



Education and Registration Standards Committee

Minutes of 9th meeting the Education and Registration Standards Committee (Public)
held on Thursday 3 March 2016

Unconfirmed

Chair: Colin Coulson-Thomas

Present: John Chaffey
Jorge Esteves
Jane Fox
Bernardette Griffin
Robert McCoy
Joan Martin
Liam Stapleton

In attendance: Steven Bettles, Education Consultant, Professional Standards
(items 9 and 10)
Fiona Browne, Head of Professional Standards
David Gale, QAA (Items 7 and 11)
Matthew Redford, Head of Registration and Resources
Marcia Scott, Council and Executive Support Officer
Tim Walker, Chief Executive and Registrar

Item 1: Welcome and Apologies

1. The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies were received from Alison White.
2. The Chair informed members that Steven Bettles, Education Consultant, Professional Standards, was unable to attend the meeting in person and therefore would participate via Skype.

Item 2: Minutes and Matters Arising

3. The minutes of the 8th meeting of the Education and Registration Standards held in public on 13 October 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

Matters arising

4. There were no matters arising.

Item 3: Registration Assessments: Alignment with European Directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications

5. The Head of Professional Standards introduced the item which concerned the GOsC's compliance with EU Directive 2005/36/EU on the recognition of professional qualifications as amended by EU Directive 2013/55/EU.
6. It was explained that the Stage 1 process had been redeveloped for EU graduates and made more streamlined. The guidance documents and forms were developed with the help and advice of the Health and Care Professions Council and also assessors and applicants. The documents will be enhanced over time.
7. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:
 - a. The Committee asked what plans were in place to check if an individual was registered in their home country. It was confirmed that the IMI system in place supported better communication between competent authorities in each country.
 - b. The Committee asked if it was right that registration in another EU country always led to registration in the UK. It was explained that the general systems regulations referred to 'no substantial difference' and that this would be made clearer in the guidance. The information available on the website for registration pathways would also be reviewed to ensure clarity and fit with the revised guidance.
 - c. It was advised that the recommendation, if agreed by the ERSC, would also require Council's approval therefore should be amended to include: '.....and recommend to Council for approval.' The Committee agreed the suggested amendment to the recommendation.

Agreed: the Committee agreed the revised registration assessment process for applicants with EU rights and to recommend to Council for approval.

Item 4: Registration Assessor: Training, appraisal and evaluation

8. The Head of Registration and Resources introduced the item which gave an update on registration assessor training, appraisal and evaluation – assuring the quality of the integrity of the GOsC's registration decisions. In addition the following comments were made:
 - a. The Committee was advised that the annex referred to at paragraph 6, page 2: Guidance on appraisal for registration assessors and return to practice reviewers: review year 2015/16, would be circulated by email to the Committee in due course.
 - b. Jane Fox was thanked for her continuing assistance with the appraisal and evaluation process. It had been found particularly helpful to have one

person undertaking the appraisal process to ensure that the feedback can be consolidated once the process has concluded.

- c. It was noted that the Registration Assessor Training Webinar had been welcomed and its further use would be looked at for the future although its use would not diminish face to face working.
9. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:
- a. The Chair added his thanks to Jane Fox for her valuable work and involvement in the appraisal process. In reflecting on the process and in comparison to the previous year Jane noted respondents appeared more aware of the training process and participants had been more focused on this occasion. It was agreed that from the feedback given participants had found using the Webinar very useful.

Noted: the Committee noted the update on registration assessments – training, appraisal and evaluation.

Item 5: New Registrants Survey: analysis of results

10. The Head of Registration and Resources introduced the item which concerned the findings of three month survey carried out between November 2015 and January 2016 on the effectiveness of the registration process and the resources available to new registrants. The survey was held with individuals who had registered for the first time during 2015.
11. It was added that the headlines were consistent with the previous survey findings and the main themes were:
- a. The Information pack was very clear and useful.
 - b. Contact with GOsC staff was well received and a reflection on the work of the Registration Team.
 - c. The Registration Pack is welcomed and well received.
 - d. There is still a need to look at business support and there will be further discussion with the Institute of Osteopathy (iO) to look at the issues.
 - e. The feedback has helped to further develop and improve student presentations and help support student transition into practice.
12. The Committee supported the initiative looking to assist and advise students as they moved into practice.

Noted: the Committee noted the content of the report.

