

## Accredited Registers Programme

### Accreditation Panel's Decision

Application for renewal from:	UK Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP)
Panel meeting:	11 November 2015 ( <b>accreditation suspended</b> ) 18 January 2016 ( <b>accreditation renewed</b> )
Accreditation valid from:	11 November 2015 – 11 November 2016

The [Professional Standards Authority](#) accredits registers of people working in a variety of unregulated health and social care occupations. To be accredited, organisations holding such registers must prove that they meet our demanding [Standards for Accredited Registers \(the Standards\)](#). Accreditation is reviewed every twelve months.

The Accreditation Panel reviewed the accreditation of the register held by UKCP. Panel members reviewed the annual review application form, an updated risk matrix, UKCP's query sheet responses and a summary report from the Accreditation team. The Panel had to review UKCP's compliance with the Standards and decide whether or not to **renew accreditation, renew accreditation with conditions, suspend accreditation** or **remove accreditation**. The Panel could also make recommendations in the form of:

- **Conditions** – changes that must be made in order to gain accreditation.
- **Instructions** – actions that would improve practice but do not affect compliance with the Standards and that the Panel requires to be implemented and be satisfied of appropriate implementation within a given timeframe
- **Learning points** – actions that would benefit the operation of the register, the implementation of which would be verified during the annual review of accreditation

The Panel noted the assessment carried out by the Accreditation team for the annual review included:

- Documentary review (annual review form, query sheet response and risk matrix)
- Due Diligence checks and Patient/Service User journey
- Review of call for information responses and concerns received during the year of accreditation.

There were no declarations of interest from members of the Panel. A summary of matters considered by the Panel is set out in the Annex. The summary is not intended to reflect all of the matters discussed by the Panel, but to record those that were most important in forming its decision.

## Outcome

At the meeting on 11 November 2015 the Panel was not satisfied that UKCP continued to meet the Standards for Accreditation. It found that UKCP did not meet Standards 7f, 10b, 11b, 11c, 11d and 11e. Also as a result of shortcomings identified in those Standards, the Panel was not fully satisfied that Standards 2 and 5 were met. The Panel decided to **suspend accreditation**.

UKCP was given an opportunity to submit further evidence to address the shortcomings identified in the Annex within a timeframe set by the Panel. UKCP engaged positively with the Authority and submitted further evidence. The Panel reviewed that evidence in a reconvened meeting on 18 January 2016 when it decided to lift the suspension and **renew accreditation**.

The renewed accreditation is valid from 11 November 2015 to 11 November 2016.

## Conditions, Instructions and Learning Points

The Panel provided the following **Learning point** to be verified at the next annual review of accreditation:

1. UKCP to consider the length of time for which sanctions issued to registrants, that are not time-limited, should be published and to address this within its Publication of decisions policy

The Panel confirmed that no Conditions or Instructions would be issued as a result of the annual review of accreditation.

## Annex – Accreditation Panel’s Decision – application for renewal of accreditation

<b>Applicant:</b> <a href="#">UK Council for Psychotherapy</a> (UKCP)	<b>Outcome:</b>
<b>Panel meeting date:</b> 11 November 2015 / 18 January 2016	<b>11 November 2015:</b> <b>Suspended</b>
	<b>18 January 2016:</b> <b>Accreditation renewed</b>
<b>Update on Condition issued in the previous year</b>	
<p>The Panel for UKCP’s initial application for accreditation noted that UKCP had developed a conflict of interest policy which applied to assessors involved in its initial assessment, and quinquennial reviews, of its Organisational Members (OMs). The policy, however, did not cover the review of potential conflict of interest within OMs. UKCP had been instructed to include management of potential conflicts of interest when assessing OMs.</p> <p>At the last annual review (2014) the Panel considered that the instruction issued in the initial decision to accredit UKCP’s register had not been implemented within the timeframe provided (annual review of accreditation). The Panel stated that non-implementation of an instruction by an accredited register was a matter of concern, because it accepted assurances by the register that it would be implemented and made their decision on this basis. The Panel agreed that the instruction should be escalated to a condition of accreditation. The condition below was required to be completed by 27 February 2015:</p> <p>‘UKCP must implement the previous instruction in the Panel’s decision letter of 11 November 2013. This instruction was accepted by UKCP but was not implemented by the due date. The instruction was: ‘UKCP must document its practices for reviewing possible conflicts of interest within its initial assessment of Organisational Members (OMs) and during quinquennial reviews. Timeframe: annual review of</p>	<p>The Panel noted that this Condition, which had previously been set as an Instruction and escalated to a Condition, had been met within the given timeframe.</p>

