Council agree to publish the Discussion Document for consultation with stakeholders.
9. **Action:** Document to be reviewed to consider Committee feedback and checked for spelling and punctuation.

Item 4: Professionalism and student fitness to practise

10. The Head of Professional Standards introduced the item and informed the Committee that following on from the Good Practice Seminar in November 2013, the main focus was on professional values and exploring how that contributes to decision making. A further Good Practice Seminar is to be held towards the end of 2014.
11. The Head of Professional Standards also discussed the idea of setting up an undergraduate working group in order to develop further information for student continuing fitness to practice.
12. The Committee queried the Osteopathic Educational Institutions (OEIs) response to the discussion on values. The Head of Professional Standards responded to say there was a lengthy discussion on both personal and professional values with variation between views as to what this meant. Part of the purpose of the

seminar was to tease this out a little further and understand how that would feed into future reviews of guidance including the OPS.

13. The Committee also encouraged a focus on the whole profession and not just the undergraduate aspect.
14. The Committee also queried the main objective of the next Good Practice Seminar and if the purpose needed to have further detail added for clarification.
15. The Committee made some comments on the terms of reference including ensuring that the purpose and the terms of reference aligned and also that protected characteristics such as disability were appropriately incorporated.

The Committee agreed the following recommendations:

1. **Noted:** The plans for scoping a seminar about values to inform subsequent revisions of the *Osteopathic Practice Standards*.
2. **Agreed:** The draft terms of reference for a professionalism working group for discussion with stakeholders.

Item 5: Osteopathic Practice Standards evaluation

16. The Professional Standards Manager introduced the item and explained to the Committee the evaluation looked at how effectively the OPS had been communicated to the OEIs. The paper also looked at how the OPS had been implemented and if the GOsC has provided effective support in terms of OPS usage.
17. The Committee welcomed the document and recognised the challenges of the evaluation and how relatively little had been published in this area.
18. The Committee made the following points for consideration:
 - a. There were some concerns about the distinction between awareness (which is mainly what this evaluation tested) and impact on osteopathic practice and how to assess whether osteopaths are using the OPS as a framework affecting their practice. It was suggested that reviewing the 'Kirkpatrick Methodology' of evaluation of training courses and how training has had an impact on organisations (exploring reaction, learning, subsequent behaviour and results) may provide some assistance for future evaluations.
 - b. Others suggested that exploring communication, awareness, understanding and internalisation may provide a useful framework.
 - c. Should aspects of the OPS be made a core part of osteopathic CPD as part of review and reflection? It was confirmed that this was part of the revised continuing fitness to practice proposals.
 - d. Mapping the OPS to curricula, mapping to assessment, hidden curricula and effective delivery of the outcomes was discussed. Committee members advised that the 'cultural web' may be an interesting tool to explore implementation of change in culture.

The Committee agreed the following recommendations:

1. **Noted:** Evaluation of the implementation of the Osteopathic Practice Standards.
2. **Noted:** Recommendations for future evaluation and communication strategies for other projects.

Item 6: Registration activity report

19. The Head of Registration and Resources highlighted 60 removals in the two year period with an equal 50/50 split with removals for non compliance with CPD and removals for not paying the fee.
20. The Head of Registration and Resources also expressed an intention to find out more about osteopaths who leave the register voluntarily and their reasons for doing so, with a survey to be carried out in 2014 which would be presented to the Committee.

The Committee agreed the following recommendations:

1. **Noted:** The contents of this paper.
2. **Action:** To include Demographic analysis on removals from the register and what it is that causes them to not comply with CPD and not pay their fees and the length of time since they were registered and circulate this to the Committee.

Item 7: Registration applications from outside of the European Economic Area

21. The Head of Registration and Resources highlighted current processes as being more than satisfactory and fit for purpose.
22. The Chief Executive and Registrar informed the Committee that the main purpose of the paper was to report back on where the GOsC stands currently in relation to this issue.

The Committee agreed the following recommendations:

23. **Noted:** The content of the paper

Item 8: Any other business

24. No other business was discussed.

Item 9: Date of next meeting: 25 June 2014.