

# Annual review of accreditation 2020/21

UK Board of Healthcare Chaplains (UKBHC)

November 2020

# Contents

Background .....	3
Outcome .....	4
Assessment against the Standards for Accredited Registers .....	5
Share your experience .....	10
Impact assessment.....	12
Equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 .....	13

## About UK Board of Healthcare Chaplains

The UK Board of Healthcare Chaplains (UKBHC) registers:

- Healthcare Chaplains

Its work includes:

- Setting and maintaining standards of practice and conduct
- Maintaining a register of qualified professionals
- Assuring the quality of education and training
- Requiring registrants to keep their skills up to date through continuing professional development
- Handling complaints and concerns raised against registrants and issuing sanctions where appropriate.

As of July 2020, there were 366 registrants on UKBHC's register.

UKBHC was first accredited on 17 July 2017. This is its third annual review and this report covers 17 July 2019 to 17 July 2020.

## Background

The Professional Standards Authority accredits registers of people working in a variety of health and social care occupations not regulated by law. To be accredited, organisations holding such registers must prove that they meet our demanding [Standards for Accredited Registers](#) (the Standards). Accreditation is reviewed every 12 months.

Accreditation can be renewed by a Moderator in cases where all Standards are evidenced to be met. A Moderator can issue Recommendations and note Achievements.

Where concerns do exist, or information is not clear, a targeted review will be initiated by a Moderator. The outcome of this review is assessed by an Accreditation Panel, who can decide to renew accreditation, renew accreditation with conditions, suspend accreditation or remove accreditation. Panels may also issue Recommendations and note Achievements.

- **Condition** – Changes that must be made within a specified timeframe to maintain accreditation
- **Recommendation** – Actions that would improve practice and benefit the operation of the register, but do not need to be completed for compliance with the Standards to be maintained. Implementation of recommendations will be reviewed at annual renewal
- **Achievement** – Areas where a register has demonstrated a positive impact on one of the four pillars of the programme; protection, choice, confidence and quality.

## Outcome

Accreditation for UKBHC was renewed for the period of 17 July 2020 to 17 July 2021.

Accreditation was renewed by a Panel following a review of evidence gathered by the Accreditation team and supplied by UKBHC. The Moderator requested that a targeted review of Standards 3 and 11 be carried out. The Moderator noted that the issues raised under Standard 11 may also impact on Standards 2, 5 and 8, so made no finding regarding these Standards. The remaining Standards were considered as met by the Moderator.

The following Recommendations were issued to be implemented by the submission of annual renewal documentation:

1. UKBHC should update its website to ensure that information about its knowledge base and complaints procedure are accessible to the public. UKBHC should consider whether it will publish its Board meeting minutes to aid in transparency. UKBHC is encouraged to add the AR quality mark to its website. (Paragraphs 7.1 to 7.3)
2. UKBHC should consider providing guidance to its registrants about whistleblowing in relation to any relevant employers. (Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.5)
3. UKBHC should consider how it could make the information about the different grades of membership and the scopes of practice easier for members of the public to find. (Paragraphs 10.1 to 10.7)
4. UKBHC should make clear its requirements on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion for both its registrants and for the Board. (Paragraphs 11.6 to 11.14)

The following report provides detail supporting the outcome.

# Assessment against the Standards for Accredited Registers

## Standard 1: the organisation holds a voluntary register of people in health and/or social care occupations

- 1.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 1.2 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

## Standard 2: the organisation demonstrates that it is committed to protecting the public and promoting public confidence in the occupation it registers

- 2.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 2.2 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