<p>accreditation.’ The condition must be implemented by 27 February 2015 and non-implementation may lead to suspension or removal of accreditation’.</p> <p>UKCP submitted evidence for this condition by the required timeframe. On 3 March 2015 the Panel found that the condition had been met and would therefore be removed from UKCP’s accreditation. UKCP’s register was then accredited with no conditions for the remainder of the accreditation period.</p> <p>During the previous annual review UKCP advised that it was further reviewing the questionnaire completed by OMs during their assessment. UKCP provided a draft, which contains a section relating to conflicts of interest. UKCP expected this work to be completed by March 2016.</p>	
<p><b>Update on Instructions issued in the previous year</b></p>	
<p>The Panel had provided the following Instruction to be implemented by the timeframe provided or by annual review of accreditation as specified below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ‘UKCP must ensure that sanctions against a practitioner following a professional conduct hearing are displayed (or a marker provided) in search tools where the public may find registrants (e.g. the Find-A-Therapist directory). This should be implemented by annual review of accreditation’.</li> </ol> <p>At the previous annual review the Panel noted that a member of the public accessing a registrant through the Find-A-Therapist service will not be notified of an active sanction through the service or the individual registrant’s profile page (and UKCP does not display suspended or removed registrants). The Panel considered that this may not allow the public to easily make informed decisions about practitioners.</p> <p>UKCP informed that sanctions against a practitioner following a professional conduct hearing are displayed in search tools where the public may find registrants. The Panel</p>	<p>The Panel had not been satisfied that this instruction had been implemented and further considered UKCP’s response in its review of Standards 2,5,10 and 11.</p> <p>The Panel expressed concern about the extent to which the public would be able to make informed choices about registrants when using the Find-a-Therapist service. Where a register operates two methods of search it needs to ensure that the public are still able to find the information they need to make decisions about which registrants they choose to see.</p>

<p>noted that the Therapist Register displays a marker against a registrant to indicate that a sanction is in place and that a link to the complaints decisions page is provided.</p> <p>The team asked UKCP to confirm that a marker will be displayed when the search is made using the Find-A-Therapist tool as well as when accessing the register. The UKCP responded that it was not technically possible to do so in the current tool but will be a requirement for development of UKCP's new website for 2016. The UKCP confirmed that markers do appear on the register tool and signpost to the complaints decisions page.</p> <p>In further evidence submitted after the 11 November meeting the UKCP advised it had added a statement 'Sanction in place – please see <a href="http://www.ukcp.org.uk/complaints-decisions">http://www.ukcp.org.uk/complaints-decisions</a>' to the Find-a-Therapist individual profile of registrants with current sanctions, so that the public can make an informed choice. Where a registrant does not have a live Find-A-Therapist profile, a minimal profile will be made accessible from UKCP's therapist register containing this statement.</p>	<p>At the 18 January meeting the Panel noted the change implemented by UKCP and was satisfied that this instruction had been met. The Panel noted that the team would monitor implementation of equivalent functions on UKCP's new website, when published.</p>
<p><b>Update on Learning Points issued in the previous year</b></p>	
<p>In 2014, the Panel had provided the following Learning Points to be revisited at the annual review of accreditation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UKCP should consider ensuring suspended or removed registrants are visible on its register with the relevant sanction displayed against their name.</li> </ol> <p>(Note: this learning point had also been issued the previous year)</p> <p>UKCP has advised it will consider this Learning Point for its new website to be released in early 2016 and will also seek legal advice on this matter.</p>	<p>The Panel noted that the first learning point is now due for consideration in 2016. All other learning points had been addressed.</p>

