

Minutes of the Human Givens Institute (HGI)'s Registration and Professional Standards Committee (RPSC) Annual Review Meeting (ARM) held via Zoom

Thursday 25th February 2021, 8 - 9.30pm (GMT)

Attendees

Monique Nauta (RPSC Chair (MN)), Owen Davis (OD), Valerie Baker (VB), Jennifer Broadley (JB), Richard Cavaliero (RC), Elaine Curtin (EC), Gilli Gladman (GG), Amanda Hargreaves (AH), Tina Hamilton-James (TH-J), Kim Hood (KH), Selina Lauder (SL), Colin Mawhinney (CM), Helen Organ (HO), Phil Sheardown (PS), Juliette Young (JY) and Andy Tarrant (RPSC Co-ordinator and minute taker (AT)).

Welcome and Introductions

MN welcomed members to the 2021 ARM - thanking them for their contribution to the RPSC - then set out the agenda for the meeting.

Apologies

Apologies were received from Mary Austin (MA), Avril Bailey (AB), Trevor Bailey (TB), Sue Saunders (SS) and Ian Thomson (IT).

Minutes of Previous Meeting, Matters Arising and Declarations of Interest

The minutes from the 2020 ARM were agreed and no declarations of interest were made.

Matters arising from the 2020 ARM:

- 1) OD to write to previous HG members asking them to remove any reference to the Institute from their website - Complete
- 2) AB to circulate HGI article on 'Duty of Candour' - Complete (this now forms part of training).

Review of the Year 2020/21

AT provided the meeting with complaints statistics in the 12 months since the last meeting (these were the statistics provided to the Professional Standards Association (PSA) as part of this year's re-accreditation process)

Total Complaints - 5

Complaints reviewed by the Committee - 1

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) - 1

Full hearing - 0 (3 legacy complaints preceding the year 20/21 progressed to full hearings in the last 12 months)

Not taken forward - 1

Complaints against the organisation re-register functions - 1

OD gave an update of work to date regarding the RPSC. There was a number of changes of personnel over the last 12 months, with the chair of the RPSC now being MN and the co-ordinator AT. OD also updated the meeting on the development of the new complaints process. A number of options had been considered, with a particular focus on incorporating mediation into the process, but which at the same time needed to preserve the unique identity of the Institute.

A discussion then took place on the preceding 12 months, with particular concerns raised about the impact of litigation upon an ethics-driven organisation; the need for all registrants to focus on ethics (and that it be incorporated into training (50% of the supervision course now focuses on ethics as a core topic) and peer-group supervision sessions, but recognising the need for all therapists to recognise their own 'personal responsibility' in this area) and the need for the HGI to balance its responsibility to the public, whilst maintaining an appropriate duty of care to its registrants. It should be noted, however, that of all the thousands of sessions of care delivered, only a tiny proportion ever result in a complaint being made.

General feedback from all members was that they would like to be kept updated on any matters that they may have adjudicated upon and in particular, whether there were any learning opportunities.

Action - AT to take on the role of updating members, and providing feedback, on any cases that they were involved in.

The Role of the RPSC, to include the new complaints procedure

MN gave an update on the new mediation stage of the process. Adoption of a mediation stage will allow for early resolution and ensure that HG principles are incorporated into the new complaints process, whilst meeting the the recommendations of the PSA at their last re-accreditation.

MN and AT then went on to outline other changes, which should streamline the complaints process, including the elimination of the 'fact-finding'/investigative stage (both complainant and registrant would be required to submit their information), that 'live' hearings would be held in the future and greater clarity as to when one of the parties could appeal an adjudication judgment.

Supporting Colleagues to Understand the New Process

OD and TB are developing a 3 unit training programme to help members understand the new process. Stage 1 is a module with basic information about the RPSC and the wider legislative framework. Stage 2 is a unit on the purpose and conduct of hearings and Stage 3 deals with appeals. The training would be delivered via slides with a spoken commentary to accompany. The training aims to be more practical, ending with problem-solving scenarios, where members would be required to work in pairs and review a transcript to deliver an adjudication.

The Proposed Role of the New Co-Chair of the RPSC

MN gave an update on what she envisages the role of the new RPSC co-chair to be. This being to lead on registration and publicising the work of the RPSC, through journal articles etc. There would be the opportunity for development for the right person through attendance at courses etc. Any person wishing to be considered was asked to provide their name.

Any Other Business

AT updated members on the resources that were available to them, should they be required to sit on an adjudication or appeals, panel (this guidance has been developed drawing upon the best practice developed by the Advisory, conciliation and arbitration service (Acas)).

The meeting then concluded.