

Agenda Item 5

Enclosure 2

Paper RC 28 / 03

REGISTRATION COMMITTEE

Return to Practice

From : Secretary to the Committee

FOR DISCUSSION

Standards for returning to practice

The Health Professions Order 2001 ('the Order') says that we can require people who have not practised or have practised for less than a prescribed period, to undertake such education and training or to gain such experience as we specify in standards.

We have chosen to set standards of education and training for anyone who has stopped practising for more than two years. If you have stopped practising at least two years ago, you will have to show that you meet the same standards of education and training for your profession that new registrants have to meet. You can show this in different ways, depending on how long it has been since you last practised.

Time since last practised	Requirement
Less than two years	No requirement under these standards
Between two and four years	<p>You need to refresh your skills and experience. You must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> work under the supervision of a registrant for at least XXX weeks. The registrant must be from the part of the register that you want to join; and undertake private study to bring skills and knowledge up-to-date. You will need to provide us with information about the study that you have undertaken.
Four years or more	<p>You need to ensure that you meet the current standards of proficiency. The Council regards a qualification that is more than five years old to be too out-of-date to enable its holder to meet the standards of proficiency. Therefore, you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> undertake an <u>approved</u> program. This can be either a standard course, or a course specifically designed for returners-to-practise. A list of approved programs specifically designed for returners-to-practise is available on our website or from our offices. A range of courses are available suitable for applicants with different backgrounds. However, the HPC doesn't run the programs itself. Course providers include

Comment: What alternative, if any, should be provided for self-employed?

Refer HPC

"Refer back" Education Provider

Applicant

①

②

③

④

Looks at SOP
 Also show full-stressday
 Approved Prof Body or other's HPE

Apply to HPC

	some professional bodies, some universities and some other education and training institutions. Course providers decide course contents and admissions policies for themselves.
--	--

Our requirements are the same for everyone, no matter what their reason for stopping practising. In other words, it doesn't matter if you stopped practising to have a baby, to travel the world, or to try out a different career. All that matters is how long it has been since you last practised. However, if you stopped practising because you were suspended or struck off, then you might have to meet other requirements in addition to meeting the standards explained in this document.

As a prospective registrant, we expect you to tell us the truth about your proficiency and not endanger the public. If you lie to us about your knowledge, skills or experience in order to get back on to our register, you are committing a criminal offence. We conduct random monitoring of applications for restoration to our register and we will also investigate applications where we have grounds for concern about whether an applicant has told the truth.

Lucinda Pilgrim

From: Gordon Sutehall [gsutehall@hotmail.com]
Sent: 30 June 2003 22:26
To: Lucinda Pilgrim; Norma Brook; rosemary.klem@uce.ac.uk; anna.vandergaag8@ntlworld.com; pmsab@cwcom.net; CMarycrawford@aol.com
Subject: Re: return to practice

Dear All

If there have been communications flying about on this topic, forgive me, I haven't seen any.

Assuming none to date, may I start the ball rolling?

It seems to me that HPC has three options, (1) to take charge of all aspects of return to practice for all professions, (2) to delegate all of the process to the professional bodies, (3) to adopt a middle position, with some of each.

As most of you will know, the Biomedical Science profession has been operating a log-book system for all new registrants, whether UK, overseas, grandparents or what, for many years, and there may be some mileage in using this model for returners (which we have never done!). We are currently constructing a new log book based on the new standards of proficiency.

If HPC developed a generic log book based on SOP for all returners, it could use its partners to assess compliance.

Thus a returner would have to complete a period of supervised practice, and complete a logbook through private study and/or course attendance as appropriate. I note that 1000 hours is a common placement duration for a registrant with a valid educational qualification, and equates to 6/12 f/t practice.

examples:-

between 2 and 4 years	500 hours	+ logbook
4 to 5 years	1000 hours	+ logbook
over 5 years	Approved course leading to (eg) PgC +	
1000 hours + logbook		

How's that for starters?

Gordon

>From: "Lucinda Pilgrim" <Lucinda.pilgrim@hpc-uk.org>
>To: "Norma Brook"
><norma.brook@hpcuk.org>, <rosemary.klem@uce.ac.uk>, <anna.vandergaag8@ntlworld.com>, <pmsab@cwcom.net>, <CMarycrawford@aol.com>, <gsutehall@hotmail.com>
>Date: Mon, 16 Jun 2003 17:39:36 +0100

>
>Good afternoon all. You'll remember that this matter has been discussed
>by the Reg. Cttee. The prescribed periods for Articles 9 (2) and 19 (3)
>were set at 4 years. The Cttee decided that where an applicant hadn't
>practiced for less than 2 years they wouldn't have to undertake
>additional education, training or experience. Where an applicant hadn't
>practiced for between 2-4 years and over 4 years they would have to
>update their skills and knowledge and meet the standards of
>proficiency. A qualification that was more than 5 years old would be
>too out of date to enable its holder to meet the Standards of
>Proficiency; such an applicant would have to undertake a programme of
>education, training or experience. Mary felt that requirements for
>returners should also apply to those who were self-employed. Another

Lucinda Pilgrim

From: CMarycrawford@aol.com
Sent: 20 June 2003 19:30
To: Lucinda Pilgrim
Subject: Stds for returning to practice

Lucinda

Sorry I have taken so long to get back to you.

