

# ACTION NOTE

## Review of DHSSPS Commissioned Cancer Education Programmes

### Meeting of the Working Group held on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2010 at NIPEC

#### In attendance

L Barrowman (LB) – NIPEC – Chair  
K Dunne (KD) – NEDC  
P Fearon (PF) - NIPEC  
S Foster (SF) – NI Hospice  
L Gribben (LG) - BMC  
L Henderson (LH) - NICaN  
R Henry (RH) – QUB  
B McGrath (BMcG) – WHSCT via telephone

#### Apologies

W Boyd-Carson (WBC) - SEHSCT  
S Campalani (SC) – BHSCT  
L England (LE) - WHSCT  
E McGaughan (EMcG) - UU  
B McShane (BMcS) - BHSCT  
D Robinson (DR) - BHSCT

Agenda item/ reference number	Action to be taken	Action by
1.0 Welcome and Introductions	LB welcomed everyone to the meeting. As BMcG was joining via telephone, introductions were given.	
2.0 Apologies	Apologies noted.	
3.0 Review of Palliative Care Training	<p>Palliative Care Programmes were reviewed in terms of clarity, target audience and possible over lap of content were discussed. It was agreed there was a need to clearly identify the target audience.</p> <p>Discussion ensued in relation to the appropriate Sector to deliver specific programmes. As a point of principle it was agreed programmes for generalists should be provided by the In service Consortia, whilst programmes directed at more specialist areas should be provided by the Universities.</p> <p>Whilst this model could be applied to most programmes, exceptions were noted.</p> <p>Concerns were raised that if exceptions to the model were not clearly defined that confusion and overlap of programmes could ensue. Suggestions were forwarded to address this.</p>	

	<p>It was agreed a distinction must be made between cancer and non cancer palliative care courses as they address different needs. The education providers will ensure clarity in course outlines to reflect this distinction.</p> <p>It was agreed that future programmes should involve engagement and consultation with the NICaN Supportive and Palliative Care Network.</p> <p>It was agreed that the report would recommend future proofing courses for a 3-5 year period, it was agreed it would be difficult to extend this further.</p> <p>The need for user involvement in the commissioning process was discussed and it was agreed that this is required. It was suggested this could be addressed by utilising the current mechanisms within NICaN, i.e. the NICaN Public and Patient Involvement Forum.</p>	
<p><b>4.0 Review of Draft Report</b></p>	<p>The Draft Report was reviewed and amendments made to reflect the discussion and recommendations of the group.</p>	
<p><b>5.0 Any Other Business</b></p>	<p>No other business.</p>	