

Education Committee**27 November 2012****Guidance about osteopathic pre-registration education**

<u>Classification</u>	Public
<u>Purpose</u>	For noting
<u>Issue</u>	The development of Guidance about osteopathic pre-registration education.
<u>Recommendations</u>	To note the progress of the Guidance about osteopathic pre-registration education working group.
<u>Financial and resourcing implications</u>	The costs of this work are incorporated into the current budget.
<u>Equality and diversity implications</u>	Equality and diversity will need to be a key component of any pre-registration educational guidance.
<u>Communications implications</u>	None at present. Consultation will be necessary in due course when a draft of the guidance is at an appropriate stage.
<u>Annex</u>	Annex A – Note of the GOPRE meeting held on 8 November 2012
<u>Author</u>	Fiona Browne

Background

1. The GOsC Corporate Plan 2010 to 2013 states that we will 'consider the need for core curriculum content to supplement the Osteopathic Practice Standards' It also states that we will 'prepare and carry out a consultation on the concept of a pre-registration curriculum content document' during 2011/12. Our 2010/11 Business Plan states that we will scope and agree the terms of reference for this work taking into account other work streams.
2. The work was subsequently delayed through extensive engagement with the Education Committee and the Osteopathic Educational Institutions to clarify the scope and terms of the project.
3. In March 2012, the Education Committee and subsequently the Council agreed the terms of reference for the Guidance for Osteopathic Pre-registration working group which reflected the feedback from the Osteopathic Practice Standards (OPS) consultation about the need for clarity about the learning outcomes – the OPS were not learning outcomes.
4. In order to populate the membership of the group, we sought the assistance of the Council for Educational Institutions who nominated all the members except for the patients.

Discussion

Membership

5. The first meeting of the group took place on 8 November 2012. Membership was confirmed as:

• Chris Mapp	Student - BCOM
• Ian Drysdale	Former osteopath, BCOM
• Tracy Stokley	Osteopath, College of Osteopaths
• Judith Neaves	Osteopath, LCOM
• Ian Hughes	Chair, Education Committee
• Marcus Walia	Osteopath, SIOM
• Ross Johnston	Osteopath, Swansea
• Steven Bettles	Osteopath, ESO
• Nicky Pender	Osteopathic patient and lay member
• Fiona Hamilton	Osteopath, LSO
• Bella Vivat	Osteopathic patient and lay member
6. The first meeting of the group was very constructive and examined the guidance in place at the other regulators as well as relationships to QAA Benchmark Statements.
7. It has been agreed that the next steps will be the development of a draft document drawing on the common themes of the Guidance with the other regulators and identification of gaps and key issues for osteopathy. The next

meeting of the group will take place in March 2013. A copy of the note of the first meeting is attached at Annex A.

Recommendation: To note the progress of the Guidance about osteopathic pre-registration education working group.

Annex A to Item 10

**Minutes from the meeting of the Guidance for Osteopathic Pre-registration
Education Working Group held on Thursday 8 November 2012, at
Osteopathy House, 176 Tower Bridge Road, London SE1 3LU**

DRAFT

Unconfirmed

Chair: Ian Hughes, Chair Education Committee

Present: Steven Bettles, Osteopath - ESO
 Ian Drysdale, Former Osteopath - BCOM
 Fiona Hamilton, Osteopath - LSO
 Chris Mapp, Student - BCOM
 Nicky Pender, Osteopathic patient, lay member (via
 telephone)

Bella Vivat, Osteopathic patient, lay member
 Marcus Walia, Osteopath - SIOM

In Attendance: Ms Fiona Browne, Head of Professional Standards
 Ms Joy Bolt, Senior Professional Standards Officer

Item 1 Welcome and Apologies

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the first meeting of this working group. The members introduced themselves to each other. It was established that Ms Pender had become involved with the group as her osteopath is a member of Council. Ms Vivat became involved as a patient of the clinic at the British School of Osteopathy.
2. Apologies were received from Tracy Stokley, Judith Neaves, Ross Johnston and Sharon Potter.

Item 2 Terms of Reference

3. The Head of Professional Standards began by confirming that the development of this guidance is part of the GOsC's Corporate Plan. The Terms of Reference (ToR) had previously been discussed with the Osteopathic Educational Institutions (OEIs) and have since been agreed by Council.