## Standard 3: risk management

- 3.1 At last year's annual review, the Authority considered safeguarding, the Authority noted that UKBHC's risk matrix did cover aspects of safeguarding it did not include specific risks related to the treatment of, or association with vulnerable adults or children. The Authority decided to issue a Recommendation for the UKBHC to consider whether there are any specific risks associated with children or vulnerable adults and if so, to add this as a separate risk to its risk matrix.
- 3.2 This year the Authority has asked Accredited Registers to review and update their risk registers, to assess how the coronavirus emergency will impact them and their registrants, and what actions can be taken to mitigate these risks.
- 3.3 The Authority has reviewed the updated risk matrix. UKBHC has added three new risks including a new risk about safeguarding and two risks related to the pandemic, one which covers the risk to the public and the other the risk to the profession.
- 3.4 The Authority found that the Recommendation had been considered.
- 3.5 The Moderator reviewed UKBHC's risk matrix and noted that the residual rating for many of the risks was significant despite the mitigations that were recorded. In some cases, the residual impact scores were higher, suggesting that the mitigations had increased the impact of the risk.
- 3.6 The Moderator was particularly concerned that the UKBHC had (properly) identified some very serious risks to patients (for example, of undue influence and breach of boundaries) and assessed the inherent likelihood of these taking place at a very high level (a '4' so that, without mitigation, there was something like an 80% likelihood of this taking place. After mitigation, however, the likelihood was assessed at a '3', so such behaviour is still more likely than not to take place. If this assessment of risk is correct, then the Moderator would expect to see substantial efforts to reduce the risk, given the seriousness of the conduct described – for example, significant emphasis on Whistleblowing and working with others to improve safeguarding.

- 3.7 It was not clear to the Authority whether this concern arises out the methodology used by the UKHBC in assessing risk (the assessment of likelihood appeared surprisingly high) or whether, in fact, there are serious concerns about the likelihood of its registrants abusing their position. A risk matrix is an important tool in assisting a register to target its efforts to protect the public and the Moderator considered that it was important that it should present risks as accurately as possible. The Moderator requested that UKBHC review and update its risk matrix and resubmit to the Authority for a targeted review.
- 3.8 UKBHC reviewed its risk matrix. The review was carried out by its Governance Committee following its Annual Engagement Event in September which concentrated on risk. The event was attended by approximately 100 UKBHC registrants. The aim of the event was to enable registrants to understand the risks that had been identified and to identify their responsibility in reducing the risk through high standards of professional practice. Attendees also discussed how continuing professional development could be used to develop professional practice and how this mitigates some of the risks identified. Following its review, UKBHC updated the risk scores, added more detail about safeguarding and added a new risk relating to community chaplaincy.
- 3.9 UKBHC reported that the Governance Committee debated whether UKBHC should be responsible for risks to professional practice rather than risks to the register and the Board. This was discussed with the Authority who explained that Standard 3 requires the register to have a thorough understanding of the risks presented by the occupation to service users and the public and where appropriate to take effective action to mitigate them. The Authority highlighted that it was good practice for the Board to also consider risks to the register and the Board but that this was not routinely requested as part of the assessment of Standard 3. UKBHC has included these risks within the matrix which is consistent with the approach taken by some registers.
- 3.10 UKBHC confirmed that its risk matrix is a standing item on each Board meeting and that any changes are recorded in the minutes.
- 3.11 The Panel considered UKBHC's updated risk matrix. The Panel noted that there were some instances where the impact scores appeared to be low and inconsistently applied within the matrix. However, the Panel recognised that completing a risk matrix is only one part of the risk management process and noted that the mitigations identified by UKBHC seem to be robust and therefore had no concerns about the UKBHC's risk management. The Panel also recognised the work that UKBHC had done to raise awareness of risks with its registrants.
- 3.12 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

**Standard 4: the organisation demonstrates that it has sufficient finance to enable it to fulfil its voluntary register functions effectively including setting standards, education, registration, complaints and removal from the register**

- 4.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year. As part of its due diligence, the Accreditation team reviewed records from Companies House and noted that UKBHC appears to be financially sustainable.
- 4.2 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

**Standard 5: the organisation demonstrates that it has the capacity to inspire confidence in its ability to manage the register effectively**

- 5.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 5.2 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

**Standard 6: the organisation demonstrates that there is a defined knowledge base underpinning the health and social care occupations covered by its register or, alternatively, how it is actively developing one. The organisation makes the defined knowledge base or its development explicit to the public**