<p>The team reported that UKCP had taken action in respect of the remaining three learning points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. UKCP should consider further how it may offer support to those unable to make complaints in writing.</li> <li>3. UKCP should provide an update on the five year re-accreditation process.</li> <li>4. UKCP should document its policy on reporting concerns to other relevant agencies when that is needed to protect the public.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Standard 1: holds a voluntary register for health and/or social care occupations</b></p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>
<p><b>Standard 2: committed to protecting the public and promoting public confidence</b></p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.</p>	<p>At the 11 November 2015 meeting the Panel was not fully satisfied that this Standard was met. The Panel considered that UKCP needed to rectify the matters discussed under Standards 10 and 11 in order to demonstrate commitment to protecting the public and promoting public confidence.</p> <p>At its 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel found that the evidence provided by</p>

	UKCP rectified the matters discussed under Standards 10 and 11. The Panel agreed that as a result it was now satisfied that Standard 2 was met.
<b>Standard 3: risks</b>	
No risks have been added to or removed from the updated risk matrix. The Panel noted that UKCP continued to review and revise the matrix.	The Panel found this Standard was met.
<b>Standard 4: Financial sustainability</b>	
There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. As part of its due diligence the Accreditation team reviewed records from Companies House and the Charity Commission and noted that the UKCP appeared to continue to be financially sustainable.	The Panel found this Standard was met.
<b>Standard 5: capacity to inspire confidence</b>	
The Panel noted that UKCP had met the Condition previously imposed on its accreditation: UKCP had added a section covering the management of potential conflicts of interest to its assessment questionnaire for Organisational Members. This was necessary because UKCP relies in part upon assurance of its registrants by its Organisational Members.	At the 11 November 2015 meeting the Panel was not fully satisfied that this Standard was met. The Panel considered that UKCP needed to rectify the matters set out under Standards 10 and 11 in order to demonstrate its capacity to inspire confidence.  At its 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel found that the evidence provided by

	UKCP rectified matters set out under Standards 10 and 11. The Panel agreed that as a result Standard 5 was met.
<b>Standard 6: knowledge base</b>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. The team noted the comments made in UKCP's most recent Trustees Report: 'We jointly led one of the strands of work of the We Need to Talk coalition around NICE and expanding the evidence base for psychotherapy'.</p> <p>The team noted that the mental health charity MIND published the coalition's November 2014 <a href="#">briefing for commissioners</a> to highlight the benefits of talking therapies and considerations to make when commissioning a service.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.
<b>Standard 7: governance</b>	
<p>UKCP currently has an interim chief executive, pending recruitment for a permanent post. UKCP's annual <a href="#">Report and Financial Statement</a> highlights UKCP's aims, achievements and performance for the previous year, including public engagement. UKCP had recently agreed to implement constitutional changes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 'creation of a more strategic board of trustees'</li> <li>• UKCP's Psychotherapy Council to be replaced by 'Members Forum'</li> <li>• The creation of a new Executive Committee that leads on the implementation of strategy.</li> </ul> <p>UKCP plans to launch its new website in 2016 and aims to 'provide more information to the public about different types of therapy and how to access this'. The Accreditation</p>	<p>At its meeting on 11 November 2015 meeting, the Panel was not satisfied that Standard 7f (effective communication with the public) was met.</p> <p>When reviewing Standard 7 the Panel noted constitutional changes being implemented by UKCP and recent changes in governance. The Panel noted that as part of its assessment, the Accreditation team had undertaken its 'patient/service user journey'. The Panel took account of UKCP's plans for its website and opportunities for future</p>