4. The Group agreed that the ToR should be regarded as a living document that can evolve and be open to amendment throughout the course of the development of the Guidance.
5. The Group also discussed the meaning of the term 'public health' as referred to within the ToR; was it referring to Public Health or the health of the public? It was agreed that what was intended was the health and well being of the public, so it was suggested that the word 'public' should be removed to avoid confusion.
6. The Group looked at the provision for it to 'co-opt expertise as it sees fit'. It was agreed that the wording should be amended to clarify that expertise could be obtained from outside of the group members without the need to formally co-opt them, as this could prove problematic when the need for their input had ceased.
7. The Group also agreed that:
 - a. Whilst the quorum is stated as five, this number should include the Chair or a previously nominated deputy,
 - b. All meetings must be convened by the GOsC,
 - c. Whilst the primary function for the document was about guidance for UK Education, consideration should also be given to the international environment,
 - d. The document should also consider how relationships are built with other healthcare practitioners and how to include them.

Agreed: The Group agreed that the ToR should be re-worded to incorporate the issues raised and brought back for formal adoption.

Item 3 Background

8. The Head of Professional Standards provided a brief background on osteopathic education and the standards that students are required to achieve at the point of registration, and confirmed that the Group is tasked with developing:
 - Educational guidance to support anticipated developments in contemporary healthcare practice.
 - Learning outcomes for osteopathic qualifications to support the revised Osteopathic Practice Standards.
9. The Group noted the significant number of sources to assist with developing the guidance and was asked whether it could identify any others that may have been omitted or the GOsC was not aware of. The group was also reminded that the aim was to develop guidelines, therefore the contents would not be mandatory. All the OEIs have subtle differences which must be recognised. The document is not intended to be imposed, but rather to encourage discussion and development and also an opportunity to horizon scan for the future.

10. The Group discussed the challenges that trying to satisfy the Benchmark Statement, the Osteopathic Practice Standards and these guidelines may bring, as they may sometimes appear to be at odds with each other. It was noted that the other regulators all set pre-registration guidance and this also linked often (but not always) to the relevant Benchmark Statements – although it was noted that some statutory regulated health professions did not have guidance.
11. It was agreed that synergy between the documents was important. The Group agreed that it is important not to contradict the Benchmark Statement but to concentrate on learning outcomes, guidance and also horizon scanning. This will enable the individual OEIs to continue to choose how they deliver the learning outcomes.
12. It was not envisaged that there would be any radical changes but expected them to be gentle and incremental. The Group would also have to be mindful that the different OEIs will also move at different paces to accommodate the changes.
13. The Group then discussed the implications of defining learning outcomes as this implied that the area would be subject to assessment. Leadership was discussed at length as it was thought to be challenging both to teach and to assess. It was suggested that leadership at undergraduate level would not have the same meaning as at post graduate. It was agreed that clarity was needed on what was meant by leadership before discussing how it could be assessed. It was noted that there would be a number of areas such as this which would be discussed in detail at subsequent meetings.
14. The ToR tasks the Group to develop two distinct areas, Educational guidance and Learning outcomes. The group will need to be clear about which area is being discussed at any time, language and meaning would be very important. Consideration would need to be given to ensure that any learning outcomes agreed upon are measurable. There would also be a need to consider differentiating between a syllabus and a Registered Qualification (RQ) requirement; a syllabus is broadly larger than an RQ and for example, a student who did not show leadership skills could still be an effective osteopath. The profession needs followers as well as leaders.
15. The Group noted a table which outlined the standards for both registration and undergraduate education for other health profession regulators. It was agreed that it could be beneficial arrange an informal meeting with the other regulators to discuss lessons learned. It was suggested that it may be advantageous to invite one of the larger regulators together with one operating in a similar environment to the GOsC in order to compare the different perspectives.

16. It was suggested that in order to compare the various standards, they should each be mapped to the OPS. It was recognised that this would be a large project, however it was felt that it would best enable comparisons and uniqueness to be identified, as well as areas possibly not covered in the OPS.
17. It was agreed that a document would be produced that mapped the pre-registration guidance of the other regulators and the OPS to produce a 'straw man' draft document. This could then be used to identify gaps and issues for discussion, including, for example, leadership.

The Group considered the factors that may influence the development of the Guidance for Osteopathic Pre-registration education.

The Group considered the possible structures for such guidance.

The Group agreed that a draft document should be produced for further consideration.

Item 4 How to move forward

18. The Head of Professional Standards gave a quick round up of what had been put forward so far, namely:
 - a. Mapping documents against the OPS
 - b. Clarification of terminology and language
 - c. Subtlety of terms
 - d. Communication.
19. It was confirmed that the project has an ambitious timeframe; however this is not set in stone. The goal is to achieve the aims as set out in the ToR. The GOsC is the only healthcare regulator that has not developed these guidelines and this was described as a gap following the *Osteopathic Practice Standards* consultation.
20. It was agreed that the guidelines should not only include environmental and outcome standards, but should encompass the ability to horizon scan to take account of what the future may hold. The Group was mindful that whatever was included in the guidelines must be deliverable and measurable.

Item 5 Date of Next Meeting

21. The next meeting will be held in March 2013 and the executive will be in touch in due course to arrange a convenient date.