My comments:

Between 2 & 4 years - suggest work under supervision for at least 2 weeks - if we could do a week per year out that may be a way of thinking about it BUT a month may be too much - esp. if someone is only able to manage part time. Which means we may want to say x hours over x weeks - or we could be discriminating against people who are not able to manage full time.

I think we should say (if we are able to) that the supervised practice should be spent for some of the time (we could define) in the speciality they intend to return to e.g. if an OT had worked in learning disability and wanted to retrain to that it would seem sensible that they "skilled up" there - probably counter views but this will open the debate

Re courses - I think HEIs will have their eye on any chance for money so getting courses run is not likely to be a problem. May be an area where a meeting with the prof. bodies or seeking a view from them would be worth it.

Think in the text (after the box) we should make it clear that this applies throughout & wherever you intend to work & who your employer will be

Hope this helps

Mary

Mary Crawford
mobile 07774 750259
phone/fax 01628 483409

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star Internet. The service is powered by MessageLabs. For more information on a proactive anti-virus service working around the clock, around the globe, visit:
<http://www.star.net.uk>

Lucinda Pilgrim

From: Pam Sabine [pmsab@cwcom.net]
Sent: 18 June 2003 20:29
To: Lucinda Pilgrim
Subject: Re:

Dear Lucinda,

Thank you for this---I would be very grateful if you could convey my thoughts on the issues to the committee, if you would be so kind:

1. If the schools of Podiatry were to be required to run refresher courses then these would have to be set up in some places and not in others, where such courses are already being run. However, guidance may well have to be issued to all schools so that there is a common basis for standards.
- 2..I am broadly happy with the paper as it was when we saw it at the last meeting. The self-employed could spend their non-fee-earning time being supervised, or split fee for the period with the assessor, but there is no way in which we could legitimately make the requirement for them any different than for anyone else. The time span is not so long that people would find it onerous, and the end result must be worth it. Perhaps we could ensure as best we can , that supervision could be done on a part-time basis, so that it can be fitted in more easily?
3. We do need some evidence that an individual has actually undertaken the private study he or she has been set---otherwise this is meaningless.
4. Does anyone have any other thoughts?
5. Is Rosemary convening this issue??

Best wishes,
Pam

----- Original Message -----

From: Lucinda Pilgrim
To: Norma Brook ; rosemary.klem@uce.ac.uk ; anna.vandergaag8@ntlworld.com ; pmsab@cwcom.net ; CMarycrawford@aol.com ; gsutehall@hotmail.com
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2003 5:39 PM

Good afternoon all. You'll remember that this matter has been discussed by the Reg. Cttee. The prescribed periods for Articles 9 (2) and 19 (3) were set at 4 years. The Cttee decided that where an applicant hadn't practiced for less than 2 years they wouldn't have to undertake additional education, training or experience. Where an applicant hadn't practiced for between 2-4 years and over 4 years they would have to update their skills and knowledge and meet the standards of proficiency. A qualification that was more than 5 years old would be too out of date to enable its holder to meet the Standards of Proficiency; such an applicant would have to undertake a programme of education, training or experience. Mary felt that requirements for returners should also apply to those who were self-employed. Another category to whom the requirements would apply were those who'd qualified but had never practiced.

I'm enclosing a copy of the paper that was used in our discussions. The Cttee needs to set the actual "Requirement" for the various categories. It is proving very difficult to arrange a meeting but I think a lot of this work can be done by e-mail. This topic is on the next Reg Cttee agenda (the Reg Cttee meeting is Tuesday 15 July at 10 a.m). However, as time will be limited and further as the requirements are required asap I'd be grateful if you could work together by e-mail so that the requirements can be ready to be put to the Cttee for decision and recommendation on 15 July. Perhaps you can appoint a convenor (Rosemary, perhaps you as Chair of the Cttee??).

Please also address this issue: where an applicant has to undertake additional training education or experience, would HEIs have courses/specific modules already in place that applicants could attend? Or would such courses/modules have to be put in place at the HEIs? As I understand it several HEIs already run courses for returners.

Many Thanks for your assistance

Regards

Lucinda