Item 6: Recruitment of Education Visitors and Registration Assessors

13. The Head of Registration and Resources introduced the item which concerned plans for recruiting to the Education Visitor and Registration pools.
14. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:
- a. The Committee suggested the following amendment to the specifications:
 - Point 2: Knowledge, understanding and experience of the delivery of undergraduate osteopathic education (including assessment).
 - Point 9: Essential – experience of education quality assurance process and academic management.
 - b. It was agreed that the QAA Visitor contract would be reviewed for clarity of content. It was agreed that retaining a pool of visitors was very useful but to maintain the pool was a fine balance, ensuring the pool was not too large when fewer visits were required during quieter years and retaining knowledge but also to ensure the group was large enough to insure against conflicts of interest.
 - c. The challenges with regard to the timings of the reviews were raised. It was noted that in some years, there was one review (requiring only three Visitors) and in other years, there were up to four reviews (requiring at least twelve Visitors). It was agreed timing was a challenge and was dependent on the type of RQ. One member asked if it was possible to extend the RQs. The issue would be reviewed and administrative mechanisms explored with the Department Health looking at extending RQ expiry dates.
 - d. It was also asked if coordinating the review timetable with the universities revalidation courses so that work was not doubled up was an option. It was explained that this has worked with some reviews in the past and the OEIs had given their views on this – some preferred GOsC RQ Visits to coincide with university validation and some did not. The challenge was that visits have to take place at specific times to receive Privy Council approval which is not the ideal. The issue would be looked into.

Agreed: The Committee agreed the approach to recruitment of the GOsC Education Visitor and Registration Assessor pools.

Item 7: Education Visitor Training

15. The Head of Professional Standards introduced the item which gave an update on Education Visitor training highlighting the training which would take place on Friday 4 March and being conducted by Tim Walker, Chief Executive and Registrar, and David Gale, QAA.
16. It was confirmed a mandatory requirement for Visitors who would be conducting visits during 2016, to have attended training in the same year. It was agreed

and noted that planning for the training sessions well in advance would be of significant help to ensure participant attendance.

Noted: The Committee noted the update on Education Visitor training.

Item 8: Professionalism Update

17. The Head of Professional Standards introduced the item which gave an oral update on the Professionalism in the osteopathic profession. In the update it was highlighted:
- a. The data collected from students, patients, and educational institutions about lapses in professionalism has been used to develop presentations which have been given to students and so far have been well received.
 - b. The data collection is ongoing and further reports to the Committee will follow in due course.

Noted: The Committee noted the Professionalism update.

Item 9: Student Fitness to Practise Guidance

18. The Education Consultant, Professional Standards introduced the item which gave an update on the review of guidance on student fitness to practise. In addition the following comments were made:
- a. The Student Fitness to Practice Guidance has gone through a number of iterations and has more recently been updated to give more depth and detail through the use of example case studies. The guidance has also received feedback from stakeholders.
 - b. The guidance would be published on the GOsC website in March 2016 and the consultation will be held between March and June 2016.
19. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:
- a. The Committee agreed that the paper was very good with a powerful set of case studies.
 - b. The version of the guidance for the OEIs was satisfactory but it was thought that the student guidance could benefit from a little more editing to reduce the words and make it even more accessible. The Committee was advised that the Policy and Communications team were reviewing the documents for content and the challenge was to ensure maximum impact while remaining comprehensive.
 - c. It was suggested that an example case study around the inappropriate use of social media (Facebook, Snapchat, Twitter, Instagram) should be included in the guidance and where possible scenarios should be included such as 'comparing different worlds' – common room gossip = gossip on Facebook or

through twitter. It was suggested that an example case study could benefit from crossing boundaries from the physical world to the virtual world and to explore issues arising in both worlds.

- d. It was also suggested that the scenarios could be made more gender neutral and the gender balance would be reviewed.

Noted: The Committee noted the progress of the Student Fitness to Practise review.