- 6.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 6.2 At last year's annual review, the UKBHC reported that it was further developing its body of knowledge. UKBHC provided an update paper to the Authority. Currently the knowledge base is split into seven areas: sociological context, pastoral care, moral thinking, organisations, world religions, knowledge of one's own faith tradition and human relationship. Last year UKBHC held a study day with its registrants which had a focus on the body of knowledge. Following this, it was proposed to redefine these seven areas into four pillars:
  - 1) Health and Social care context
  - 2) Self in relationships
  - 3) Faith and beliefs
  - 4) Pastoral care and moral thinking.
- 6.3 UKBHC plan to provide up to date references for each of these pillars. This work is ongoing. UKBHC reported that work on each pillar has been commissioned with academic partners and the outcomes of this work will be presented at its annual engagement event in September 2021.
- 6.4 Part of this Standard requires that an Accredited register makes the defined knowledge base or its development explicit to the public. UKBHC previously published information about its knowledge base on its website but that this did not appear to have been migrated to its new website. UKBHC reported that it will update its website to include information about the current body of knowledge while this is developing.
- 6.5 The Authority noted the ongoing work that the UKBHC is doing to develop the knowledge base. The Authority noted that part of this Standard required that the knowledge base be made clear to the public and that this appears to have

disappeared during the migration of data to the new website. The Authority considered this as part of Standard 7f.

6.6 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

### Standard 7: governance

- 7.1 UKBHC has developed a new [website](#). The home page provides quick links to the register, information about training and education, the knowledge base (discussed under Standards 6). Information about complaints is accessed through the 'for public' tab or from the dropdown menu on the 'for professionals' and 'for employers' tabs. UKBHC has published Board meeting minutes up to November 2011 and has published its Articles of Association and Standing Orders. The team also noted that UKBHC had not used the AR quality mark.
- 7.2 The Authority considered how easy it was to find complaints information on the new website and noted that users had to go through several layers of menus to get it. Previous decisions have required that registers make their complaints procedures more accessible to the public on its website. UKBHC reported that it will be instructing its website manager to update its website to include the AR Quality mark, add its recent Board meeting minutes to its website and add a raising a concern tab to make complaints information easier to find.
- 7.3 The Authority considered the work that UKBHC had done to update its website and noted that this work was ongoing. The Authority noted that it was important that information about the knowledge base (Standards 6) and complaints were easy to find by members of the public. The Authority considered previous recommendations about the publication of Board meeting minutes and their importance in transparency. The Authority decided to issue a Recommendation: UKBHC should update its website to ensure that information about its knowledge base and complaints procedure are accessible to the public. UKBHC should consider whether it will publish its Board meeting minutes to aid in transparency. UKBHC is encouraged to add the AR quality mark to its website. (Recommendation 1)
- 7.4 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

### Standard 8: setting standards for registrants

- 8.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 8.2 At last year's annual review, the Authority considered how Accredited Registers approach whistleblowing and Duty of Candour. UKBHC reported that it covers the Duty of Candour within section 4.3 of its [Code of Conduct for Healthcare Chaplains](#) which states that 'every Healthcare professional must be open and honest with patients when something has gone wrong with their treatment or care which causes, or has the potential to cause, harm or distress.'
- 8.3 UKBHC did not include whistleblowing within its Codes and did not have any additional guidance for its registrants about whistleblowing either in terms of against the UKBHC or about their employers. UKBHC noted that it would

accept complaints against the Board and would direct registrants to local speak up guardians or the relevant religious professional body for advice and support. The Authority decided to issue a recommendation that UKBHC should consider developing whistleblowing guidance for its registrants, in relation to both UKBHC and any relevant employers.

- 8.4 The Moderator noted the importance of a Whistleblowing policy, particularly given the nature of the complaint discussed under Standard 11. UKBHC supplied its draft whistleblowing policy to the Panel for review. This will go before UKBHC's Board in December 2020.
- 8.5 The Panel considered the draft policy and noted that it was important that people were not discouraged in raising such concerns and that UKBHC could be clearer about what is required to raise a concern when the complainant does not have evidence. The Panel noted that the original Recommendation had requested that UKBHC consider providing guidance to registrants in terms of whistleblowing about UKBHC and relevant employers. The Panel found that UKBHC had considered the Recommendation in terms of UKBHC but not relevant employers and requested that a further Recommendation be issued to allow UKBHC to make the changes to its draft policy. The Recommendation is: UKBHC should consider providing guidance to its registrants about whistleblowing in relation to any relevant employers. (Recommendation 2)
- 8.6 UKBHC highlighted its work with NES Scotland to revise the Chaplaincy Spiritual Care Standards and Competency documents for 2020. It has been agreed that these will be adopted in Scotland in 2020 with the rest of UK by 2021. UKBHC confirmed that no changes had been made to the standards required to be a healthcare chaplain.
- 8.7 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met