<p>team had carried out a 'patient/service user' journey and had not highlighted any issues, other than those discussed relating to its register.</p>	<p>revisions of content. However, it considered that UKCP needed to address the issues identified in the Instruction, Learning Point 1, Standard 10 and Standard 11, in order to comply fully with Standard 7f.</p> <p>At its 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel found that the evidence provided by UKCP demonstrated it was addressing issues regarding its communication with the public (including those making complaints against registrants) and had addressed issues identified under Standards 10 and 11. The Panel agreed that as a result Standard 7 was met.</p>
<p><b>Standard 8: setting standards for registrants</b></p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. UKCP advises it is reviewing its Standards of Education and Training as well as its Ethical Principles and Code of Professional Conduct as part of its routine review of their policies.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>
<p><b>Standard 9: education and training</b></p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. UKCP is reviewing its Education and Training standards as noted above.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>

## Standard 10: the register

There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. The team had checked UKCP's Continuing Professional Development (CPD) policy and 2014 CPD Audit report, and observed that a sample of UKCP registrants' supervision, CPD, and current indemnity insurance were checked.

The audit recommended improvements on guidance for registrants in future audits and for registrants selected to provide evidence of current Disclosure and Barring Service certification when working with children and if required to have one by their Organisational Member or employer.

At its meeting on 11 November 2015 the Panel found that Standard 10b (maintains a register that is accurate, easily accessible to the public and supports all those using it to make informed decisions) was not met.

The Panel was concerned that members of the public may not be able to find information about disciplinary action, sanctions or suspensions with sufficient ease. This was based on UKCP's current publication of decisions policy (discussed under Standard 11) and the Instruction about the Find-A-Therapist directory (which had not been implemented within the timeframe provided, as discussed above). The outcome of not addressing Learning Point 1 also added to the Panel's concerns. The Panel considered however that some method of flagging up concerns should be possible through use of content, such as making clear that if a registrant's name is not found, users should be advised to check the register's complaints decisions page.

The Panel considered that these shortfalls impacted on UKCP's ability to maintain a register that is easily accessible and

supports all those using it to make informed decisions.

At its 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel found that the evidence provided by UKCP demonstrated that it now met Standard 10b. The Panel noted that members of the public accessing registrants through the Find-A-Therapist directory will be notified of sanctions within the registrant's individual profile. The Panel noted that when a registrant does not have a Find-a-Therapist profile, clicking through from the register will provide a minimal record which also notifies of the sanction. Registrants will be unable to amend this information on their profile. The Panel noted that UKCP will publish a registrant's sanction until considered completed by UKCP, as discussed below. In addition, UKCP has included information on their 'About our registers' webpage to make the reasons why someone may not appear on the register clearer to the public. The new website (to be launched in 2016) will ensure that this message is visible on the register search tool for practitioners 'not found' by the user of the register.

## Standard 11: complaints and concerns

UKCP's review of its Complaints and Conduct Procedure 2012 (CCP12) had been expected to have been completed by July 2014. At the previous annual review UKCP advised it then aimed to implement its revised CCP, following further consultation and Board approval, by October 2015. The Panel noted at that time that the review was taking longer than expected and felt that the revised CCP should be fully implemented by next annual review of accreditation or UKCP's compliance with the accreditation Standards could be affected. The UKCP confirmed to the accreditation team that the Complaints and Conduct Procedure 2015 (CCP15) had been published and was in force as of 31 October 2015. UKCP advised the review was completed in time with its planned timeframe.

