National School of Healthcare Science
Trainee Representative Group Meeting
16th September 2019
Hallmark Hotel, Hagley Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham

Chair: Ashley Pritchard (AP)

Attending: Anna Veronese (AV), Beth Atkinson (BA), Cara McKenzie (CMcK), Claire Bradshaw (CB), Djemilah Gordon (DG), Drew Davie (DD), Emily Plimmer (EP), Evangeline Walker (EW), Ffion Lewis (FL), Hannah Green (HG), Isobel Turbin (IT), James O'Sullivan (JO'S), Joel Young (JY), Kerry Bean (KB), Nathan Spectre (NS), and Victoria Steventon-Jones (VSJ)

Apologies: Arantxa Banares (AB), Chris Corbin (CC) and Emily Aveyard (EA)

School Reps: Andrew Wiliams (AW), Alex Levine (AL), Berne Ferry (BF), Chanel Peters (CP), Chris Fisher (CF), Jas Daine (JD), Jane Lynch (JL), Katie Foster (KF) and Sarah Ball (SB)

Minutes: Lisa Murphy (LM)

FOR MEMBERS USE ONLY

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
1.Welcome & Apologies	
The Chair welcomed the group and acknowledged any apologies that were received.	
2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	
The minutes were reviewed and reported to be accurate.	
3.Funding Gap	
There has been some sort of mailing distributed which contained information regarding a funding gap, this has caused lots of discussions between trainees, some clarity regarding this matter would be useful to have. AW explained that it relates to 2019 trainees, HEE are providing money at the rate of 2018 band 6 and not the current band 6, this is something that the School are now aware of, it should not affect the salary of trainees. This information is currently documented in the 'Expressions of Interest' guidance that Trusts submit, so they will be well	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
aware of this issue. BF confirmed that Health Education England was not given funding for this although they are working hard to try and sort this matter out, BF confirmed that as the School it is not our role to argue this matter out with the commissioners. Going forward HEE are going to have a review regarding salary support, part of that review will be asking if the programme should be attached to a band 6. Most trusts have accepted that this training is needed and therefor justifies absorbing the cost. It was asked if somebody who comes onto the programme is already a band 6 would there salary be different, the answer is no, if somebody joins the programme then the rules are the rules. AW asked the trainees to let the School know if this funding issue is affecting their trust.	
4. Training budget	
AP asked whether the funding gap will affect training budgets, BF confirmed that the training budget is £2000 per year per trainee and that this should not be affected in any way, the School cannot police how budgets are spent but advised the group to contact your local commissioner if you have any concerns with training budgets. See action log CMcK had made headway with local commissioners by creating a document showing a breakdown of training spending for them to review. A clear agreement on what the budget could be used for was then devised. CMcK to send document details. See action log. It was mentioned about a trainee having to travel to London to do some mandatory training, BF felt mandatory training should really be available online, more clarification on this matter was required. BF suggested to the group to collate any of these matters and send to the School so that we can send to Jenny Hannington and Christine Sykes, she also suggested that trainees should try and seek out who their lead scientist is and if there is no lead scientist then maybe nominate one.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
5. ASP	
The issue was raised regarding ASP trainees, some had suggested that they felt they were treated like 2nd class unlike STP trainees, there were also issues around long-distance learners – AW explained that universities can't rearrange their learning. Unfortunately resources for non-commissioned programmes isn't there. BF reminded the group that it is because the STP programme exists that ASP trainees can sometimes attend certain events, sometimes it's more of a perception. Also, it worth remember that that ASP have not gone through the rigorous application process in the same way that STP trainees have. As ASP grows things will probably change.	
6. WAS Eligibility	
Although this has been discussed previously there has been an update on the HMRC website, to summarise any new trainees will not be put on the WAT scheme as they aren't eligible but those who have incorrectly been put on it will remain on it and won't have to pay it back – please see the HMRC website for clarification.	
7. Competencies	
Some trainees have felt undervalued due to the process of having competencies just ticked off, that was some of the feedback received. JD explained that the School has done lots of work around this issue, this includes a training review that took place looking at the inconsistencies, workshops were arranged which resulted in the training guides on the School website; JD asked for the group to cascade this information. CF mentioned the STP review in which she hoped would help to balance this out. BF reminded the group that these competencies are devised by your professions, we can't just ask your area of profession to simply change this. EP asked of there could be more information on the School website because CBDs are impossible if you don't have any patient facing work. JD reminded the group that even if this is the case your work still affects patients so suggested maybe doing a questionnaire. There are many indirect ways of contacting patients, BF spoke about patient groups that may have used your medicines / services. BF and JD suggested your training officers contacting the School if there are issues around this matter, JD gave EP her email address.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
8. NE Trainees – Compulsory School Mentors	
JY spoke about trainees in the North East region being told that they have to be school mentors and that this is compulsory. There are concerns around the time this will take out of what are already very busy schedules. Some trainees would prefer to do this for larger groups. BF feels this can only be a positive thing, she felt that trainees should be more open to help although agreed there could be more discussion and negotiation around this. Anything that raises the profile of healthcare scientists can only be a positive thing. Communication is very important and it is the responsibility of all scientists including trainees to help everyone understand the work of a scientist, ensuring that we need to train and teach that healthcare science does exist. BF agreed that she would write to the NE to discuss the finer details. AP suggested this being opened up to other trainees in other areas in order to help. The NSHCS will also be going up to the North East to meet this school as we are very keen to support this.	
9. Supernumerary Trainees	