### **Standard 9: education and training**

- 9.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 9.2 In the September 2019 Board minutes, the Authority noted that the UKBHC has received an application from Newman University, Birmingham for UKBHC course accreditation. This application is ongoing.
- 9.3 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

### **Standard 10: management of the register**

- 10.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.
- 10.2 At last year's annual review, we reported that the UKBHC was considering different routes to the register. One of the options under consideration was the port-folio route. UKBHC reported that this is still be considered along with other equivalence routes.
- 10.3 At last year's annual review, the Authority noted that the different grades of registration are explained on the website but that this is accessed from the 'for professionals' menu and so may not be easy for members of the public to find. The Authority decided to issue a Recommendation that the UKBHC should consider how it could make the information about the different grades of

membership and the scopes of practice easier for members of the public to find.

- 10.4 Also, at last year's annual review, the Authority reported on the changes UKBHC had made to its registration requirements. UKBHC added the following requirements to its application process:
- 3 verbatims using the standard template of UKBHC
  - 1 critical book review (from last 3 years)
  - 1 in depth research article review (from last 12 months).
- 10.5 These submissions are assessed by two markers selected from a pool, using an external examiner (who will be UKBHC's academic adviser) to ensure the quality of work is maintained. The Authority noted the changes however found that it was not clear on the UKBHC's website so issued the following Recommendation: UKBHC should consider making its new registration requirements clear and transparent to the public.
- 10.6 UKBHC reported that its review of the public information available for both its registrant grades and the registration requirements is due to be reported to the Board in September.
- 10.7 The Authority decided to reissue the Recommendation: UKBHC should consider how it could make the information about the different grades of membership and the scopes of practice easier for members of the public to find. (Recommendation 3)
- 10.8 UKBHC has reported on a trial revalidation process modelled on that used by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. The trial was carried out by the professional members of the Board. UKBHC reported however that only 50% of the Board members completed it. Concerns were raised with the process including that the revalidation process was too onerous and could create a barrier to continued registration.
- 10.9 UKBHC's Board did however agree to pilot it with course tutors and mentors as part of its work to increase standards in its approved courses. UKBHC reported that the pilot will be run for mentors and course tutors in 2021. Funding for the training of mentors and tutors has been sourced and an academic partner has been commissioned.
- 10.10 UKBHC continues to require its registrants to complete Continuing Professional Development (CPD) which it monitors on an annual basis. UKBHC reported that the return rate of CPD has been good and that generally the completion of the form is good with registrants recording a range of activities. UKBHC noted that some registrants appear to find it difficult to apply the activity to their practice and so UKBHC had to return between 10-15% of forms so that the section 'impact of learning on practice' could be properly completed. UKBHC reported that it will be considering CPD as part of its annual engagement event in September 2020.
- 10.11 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

## **Standard 11: complaints and concerns handling**

- 11.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.

