



CCP Review Group Minutes

Meeting Date: Wednesday 28 May 2014

Time: 12.30 to 15:30

Location: Room 1, UKCP

Present: David Pink (DP) – Chair
 Sally Forster (SF)
 Fiona Biddle (FB)
 Haya Oakley (HO)
 Sian Ellis (SE)
 Brian Linfield (BL) (arrived at 14:00)
 Sunita Thakore (ST)
 Samantha Lind (SL)

Apologies: Kate Waters (KW)
 Catherine Freeman (CF)
 Debbie Livingstone (DL)

Minutes: Sunita Thakore (ST)

Item	
1.1	<p>Remit of the CCP Review Group</p> <p>The Chair set out the purpose of the CCP Review Group – to review and collate the feedback obtained during the consultation and to agree a list of recommendations to the Board of Trustees. It was suggested that the group see itself as a policy group whose aim was to deliver an explicit working system. The group noted that they were not the final arbiter of the detailed drafting, though they will be reviewing and commenting before the final version is presented to the board. The group discussed the CCP consultation day and the Chair formally closed the CCP consultation. Concerns were raised that the number of collective responses were less than the group had hoped for, and the group agreed that the UKCP Colleges that did not respond to the consultation should be afforded a final opportunity to do so.</p>

<p>1.2</p>	<p>AP: DP to contact College Chairs (save for the CPJA College) in his capacity as Chair of the CCP Review Group and offer them an opportunity to submit feedback to the consultation.</p> <p>Meeting protocol</p> <p>The group discussed the best method to tackle each of the topics listed within the consultation and the additional feedback unrelated to the questions. The group acknowledged that in addition to the consultation issues there are fundamental concerns about the “rule book” and these may well have to be addressed as we approach each topic. The group agreed to work through the questions using the summary report as a base to generate discussion and make a decision and/or recommendations to the Board about each. The group also considered that we may need to consider external organisations such as the Professional Standards Authority and the Charities Commission when making recommendations for change; however noted that the PSA has no clear requirements for a complaints scheme that we are aware of and the Charity Commission’s role is primarily concerned with governance and charitable objectives.</p>
<p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p>	<p>Review of Consultation Responses</p> <p>The group reviewed the summary report prepared by SL which provided a summary of the feedback received during the consultation process. The group were also provided with the raw data from each of the consultation responses. The group acknowledged that not all comments had been added to the summary report, however noted that the included comments were intended as a sample representative of the different responses to each of the questions. Comments that were unrelated to any of the particular consultation questions were also grouped and collated in a “General Comments” document. The group considered these documents a fair summation of the responses received.</p> <p>Feedback of the CCP Event Day (May 2014)</p> <p>The feedback from the event was overwhelmingly positive and was one of our first involving service users. There was one instance of negative feedback from a service user who felt upset at times, but was still impressed with the event and glad to have been offered the opportunity to attend. The group agreed that members of the Review group had not been utilised enough on the day which was something that could be improved upon next time.</p> <p>Publication of the Responses</p> <p>The group discussed appropriate publication of the responses with an aim to be as transparent as possible. The group agreed to publish all appropriate responses received from the consultation which are not case specific, and where we are unable to publish we will report the number of responses not published. It was agreed that the summary report will be made available to the public. At the conclusion of the process a report will be published with the group’s recommendations and reasons.</p> <p>AP: SK to publish the summary report along with the appropriate responses on the UKCP website.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Question 12: Do you have any comments about the composition of our Panels?</p> <p>The group began work on the consultation questions, beginning with Panel composition. The Complaints and Conduct Officers took some time to explain the way that the current members are chosen and the different expertise of those that we currently utilise. The group considered the following points:</p>

	<p><i>The use of a Lay Chair</i></p> <p>The CCO's explained that the purpose of the Lay Chair is to ensure the smooth running of the hearing in accordance with the rules, rather than as a key decision maker. The Lay Chairs are people with expertise in the field who are experienced at running hearings – they are not like a juror with no relative experience. The group were alerted to the fact that it is common practise to utilise a Lay Chair in disciplinary proceedings. The group considered whether a retired psychotherapist or someone who has training in psychotherapy could be considered lay but determined they could not. After reviewing the role of the Lay Chair the group determined that this person does not need to be a psychotherapist.</p> <p>Decision: The inclusion of a Lay Chair should continue.</p> <p>Recommendation: The roles and responsibilities of a Lay Chair should be made clear. All Lay Chairs should be adequately trained on the CCP and should have relative experience.</p> <p><i>The modality of the Professionals on the Panel</i></p> <p>At present, the CCP holds that one professional member should normally be of the same modality as the person concerned, and one should be from a different modality. The group noted that a common suggestion in the consultation responses was that the Panel ought to be composed of modality-specific individuals. This is mainly due to concern that modality differences may not be understood which could disadvantage the Registrant. The CCO's explained that in order to bring a case against a therapist, the allegations must point to a breach of the Ethical Principles and Code of Professional Conduct. UKCP have the burden of proof, which means that UKCP must prove that a therapist has acted unethically, rather than the therapist proving they have not. This means that modality differences have very little influence over the overall outcome of a hearing. Unless it is not possible, there will one therapist representative of the modality of the Registrant. The Registrant is also able to use witnesses (either written or oral) that can give insight into the common practises of their modality if they feel that they are not represented enough on the Panel. The Registrant also has the option to contest the appointment of certain Panel Members if they feel there is a bias. The group noted that having two members from the same modality is difficult to justify and may cause problems for the smaller colleges. After considering the current practise of the Panels and the options available to the Registrant, the group agreed that the current setup is fit for purpose.</p> <p>Recommendation: The practise of utilising two professional members from different modalities (with one the same as the person concerned) should continue.</p>
4.	<p>Finalise Actions / AOB</p> <p>AP: DP to contact College Chairs (save for the CPJA College) in his capacity as Chair of the CCP Review Group and offer them an opportunity to submit feedback to the consultation.</p> <p>AP: SK to publish the summary report along with the appropriate responses on the UKCP website.</p>
5.	<p>Next Meeting – Wednesday 11 June</p> <p>12: 30 to 15: 30</p> <p>The Review Group agreed to consider questions 1 to 3 at its next meeting.</p>