The British Council for
Therapeutic Interventions With
Children Limited

5 Brayford Square,
London, England,
E1 0SG
www.bctiwc.org/

Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday March 26th 2015

Present:
Hazel Colyer (HC) – Chair
Janet Butler (JB) – professional member
Sylvia Lucas (SL) – lay member
Anne Mayer (AM) - professional member

In attendance:
Monika Jephcott (MJ) PTUK
Jeff Thomas (JT) PTUK

1. Welcome & Chair's opening remarks
Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, with a special welcome to Sylvia Lucas whose first meeting it was.

2. Apologies for absence
Noyona Chandra. HC reported that Noyona had resigned from the group.

3. Conflict of Interest Declaration
HC reminded members of the requirement to declare an interest for specific items if necessary.

4. Minutes of meeting held on 23rd October 2014
These were agreed as correct record.

5. Matters arising (not on agenda)
- Response from PSA to BCTIWC letter, previously circulated.
This was noted. HC agreed to construct Term of Reference for accreditation panels.
-PTUK Risk Register.
This had been reviewed and was approved with one addition, 3e Business Practice.

6. Financial Report
HC reported that, due to a misunderstanding between the directors, the accounts for Feb 2013 – Feb 2014 had been submitted late to Companies House, incurring a fine. BCTIWC had appointed Kemp, Carr Brown of Faversham as accountants and this would not happen again. The Corporation Tax return to HMRC had been submitted on time.

The current balance at the bank is £3922.67. HC reminded members to submit expenses claims for this meeting.

7. 2015 Renewal of Accreditation of PTUK Assured Register

JT circulated PTUK's stakeholder strategy, developed as part of the re-accreditation process. He reported that this was underway with the panel meeting due to be held on 20th April. He had requested permission to attend the panel in order to mitigate the likelihood of conditions being imposed, but had been told that PTUK had no right to attend.

8. 2015 Revalidation Process

Prior to this meeting the Chair had been made aware in writing of concerns about some of the information requested as part of the revalidation process from a 2 groups of PTUK registrants.

The first of these, from Howes et al, had been circulated prior to the meeting. The concerns related specifically to the requirement in the clinical data section for location data, client attribute data, educational data and session activities. A concern was expressed that, 'the current Caerus format is largely concerned with the collection of research data. This is irrelevant to the revalidation process, and therefore inappropriate to include'.

The second was a formal complaint, which had only been sent to the Chair at 23.32pm on the previous evening and therefore could not be considered at this meeting.

Professional members were also aware of some disquiet about the ongoing development of the CAERUS spreadsheets for electronic submission of renewals and the additional information that this permitted.

JT described the history of the journey towards assured registration from 2009/10 to the present, and the consultation process that had occurred throughout. In 2013, the proposal to move towards electronic submission (CAERUS) had been put to the annual conference, which had endorsed it and chosen Excel as their preferred application. An expert panel of users had defined user requirements.

The first version of CAERUS in February 2013 captured changes to contact details and declarations. It was used by approximately 60% of registrants. Version 2 was further developed to capture CPD and supervision information in February 2014. Renewals of approved supervisors had been introduced in November 2014 to ensure that registrants could complete the 2015 CAERUS submission for the following February. BCTIWC had been informed of the proposals for 2015 at their October meeting and given their approval.

The additional information requested has been differentiated into minimum requirements for registration (declarations) plus additional information (clinical data, clinical supervision log and CPD) which has been submitted in the past using hard copy. Other data requested, which are not compulsory for minimum attainment, are session data, extended supervision data, SEPACTO, Education data and client satisfaction surveys. Registrants have the choice about how much they include and would be sent a transcript to show their registration attainment levels. Ultimately, PTUK would like to annotate the register with different levels of compliance.

PTUK's philosophy is one of continuous improvement of standards of practice through providing assistance and support to registrants to improve their own practice. The development of best practice guidelines is an aim and, in order to achieve this, a fuller picture of what is happening in practice is needed. The aim of the clinical data collection is not to undertake research per se, but for programme evaluation and the development of best practice guidelines. The requirement for more

detailed supervision logs was to evidence that the process of supervision resulted in a learning point or some other action and to try to ensure that all practitioners are accessing and using supervision appropriately.
JT described how PTUK, in common with the medical profession, was unhappy about reliance on declarations of continuing fitness to practise and wished to see more evidence of the effectiveness of practice, rather than relying on a sampling method such as that employed by the HCPC.

AM said that it was important to understand that in using a 'structure, process and outcome' model in setting and raising standards, it is the 'process' part of the model that is the most difficult to audit. The Clinical Data section, which is process material since it requires the recording of session activities, seemed unlikely to fulfil the requirement as it stood and it was hard to see how this could benefit raising standards.

JB stated that she would have preferred it if Council had had sight of the spreadsheet at the October meeting and been asked to make a reasoned judgement about it. She felt that PTUK were trying to do too much too soon. SL asked if children would be safer as a result of this process and PTUK responded that it was their belief.

JT drew members' attention to the PTUK CAERUS Review document which detailed the large correspondence that PTUK had had with registrants and PTUK's responses. He referred members to an 8 page supplement published with Play for Life. He also stated that session data had only been requested from November 2014, because PTUK realised that it was too onerous to expect registrants to go back further.

The 2015 Revalidation outcomes to date were that, of 1036 practitioners required to renew, 989 have renewed and the numbers of complainants were small in comparison.

The Council discussed and considered all of the information provided by PTUK. They supported the overall direction of travel, noting that it was consistent with approaches to revalidation being developed by other professional groups and school inspection practices. Members accepted PTUK's explanation for requesting clinical data, suitably anonymised, and were satisfied that data protection regulations were not being breached. They do not doubt that PTUK's intentions are in pursuit of raising standards of practice and are in the public interest.

However, members were critical of the speed with which PTUK was implementing the changes and urged them to give time for consolidation before taking any more steps. In particular, they cautioned against annotating the register in 2016. The Council reminded PTUK of the need to take every opportunity to involve registrants in the ongoing developments and to give clear explanations of their approach.

9. Recruitment of lay member
The Chair proposed Lorna Lewis, primary school teacher with a special needs qualification. This was accepted. Lorna will be inducted by the Chair during the summer and attend the next meeting.

10. Proposed Member's Agreement
This had been circulated previously and was accepted by all members.

11. Any other business
11.1 Council were asked to review the transcript document. They fully endorsed the proposal to give feedback to each registrant and suggested that the feedback should be differentiated by use of the terms conditions, requirements and learning points. This was accepted by PTUK.

11.2 Janet Butler advised that she was retiring from play therapy practice and therefore would be standing down from the Council after this meeting. Janet was thanked for her contribution to BCTIWC's development and wished well for her retirement. Arrangements would put in hand to appoint a new professional member.

11.3 There was a short discussion about the procedure adopted by PTUK to remove a registrant from the register. It was noted and agreed that this is separate from the complaints procedure. JT to circulate to members.

12. Date of next meeting
Thursday 15th October 2015