At UKCP's initial assessment for accreditation the Panel had asked UKCP to consider the public interest in reserving its right to appeal the decision of an Adjudication Panel for being 'unduly severe'. The Panel considered this policy may present a conflict of interest and affect UKCP's ability to comply with the Standards. The Panel considered that having the right to appeal decisions that were 'unduly lenient' would be in line with UKCP's commitment to protect the public. UKCP provided the Panel its assurance that it would not appeal decisions on the grounds that they were unduly severe and that this would be reflected in an updated CCP. The UKCP then advised that under the CCP15, they took the decision to retain the ability to appeal against a sanction that is unduly severe. UKCP informed that the reason for this was because UKCP's CCP was not punitive – its purpose was to maintain integrity of the register.

Following the Panel's decision to suspend accreditation, UKCP advised that it had amended section 8.4 of the CCP15 to remove UKCP's ability to appeal a complaints decision it believed to be unduly severe. UKCP further provided the reasons it had considered for making the change when reviewing the CCP12. The sanctioned registrant is able to appeal a decision they believe to be unduly severe.

At its 11 November 2015 meeting the Panel found that Standards 11b, 11c, 11d, and 11e, were not met.

The Panel noted that UKCP had reversed its previous decision and the CCP15 allowed it to appeal cases it considered unduly severe. The Panel noted UKCP's explanation that its process was not intended to be punitive but to maintain the integrity of the register should a panel disregard the advice of the UKCP Legal Assessor and come to a perverse decision. However, the Panel considered that UKCP's position was inconsistent and did not inspire confidence in its primary role to protect the public. This impacted compliance with standards 2, 5 and 11d.

At its meeting in January, the Panel noted that UKCP had removed its ability to appeal complaints decisions believed to

UKCP highlighted that the CCP15 allows UKCP to continue with its complaints process if a registrant resigns or lapses their registration during the process. The clause states that: *“If the Registrant resigns from the UKCP register, or fails to renew UKCP membership, after a complaint has been received by UKCP, the complaint will still proceed pursuant to this procedure unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Case Manager determines it would not be reasonable or in the public interest for it to do so”*. UKCP stated this would allow it the discretion to continue a complaint against a registrant who has lapsed their membership or resigned when it is in the public interest for UKCP to do so.

The Panel’s initial decision to accredit the UKCP’s register in November 2013 stated:

‘The Panel noted that UKCP’s publication policy for complaints hearing decisions states that determinations will be published for 12 months, which may cause scope for confusion should sanctions be issued for longer periods. UKCP confirmed that decisions will be kept online until the sanction has been complied with, and that it will review its policy to ensure it is in line with the actual timeframes of sanctions issued. The AVR team advised that removals from the register should be published for a reasonable timeframe’.

The Panel’s decision to renew accreditation of UKCP’s register last year stated:

‘The Panel noted that UKCP had not yet completed the review of the policy and the team had been advised its practice had not changed. UKCP advised that the publication policy is owned by its recently reconstituted Ethics Committee. The Panel noted UKCP’s statement that this is a priority for the Ethics Committee and the complaints team.’

For the annual review this year the team asked UKCP if at present, a sanction issued for a period of over 12 months would be maintained on the Complaints Decisions webpage for that period. UKCP informed that published decisions are listed for 12 months only but it planned to revise its publications policy later on in 2016. According to UKCP, at that time, the policy *may* change so that decisions are published for the duration of the

be unduly severe from the CCP15 and noted that the registrant retains the right to make such an appeal. The Panel was satisfied with the change to the CCP15.

The Panel was earlier concerned that UKCP had not implemented its revised Publication of decisions policy when it said it would and that non-implementation impacted on UKCP’s ability to comply with Standard 10b.

At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted changes made to UKCP’s Publication of decisions policy. The Panel considered that its concerns had been addressed in the current policy and noted that the policy would be reviewed further in 2016.