Item 10: Health and Disability Guidance

- 20. The Education Consultant, Professional Standards introduced the item which gave an update on the review on student fitness to practise explaining that it was an attempt to bring guidance into line with current thinking on health and disability and Student Fitness to Practise.
- 21. There had been meetings to canvas OEIs and meetings with Senior Management of the institutions. Students had not been involved in discussions to date but seminars were to be organised to discuss issues in more detail and interest in participating had already been expressed.
- 22. The guidance required some checking from a legal perspective but it was expected that the consultation would run from March to June 2016.
- 23. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:
 - a. The Committee queried the point of ensuring about all students working from a level playing field and that students with a health or disability issue were not given what could be perceived as an unfair advantage. It was agreed this is difficult issue to balance and would be reviewed.
 - b. It was suggested that case studies and role playing could be further developed to help in understanding issues.

Noted: The Committee noted the progress of the guidance on health and disability and student fitness to practise.

Item 11: Surrey Institute of Osteopathic Medicine (SIOM): Monitoring review

- 24. There were no interests declared relating to Surrey Institute of Osteopathic Medicine.
- 25. The Head of Professional Standards introduced the item which concerned the outcome of the monitoring review of the Surrey Institute of Osteopathic Medicine as part of a major change to the delivery of existing Recognised Qualification (RQ) provision. It was highlighted that SIOM had addressed all of stipulated conditions as shown in their action plan at Annex C. It was also noted that even though the conditions were not 'RQ' conditions published on the face of the RQ order, the 'Monitoring Conditions' arising from this monitoring review

would be treated in the same way and reviewed within the same parameters as set out in information received under s18 of the Osteopaths Act 1993 ensuring the Osteopathic Practice Standards continue to be met.

26. The QAA were pleased with the evaluation and the Committee paper and had no further comments or recommendations. It was also added that SIOM had been cooperative throughout the process.

27. In discussion the following points were made and responded to:

- a. It was confirmed that following discussion SIOM had were happy for the report on the monitoring review to be presented on the public agenda and to be placed in the public arena.
- b. A correction was noted at paragraph 15, page 5. The sentence was amended to read:

We wrote to SIOM on 19 December 2015

- c. It was suggested that the final bullet point of the recommendations should be made a little clearer on how SIOM would demonstrate how it would ensure students would meet required English Language standards. It was also suggested that observance of cultural boundaries should be included in the recommendation. It was advised that these points are demonstrated at theme A of the OPS – communication and patient partnership.
- d. The Committee requested clarification on the timeframe for Recommendation – Monitoring Condition 3 – where reference was made to 'regularly monitor...'. It was agreed that monitoring would take place twice per year and the recommendation would be amended to reflect this.

Agreed: The Committee agreed that the Recognised Qualification for the Surrey Institute of Osteopathic Medicine should continue and that the following monitoring conditions and requirements would continue to be monitored throughout the duration of the RQ period:

- a. Monitoring condition 1 – 'Initially use the CPL route and associated processes only for graduates of ICOM and that this condition is reviewed at the next RQ renewal (paragraphs 20 and 36).
- b. Monitoring condition 2 – ensure effective arrangements are in place for students to be able to travel to offsite clinics where these clinics form part of students' critical clinical experience (paragraphs 53)
- c. Monitoring condition 3 - regularly (on a twice yearly basis) monitor, analyse and report patient numbers to ensure that patient numbers and their diversity is sufficient to meet actual demand of CP and SEP students, while ensuring continuity for postgraduate practitioners and osteopathy services to patients are not compromised when student demand for patients falls (paragraph 57).'

- d. RQ Condition B – The SIOM develops and implements a marketing plan from September 2013 which is linked to forecast student numbers, underpinned by strengthened commitments to ensure that students are gaining the requisite breadth and depth of experience to deliver the Osteopathic Practice Standards and address ways of building relationships with existing patients. The SIOM should report on progress with the implementation plan in each Annual Report submitted to the General Council within the recognition period. In future reports it should provide a yearly figure for patient numbers to demonstrate implementation.
- e. The College structures clinical activity so it is not scheduled at the end of the day to ensure CPL students are sufficiently alert and maintain OPS integrity.’ (Paragraph 26).
- f. Kingston University enters into a progression agreement that also includes, in this specific case, providing quality oversight of the ICOM provision
- g. SIOM is able to specifically to demonstrate how it ensures that students meet the required English Language standards.

Item 12: Any other business

- 28. The meeting was the final for the Chair as a member of the ERSC and Council. The Chief Executive on behalf of the Committee and staff of the GOsC thanked the Chair for his service to the organisation and his involvement in its ongoing work which was much appreciated. The Committee wished him well for the future.

Item 13: Date of the next meeting: 16 June 2016 at 14.00