



Ethel Rodrigues
Lead Professional Officer(Education) & Ireland
Unite the Union
128 Theobald's Road
Holborn
London WC1X 8TN

By email: ethel.rodrigues@unitetheunion.org

20th September, 2018

Dear Madam

**Academy for Healthcare Science One Voice Response –
CPD Joint Position Statement Review Group - CPD-JPSRG: Draft V5**

In consultation with Professional Bodies, the following comments have been made:

- Draft v5 appears consistent with approaches taken for HCS, although we would have expected this document to reference the HCPC CPD Standards. The behaviours document is referenced but doesn't cover this but appears to be consistent with these standards.
- We would have expected Draft v5 to reference HEE in some way – assuming that HEE is part of the 'wider systems' described here, although as a general principle there is no requirement for this, and also this could confuse as HEE cite their work in supporting CPD only for bands 5-9.
- Last year's H&SC mandate had a section on CPD needing to take into account priorities of the NHS rather than 'Clinicians currently choose their own life-long learning priorities, things they are interested in and enjoy. These principles achieve this through their focus on benefitting the end user, improving service delivery and relevance to scope of practice. Nothing from HEE has prompted a change of focus from the individual ownership of CPD and this is not mentioned in the more recent mandate and by and large this is only a very small part of CPD delivery.
- In terms of relevance to services, it is doubtful that locally there are readily accessible KPI's that show how the CPD improves the quality of service delivery (principle 3). Training is usually identified as a service need in appraisals

Contd./



- The section on the importance of CPD and the benefits of CPD should come after the introduction and before the purpose of the document. In its current format Draft V5 places a lot of emphasis on service users, but less on the individual. Changing these sections around will help emphasise the importance of CPD to individuals
- Draft V5 should talk about reflective vs reactive CPD. Reflective CPD is where an individual thinks 'I really need to know about this – how can I find out and learn about it?' Reactive is where an individual may attend a meeting or conference and learn from it, but the learning is less targeted and more making the most of a good learning opportunity.
- The outcomes of the CPD should be peer reviewed – e.g. discussed with team members or during an appraisal
- The regulator requirements do not request evidence of a collection of points or hours studied but of evidence of relevance and impact of the CPD activity undertaken.
- Membership of Professional Bodies and Trade Unions is encouraged for individuals so that they may easily access CPD support.
- Principle 4: CPD and lifelong learning should be balanced and relevant to the individual's current and developing scope of practice
- Principle 5: CPD and lifelong learning should be recorded and reflect the impact on the individual's practice – suggested wording change below:

The individual you are responsible for maintaining an ongoing record of your learning that demonstrates:

- what you revised, updated and learnt
- how it enhances or develops your scope of practice
- the impact on service users or service delivery

You are responsible for accessing, advocating for and using the resources available to you. You are responsible for submitting your record of undertaken CPD to your regulator is called upon to do so for audit purposes.

- The document does not make clear what leverage – if any – the statement has with employers regarding their responsibilities in supporting employees' CPD and lifelong learning opportunities. What commitment is expected from organisations and what action can be taken by departments and individuals in the event of a lack of support by employers as stated in the principles below?

Contd./



- It also does not state how it is envisaged this document would be used or referred to by professional bodies or managers. Is it possible to insert a clarification paragraph in the introduction explaining the need for the joint statement and how professional bodies and employers alike should use it in their guidance?

Kind regards,

Prof. Brendan Cooper
President