The Panel discussed that some possible sanctions issued by Adjudication Panels, such as warnings, did not appear to be time-limited and it was unclear for how long such sanctions would be published. The Panel decided to issue UKCP a

sanction. The consequence of this policy was that, in theory, a case involving a registrant with a sanction against their name could be removed from the website before UKCP was satisfied of the registrant's compliance with the sanction. This would impact on the register users' ability to make an informed choice. UKCP provided its draft updated publication of decisions policy and advised that until this is formally approved, if a registrant receives a sanction in excess of 12 months UKCP will ask the Board of Trustees to agree to publish the decision for the duration of the sanction. The team noted that the draft policy states:

'All complaint decisions will remain on a psychotherapist's record for a period of two years, or until all sanctions are considered to be completed, whichever is earlier'.

Following the Panel meeting on 11 November 2015 UKCP advised it had revised its Publication of Decisions Policy to confirm that all complaints decisions will remain published on the UKCP's website until the sanction has been considered completed by UKCP and in line with the timeframe of the sanction issued. UKCP confirmed that decisions to remove a registrant would remain on the UKCP website for five years from the date of the decision.

UKCP had also removed the 'Alternative Dispute Resolution' (ADR) process from the CCP15. The team asked UKCP to clarify how it would continue to meet the outcome described in Standard 11b:

'Encourages early resolution of complaints including use of mediation where appropriate and it has adequate monitoring arrangements in place to identify matters that require disciplinary action'.

UKCP explained that they had separated ADR from the CCP and intended to carry out a review of ADR in 2016. In the meantime if complaints come to their attention that might benefit from mediation, they would consider it on a case by case basis.

Following the Panel meeting on 11 November 2015 the UKCP had provided its ADR procedure and referenced this within the updated CCP15 and its information leaflets.

Learning Point to consider for how long sanctions that are not time-limited would be published and amend its policy accordingly.

At its meeting on 11 November 2015 the Panel noted that UKCP would review its use of ADR in 2016 and in the meantime would facilitate mediation on a case by case basis. The Panel stated that there was lack of clarity for the public and the absence of a procedure and criteria for early resolution of complaints impacted on compliance with standard 11b.

At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted UKCP had provided its Alternative Dispute Resolution procedure. The Panel noted that text in the amended CCP15

UKCP will further review the ADR policy in 2016. UKCP stated it considered ADR to be of fundamental importance however should only be for complaints that do not allege a public safety risk or that a registrant's ability to practise without restriction has been called into question.

The CCP15 (section 2.1.2) stated that UKCP may consider any complaint relating to 'serious professional incompetence'. The team had asked what test or definition UKCP would apply to decide whether professional incompetence is serious. UKCP informed that 'it refers to behavior which falls short of the standards that would normally be expected of a professional in the circumstances'.

Following the Panel meeting on 11 November 2015, the Clinic for Boundaries Studies raised a concern with the team about updated guidance leaflets for registrants involved in UKCP complaints processes. The guidance stated that registrants will not be in breach of confidentiality requirements when providing information to UKCP in response to a complaint, as the complainant waives the right to confidentiality when making the

and leaflets stated, 'ADR offers the opportunity to resolve disputes in a fair and transparent way while avoiding the stress and emotional toll of a formal complaints process where the CCP is not appropriate'. This makes clear that the formal complaints process cannot be avoided if allegations require UKCP to deal with concerns under the CCP15 instead of ADR.

The Panel noted that section 2.1.2 of CCP15 stated that UKCP may consider any complaint relating to 'serious professional incompetence'. It considered that the definition provided by UKCP was unclear as it appeared to refer to 'personal behavior' instead of 'technical competence'.

At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted UKCP had removed the word 'serious' from section 2.1.2 of the CCP15 and associated materials. The Panel noted the reasoning provided by UKCP as to why the word 'serious' had originally been included.

The Panel noted that after discussion with the team about the matter raised by the Clinic for Boundaries Studies, UKCP advised it will add a sentence to its guidance stating the registrant 'should

complaint. The Clinic stated there was a risk registrants could provide irrelevant confidential information in order to embarrass and dissuade complainants from pursuing their case. UKCP responded that registrants must use their clinical judgement when disclosing information that is necessary to their complaint.