- 11.2 At last year's annual review, the Authority issued the following Recommendation: UKBHC should consider developing guidelines for use by its complaints panels to ensure that the outcomes of complaints hearings are fair and consistent, for example indicative sanctions guidelines.
- 11.3 UKBHC has developed an *Indicative Sanctions Policy*. The policy provides details about the sanctions available and the factors that the committees should consider when deciding about a registrant's fitness to practise including proportionality, aggravating and mitigating factors. The policy provides details of each of the sanctions, the circumstances in which they should be considered and the timeframes that should be applied. A copy of the policy is available has been supplied to the Moderator. UKBHC has also confirmed that this will be published on its website.
- 11.4 The Authority found that this Recommendation had been considered.
- 11.5 At last year's annual review, we reported that the UKBHC reported that it had discussed writing to relevant employers and faith and belief groups to request that UKBHC be notified of matters that require disciplinary action against a registrant. UKBHC reported that it will be completing this action by the end of September 2019. UKBHC reported that due to Covid work pressures the expected completion date for this moved to the end of October 2020.
- 11.6 UKBHC reported that it had received one complaint this year. The complaint related to a Board member who was also a registrant and related to allegations of direct discrimination against non-religious individuals and institutions. UKBHC handled the complaint through its organisational complaint policy and found that there was insufficient evidence to uphold the complaint.
- 11.7 The Authority reviewed the outcome of the complaint and the complainant's response. The Authority asked if UKBHC had considered whether it should have handled the complaint as a fitness to practise issue given the nature of the allegations. UKBHC noted that this had not been considered at the time, however, it has now been identified as a learning point for future complaints.
- 11.8 The Moderator noted that the complaint related to allegations of discrimination. He was concerned that, if true, the alleged comments appeared to conflict with the UKBHC's ethos which explicitly involved both religious and non-religious people. He was also concerned that the alleged comments about the Equalities Act might suggest an attitude that could discriminate against individuals with protected characteristics under that Act.
- 11.9 The Moderator also noted that there was nothing in the UKBHC's *Code of Conduct* to prohibit discrimination on grounds prohibited by the Equalities Act and was concerned that the organisation did not have an organisational Equality and Diversity policy. In his view, registrants of the UKBHC were likely to come across a wide spectrum of individuals with different protected characteristics and it was crucial that such individuals should be treated with equal respect. The Moderator also noted that UKBHC had been issued with a Recommendation to develop a whistleblowing policy at last year's annual review and that this had not yet been completed. The Moderator considered that the absence of an Equality and Diversity Policy and a Whistleblowing policy means it is not clear how the UKBHC would handle these types of

issues within its processes, while the absence of a requirement in its Code might make it difficult to address discrimination by registrants.

- 11.10 UKBHC confirmed that when the Chair received the complaint, they discussed the issue with the individual concerned and considered and responded to those instances highlighted as evidence of the alleged discriminatory practice. The Chair decided that there was insufficient evidence to uphold the complaint. However following our review of its handling of the complaint, UKBHC has recognised that consideration should be given to whether complaints against registrant Board members should be considered as fitness to practise matters and has amended its organisational complaints policy with the addition of paragraph 16 which states: 'If the Board member is a Registrant the Chair will consider whether the complaint needs also to be referred to the Registrar as Fitness to Practice matter.'
- 11.11 UKBHC stated that it acknowledged 'that an Equality and Diversity Policy would enable the Board to outline how it would reduce and hopefully eliminate any discrimination or negative impacts in relation to its role as a regulator or as a Board.' UKBHC's Governance sub-committee will develop an Equality and Diversity Policy and consider UKBHC's approach to equality impact assessment and equalities monitoring. The draft policy is due to go to the Board in December 2020.
- 11.12 The Panel noted that the behaviour of a registrant whether in the course of their practice or not, may impact on their fitness to practise and welcomed UKBHC's acknowledgment of learning in terms of considering whether complaints against registrant Board members should be considered through the fitness to practise process.
- 11.13 The Panel considered the actions taken by UKBHC and its proposals for the development of an Equality and Diversity Policy. The Panel reviewed UKBHC's Codes and Standards and noted UKBHC may wish to review these as well to ensure that its requirements in terms of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion were clear. The Panel decided to issue a Recommendation: UKBHC should make clear its requirements on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion for both its registrants and for the Board. (Recommendation 4)
- 11.14 UKBHC reported that it has now added a 'button' that appears on the top of each page of the website which links directly to the raising a concern page. This page contains information about how to raise a concern about registrants and about the Board and links to the policy.
- 11.15 The Authority found that this Standard continues to be met.

### **Share your experience**

- 12.1 The Accreditation team did not receive any responses to the invitation to share experience and did not receive any concerns about UKBHC during the accreditation year.

### **Impact assessment**

- 13.1 There were no significant changes reported or noted in the past year.

- 13.2 UKBHC reported that 12 registrants had not renewed or had lapsed their registration. UKBHC reported that the predominant reason was due to people leaving the profession often due to retirement.
- 13.3 The Authority considered the impact of its decision to renew UKBHC's accreditation.

#### **Equality duty under the Equality Act 2010**

- 14.1 The Authority considered UKBHC's approach to equality and diversity through its handling of complaints under Standard 11.
- 14.2 The Authority had due regard to its duty under the Equality Act 2010 when considering its decision to reaccredit.