Some trainees feel they are doing some admin based tasks, AW highlighted that although trainees are supernumerary we do expect trainees to support the workplace tasks, although this should not be at the expense of completing training, if there are any major concerns please email the accreditation team NSHCS.accreditation@hee.nhs.uk	
10. HSST Representation	
HSST reps at the last group meeting felt they needed their own group; they were going to have less meetings and maybe more via Skype.	
11. OneFile – Problems and Suggestions	
AV raised the matter of issues with trainees and training officers not being able to see the competencies. AL confirmed that there are a few changes that will be taking place over the next few weeks, there will also be changes to the administrative roles, the School are working with OneFile to work through some of these issues. AL explained that OneFile is used by masses of clients and not just us so for this reason there will be things that we cannot change. After we have looked at the initial issues we will then be looking at submissions' workflow. All our new guidance can be found on the School website.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
1. - It is difficult for some trainees as the training officer cannot see who they sent competencies to and when. This requires them to keep track of things in a separate spreadsheet. Extra/Duplication of work. This also means that the training officer cannot monitor effectively the status and progression of their work. In a few weeks it will show assessor when opening up submissions. 2. An issue with settings All common /known issues have been addressed on the School website. 3. It would be helpful to have the traffic light system that was available on OLAT The traffic light system is part of OneFile and most trainees are happy with it. 4. Some assessors have multiple accounts These can be merged as long we know about them, please contact the help desk if these are picked up NSHCS.digital@hee.nhs.uk. Separate accounts are ok but they can be merged via an email address but the accounts will need to remain separate. 5. Generally, the layout is not helpful for getting around the site and important things seem buried under layers of menus. This should be improving over time. 6. For the professional practice competency SCC11-0-C-13 which says "generate a reflective diary" – why can't you directly link a competency to the reflective log using the link button? We agree completely, this advice is to grab the URL and paste it into the reflective log. There is a newer version of Onefile and the School will be looking at it over the next few months I the functionality is available in the newer version. 7. It would be useful to improve the option to Edit the "Submission Title". This function is currently available on OneFile, but it doesn't work, so once the title of the submission is inputted, it cannot be changed. You can edit whilst in draft mode. 8. What happens if a piece of work needs signing off by 2 training officers? Start creating the competency with a piece of evidence, then the training officer should select submit but with feedback All the guidance is on the website, it was advised that trainees should add this to your submissions for your training officer. The School are happy to deliver any roadshows to help with any issues, also please make sure that your training officers are signed up to email alerts.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
12. Different Opportunities in Different Departments	
JD – we are trying to support this although it's not growing as quickly as the one in London. CF – this should be assured when departments are accredited, if there are any issues where a department isn't able to provide part of the training then the School would need to made aware. There is information on the School website about accredited departments.	
13. Change to Bioinformatics Genomics Y1 University.	
AP – Changes meant that there was more university teaching in the first year. Ultimately this will be beneficial to trainees as they have more of the academic knowledge to build on earlier in the course. Some teething problems included (1) the extra time out of the workplace during rotations not being accounted for, (2) delays in marking due to the increased workload of the university staff (this will be countered when the trainees attend university less in the second and third years) and (3) during the transition, the first year trainees attended university with the second and third year – trainees found this unfair for marking and keeping pace. This won't be a long-standing issue as first year trainees will be alone in future. CF – The School are not aware of this happening with other specialisms	
14. Delay in Grading and/or Absence of Feedback from all Universities	
This is a matter that should be raised with the university, AV mentioned that issues raised by trainees were not taken very seriously. JD advised them to contact at the university's subject Boards or even threaten to put in a complaint.	
15. Slow Response Time from the School	
The School receive lots of requests for data, these requests have to be authorised to ensure that what we are sharing adheres to GDPR, due to resources the School must prioritise what is urgent/time sensitive and what can wait. Queries sometimes have to be sent to our training programme directors for specialised advice, also there are times where matters can take a while as they must go to certain boards for decisions. The School advise if your enquiry is urgent then please chase up.	
16. AOB	
STP and HSST trainees have been invited to come into the School and do a presentation, all the information is on the School website – it will be on a first come first served basis Mock OSFAs – it was fed back that trainees would hate for mock OSFAs to be no longer available.	

DISCUSSION ITEM	PROGRESS
The Chair of the next meeting is Hannah Green Date and time of next meeting TBC.	

ACTION

ACTION LOG					
Agenda Item & Meeting Date*	Action	Progress / Further Actions	Lead	Due	Status

ACTION LOG					
Agenda Item & Meeting Date*	Action	Progress / Further Actions	Lead	Due	Status
01/06/19- Item 2	Trainees to be sent list of Healthcare Scientists	BF has obtained the list but needs to make sure she is not breaching confidentiality before sending out Update List has been sent by Katie Foster	BF/KF	ASAP	Closed
01/06/18- Item 5	Formal learning contracts need to be in place between trainees and training officers	DW to send his learning contract to the school for guidance, JD and assessment team to decide whether completing the contract should be mandatory, the same goes for training plans Update Training plans are already in place so no need for a learning contract, training plan shows everything you need to know.	DW/JD	ASAP	Closed
16/09/2019 – Item 4	Training budgets – list of commissioning leads to be sent to the members so that questions and information around training budgets can be directed correctly. Training budget document that can be used to log information about training budgets to be shared with the members	Commissioning leads list of contacts to be sent with the minutes.	LM CMcK	ASAP ASAP	Closed Open