UKCP's annual review form stated that nine cases were heard by UKCP in the last year. The Complaints Decisions page listed three removals/suspensions. UKCP's publications policy requires it to publish all cases where an allegation is determined to be well founded. The team asked UKCP if the remaining cases were not well founded. The UKCP responded with a breakdown of eight cases heard, stating one was a part-heard meeting held on two dates. The team checked the list was in line with UKCP's published decisions.

only disclose information that is necessary and relevant.'

The Panel discussed a complaint that appeared to have been discontinued by UKCP outside of the CCP12 process due to the length of time the case had taken and its consideration by multiple UKCP panels. The Panel noted that although UKCP's decision may be in line with principles of natural justice for the registrant, it may not however have demonstrated to the complainant that UKCP had acted to protect the public. The original allegation, regarding a breach of confidentiality had not been addressed conclusively. The Panel noted that the removal of the Preliminary Enquiry Committee (PEC) from the CCP15 may prevent similar occurrences in future.

At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted UKCP's statement that it recognized the adverse impact that the duration of these proceedings may have had on both parties and that it is confident that the CCP15's more robust screening process and lessons learned will assist to avoid similar situations occurring in future.



The team reviewed and summarised for the Panel four concerns about the UKCP's complaints processes raised with the Authority since the last annual review of accreditation, which included one case from the sample the Panel asked the team to audit in 2014.

In two cases the team identified that technical language used in correspondence may not be easily understandable to those making complaints, for example in one case:

'we do not consider that the evidence you have provided demonstrates a reasonable prospect that the respective therapist has breached UKCP's Ethical Principles and Code of Professional or that his fitness to practise is impaired'.

In the second case the team noted there was possibility for confusion about grounds for appeal against a decision made under the CCP12 in the UKCP's communication with a registrant. The following advice to the complainant was unclear as to whether the 'second criterion' refers to '*renders its decision unsafe*' in Grounds for Appeal A, or refers to the CCP12's Grounds for Appeal B:

'This means that whilst the first criterion was fulfilled, the second was not and as such the case did not meet the threshold to progress to an Appeal hearing.'

At the 11 November meeting the Panel discussed concerns raised about UKCP with the Authority during the year. The Panel noted that a decision by UKCP's panel related to an allegation of breach of confidentiality had been made without being properly documented in the panel meeting minutes, which could impact on UKCP's compliance with Standard 11e. The Panel stated that reasons for decisions should be clearly recorded.

The Panel noted from concerns raised with the Accreditation team that language used by UKCP may not be easily understandable to those making complaints, particularly in relation to explaining the reasons for decisions made. The Panel noted this could impact on UKCP's compliance with Standard 11e.

The Panel noted UKCP's statement that it is currently undertaking an audit of all its communications and communications around the complaints and conduct process will be included in this.

At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted UKCP's Communicating Complaints Clearly review plan outlining how it aims to explain and communicate its decisions more clearly. The Panel

In another case, the complainant contacted the team regarding the handling of their complaint against a UKCP registrant, alleging the registrant violated sexual boundaries. The case went to hearing where the UKCP Adjudication Panel had found that based on the evidence the allegations were unfounded and dismissed the case. There was no route of appeal as the case had been dismissed and a sanction was not issued. The team noted that UKCP had appeared to follow its process. However, the complainant had also raised concerns about the composition of the Adjudication Panel, which was all male. The Adjudication Panel, having decided that the complainant was not a credible witness, did not call the therapist for questioning. This was in line with CCP12 section 9.22.3:

‘9.22.3 when appropriate, the AP may withdraw to consider whether sufficient evidence has been produced. If it believes that insufficient evidence was produced it must dismiss the allegation without hearing evidence from the registrant’

Theme identified: Communications

From its review of these cases the team noted that UKCP appeared to be following its complaints processes and is generally communicating within the timeframes stated in its policies.

