



Training Committee Meeting: Minutes

Time	Monday 8 th July 2019
Attendees	Jamie Barsky, Jane Taylor, Marie Wardle, Fiona Duffy, Louise Deacon, Liz Robinson
Apologies	Julia Fox-Clinch, Roslyn Law
Chair	Jamie Barsky
Minutes	Jess Alton

1. Minutes from last meeting

- a. **Jamie thinks there is an error in the info on item 4:** *“Committee agreed that students need to start their cases within 1 year of training, 2 years to complete all 4 cases (level B) with an exception of up to 3 years (on starting the initial training course i.e. day 1 of training) if the student has requested & been granted permission from IPTUK”.*

Jamie thought that up to 3 years was the standard and did not need additional permissions from IPT-UK

All agreed that Jamie is correct.

Action: JA to amend previous meeting’s minutes accordingly.

2. Actions from last meeting

- a. **JA to check with LoveAdmin if online self-confirmation is possible**

JA advised that LoveAdmin do not offer a self-confirmation option

We discussed the above issues in some detail and agreed that we needed some mechanism by which practitioners self-certify their CPD before applying for re-accreditation. We discussed different approaches for this, and RL was keen that any mechanism lends itself easily to auditing. FD suggested that on the online subscription page there is a blurb that says by applying for re-accreditation they have read and understand the IPT-UK requirements for CPD, and a link to this can be provided on the page. For auditing purposes, selected individuals can be sent a form that they are required to fill in within a set a time frame and return to IPT-UK for auditing.

We need to someone to lead on this – not agreed who at last meeting

Action: JA to add a blurb to LoveAdmin registration forms as above, and a disclaimer that CPD fulfilment may be audited

Action: FD to create auditing form

- b. **Complaints Procedure**

Various people were going to access information about their own institution’s policies to inform decision making about proxy complaints and time frame for holding info:

Jane – NHS Trust (attached – 1A)

Fiona – BPS

Jamie – Manchester Uni

TC members agreed that their academic institutions don't seem to have a role for proxy complaints in their policies.

c. Complaints Procedure

People to review typed complaints flow chart (attached – 2A) and consider issues highlighted as comments prior to the next meeting

There is no set criteria for deciding if a complaint received via email should be taken further. All agreed that, if a concern is sent to JB directly (as TC Chair), he will recruit someone else from the TC to decide together whether a further investigation is warranted.

Action: LR to check timescales for how long we can store information regarding complaints, and to inform JB

Action: JB will amend the Complaints Flowchart accordingly, and will have a look at creating a pamphlet for members regarding how to make a complaint

d. Review of supervisor courses – RL to re-circulate summary document (not clear if done as was covered before RL got to meeting) – Any further actions required on this?

MW, FD and LD have sent their information on to RL.
Item resolved.

e. LR to contact JA to check for an update regarding submissions from trainers
Ros also believes she is waiting for training videos to be allocated to her.

Item resolved.

f. Marie to liaise with Greencloud Hosting to discuss GDPR compliant backing up of data

Item resolved; data back-up is in place via Greencloud.

g. Policy for funding lunch at all day events – We agreed that this was in principle acceptable and that there should be consistency across the country. On email we discussed that a one-page guidance and application form for IPTUK funding support would be helpful. I have drafted (attached – 3A) a very rough copy. Please people review and consider improvements prior to the next meeting.

Action: JB to add option to be requesting funding for 'other' (e.g. speaker fees), in addition to room hire, refreshments etc. Also to add a field for individuals to describe previous attempts at trying to find free venue hire.

3. New/upcoming trainers?

Nothing to discuss.

4. Requests for extensions?

Nothing to discuss. All agreed that only more complex issues should be brought to the TC meeting in future.

5. Trainee Supervisor issue – JB's item – (see attached – 4A)

All agreed that SH has met requirements.
Action: JB to inform SH

6. Re-accreditation requests

a. MR – practitioner in Switzerland will struggle to meet requirements due to location (see email thread attached – 5A)

Agreed. TC suggested that the individual can view some training via webinar, in place of attending refresher training. Supervision can take place via Skype with an accredited supervisor, and the individual must meet CPD requirements.

Action: JA to respond to MR

7. New IAPT paperwork – carried forward from last meeting

To carry forward (RL absent).

8. RL's item on trainees in advance practice who are not performing optimally (borderline passes etc)

To carry forward (RL absent).

9. Problems with Webinar at the York meeting – do we need to troubleshoot this?

All agreed that we will ensure that one/two people (i.e. administrator/s) are allocated to WebEx management on the day of national events (i.e. network meetings).

10. NICE Guidance for Depression in young people – update and comments

IPT-A (and family therapy) has been downgraded to a second-tier treatment, due to having a smaller volume of research in comparison to CBT. This is an improvement on NICE's original proposal (which was to have both CBT and family therapy above IPT-A).

Family-Based IPT is now a recommended treatment for under-12s. JB suggested we should think about how we can take this model further (in terms of how we strategise this training) now that FBIPT is in the NICE guidelines. LD suggested that individual courses should propose this to the TC, rather than the TC taking a lead.

Action: FD is in the process of reviewing and summarising the NICE guidance and will circulate this to members when done

11. Translation of IPT material into other language (Urdu specifically)

Action: LR to email the ISIPT community for any material available in Urdu, and will forward anything on to JT to pass on to her colleague.

12. Exec meeting dates – Jamie requests a change to after TC meeting, otherwise a representative from the TC will be required

MW agreed that Executive Committee meeting dates will try to be rescheduled to suit JB (i.e. not on Fridays). The next Executive meeting is scheduled for 19th July, and this item is on the agenda.

LR agreed to cover JB in upcoming Executive Committee meetings where necessary (apart from on 19th July).

13. IPC accreditation standards – Fiona Duffy (see pathway attached – 6A)

LR suggested that the levels (A, B and C) should be made consistent with the existing IPT levels (i.e. A, B, C and D). JB and LD suggested a change of wording regarding supervision.

Action: FD to make the suggested amendments.

14. CPD Query regarding maternity leave

The TC agreed that CPD requirements are paused during maternity leave. This need to be made explicit in the CPD document.

Action: Jamie to amend the CPD policy and circulate.

15. CPD Query from Marie (“whether CPD hours should include refresher day or CPD educational network. In terms of being a Supervisor then a Refresher day annually is needed”)

We discussed whether a 1 day Refresher was needed for supervisors. We agreed that as far as we know, some course directors require this of their supervisors, but other do not. This appears to be at the discretion of the course lead and there is national IPT-UK requirement for this.

16. Counselling Directory not recognising IPTUK accreditation (see email trail attached – 7A)

The outcome of this issue depends on how the complaints procedure is updated (see above discussions). All agreed that a holding email should be sent before we discuss this further in September’s meeting.

Action: JB to draft email for JA to send.

17. AOB

Request from a practitioner about how much CPD is required to re-accredit following an 11 year break in IPT practice. The TC agreed that a full 5 days course is required.

Action: JA to respond

An issue has been raised by a member about whether supervision of supervision is a mandatory requirement. All agreed that regular supervision of supervision is required, but there is no specific policy about the frequency or timing required. IPT UK expect regular supervision of supervision according on the number of trainees they have.

Action: MW/JB to respond to query via email

Upcoming TC meeting dates:

Monday 9th September at 1:30pm – 3pm (via conference call)

Friday 29th November at 10am – 11:30am (Network Meeting, Manchester)