The team suggested however, that in line with Standards 11e (*Makes sound decisions that are [...] explained clearly*) and 7f (*Communicates effectively with the public and its registrants. In particular it ensures that the information it provides about its registrants and their occupation(s) helps service users to make informed decisions*) UKCP could consider how information provided to parties at all stages of its complaints processes could best inform them of decisions made, the reasoning behind such decisions and further avenues available under its processes.

emphasized the importance of providing and recording clear reasons for decisions made by UKCP officers and panels dealing with complaints.

The Panel discussed a concern regarding the handling of a complaint alleging breaches of sexual boundaries. The Panel noted that the case had been dismissed by the Adjudication Panel. There was no route of appeal as a sanction had not been issued by the Adjudication Panel. The Panel noted that the case had been dismissed without hearing the registrant and the procedural reasons for that (based on advice from the UKCP legal assessor), but remained concerned that the evidence had not been appropriately tested. The Panel considered the selection of an all-male panel in a sexual boundaries allegation had been insensitive. It also concluded that the handling of this case whilst it may have been in line with UKCP’s processes, was not compatible with good practice set out in the Authority’s ‘Clear sexual boundaries between healthcare professionals and patients: guidance for fitness to practise panels.’ The Panel considered that issues raised by this case and other concerns raised with the team could affect the

	<p>public's perception of UKCP's handling of complaints.</p> <p>At the 18 January 2016 meeting the Panel noted UKCP's reflections about this case, including that it will provide new Adjudication Panel members and Chairs with the Authority's guidance 'Clear Sexual Boundaries between Healthcare Professionals and Patients'.</p> <p>At the 11 November 2015 meeting the Panel noted that the concerns raised with the Authority also impacted on compliance with Standard 11c. Following its review at the 18 January 2016 meeting of further evidence submitted by UKCP the Panel agreed that Standard 11c was fully met.</p>
<p><b>Call for Information</b></p>	
<p>The Accreditation team received one response to the Call for Information, however brief information was provided and consent was not given to pass to UKCP for its comment. Therefore, the team did not take it into account during assessment.</p> <p>The team received eight complaints/concerns raised about the UKCP since the previous annual review of accreditation. Three of these were related to the UKCP's <i>Memorandum of Understanding on Conversion Therapy in the UK</i>. The team responded to these concerns in line with the Authority's previous statements on this matter.</p>	

<p>One concern was raised about UKCP’s handling of a complaint prior to the launch of the Accredited Registers programme and so the team advised it fell outside of the programme’s jurisdiction.</p> <p>Another concern alleged that a UKCP registrant was advertising on a third party website that they ‘only saw Christian clients’. The Panel noted that UKCP had investigated and acknowledged the registrant’s actions to immediately remove the advertisement. The registrant had stated it was likely placed by a former client providing false details, stating they had never used that service. The UKCP did not take further action against the registrant.</p> <p>Other concerns raised were discussed in Standard 11, above.</p>	
<p><b>Equality duty</b></p>	
<p>The Panel must consider the Authority’s equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 when considering an application for renewal of accreditation.</p>	<p>The Panel had regard to its duty under the Equality Act 2010 when considering this application for renewal of accreditation.</p>
<p><b>Impact Assessment</b></p>	
<p>The impact assessment remains largely unchanged since last year.</p>	<p>In making its decision in November to suspend accreditation, the Panel took account of the impact of its decision on the public, UKCP, and its registrants. It considered all of the options available to it, including use of Conditions, but concluded that UKCP’s pace of action on previous recommendations did not give it sufficient confidence.</p>

The Panel therefore decided to suspend accreditation on 11 November 2015 until UKCP demonstrated that it met all of the Standards. On the 18 January 2016 the Panel reviewed further evidence and decided to renew accreditation.