

1

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 June 2018 14:54
To: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: Conversation with [REDACTED] at JCCP

George, [REDACTED]

As promised, a quick summary of my earlier conversation with [REDACTED]. If you recall, I tried to speak to him prior to the tele-KIT to determine JCCP's position on 'injectable' qualifications for medical professionals. (I'll get back to this later!)

1. Updated [REDACTED] on the MoU that he provided for information. I advised that, generally speaking, we considered it to be a workable document and that it was now with our legal advisors to see if they saw any issues with it. He was delighted with this development and awaits any further feedback. Still very keen to establish a formal working arrangement with SQA Accreditation.
2. I provided an update on what we thought Scot Gov's position is now likely to be following the tele-KIT. Again, the suggestion of govt support for accredited/regulated quals at SCQF Level 10 and above was welcomed and is in line with JCCP stance. [REDACTED] is very much up to speed on the content of the EDuQual qualification and should it be accredited, will be actively promoting it/them down south as an alternative to the existing IQ qualification. (He is aware that EduQual is actively pursuing Ofqual recognition and has spoken about the application. I assume to offer support and seek a way of speeding things along.)
3. Broader discussion took place regarding the current IQ Injectables qual at Level 7. Although recognised by Ofqual, JCCP consider this to be a 'weak' qualification, based upon the old HEA(?) standard and doesn't have a sufficiently practical/clinical focus in terms of assessment. Said standard is now passed to the JCCP and have been updated to address the weaknesses. They have tried to negotiate with IQ around upgrading the qual but to no avail. (The qual remains live until May 2019). However, JCCP are so unhappy with the stance taken by IQ and concerned about the weakness of the qualification that they have raised the matter with Ofqual. The important thing for us, I guess, is that we hold off accrediting this qualification until it has been 'refreshed' against the revised standard....should IQ bring it forward of course.
4. Now on to the confidential points. [REDACTED] advised that the CPSA website, www.cosmeticstandards.org.uk, will shortly (by the end of the month) contain a competency framework which has been developed from the standard. They are keen that this underpins any qualification development in the area of injectables and complements the standard and supervisory framework which is already present. He stressed that he was sharing this info in a spirit of co-operation, knowing that Karen is working with EduQual on the accred submission. EduQual are unaware of this impending development and [REDACTED] is keen that we do not share the information until it is published. He agreed that it is likely to result in some tweaks/changes to the submission but is also of the opinion that as the EduQual qualification is based on the update standard, it should not result in a major piece of work for Jason and his team.
5. Second (really) confidential point. Again, provided in the spirit of co-operation but not for sharing on an official level. The Department of Health, having created a Cosmetics

Regulation Team (CRT), are now considering a JCCP proposal to debar non-medical staff/individuals from undertaking qualifications at Level 6 and Level 7 in injectables. This was mooted a few years back but although Dept of Health was supportive, Treasury knocked it back as they saw the growth this sector as something of a financial bonus. However, [REDACTED] feels that the public health argument is now gaining sway and this is reflected in the existence of the CRT and the fact that they are willing to revisit this option.

6. Lastly, going back to the original point regarding the need for medical professionals to undertake these qualification, [REDACTED] reiterated that this is very much the JCCP stance. Evidence supported the fact that an assumption that being a medical practitioner confers the necessary skillset to deliver injectable to be flawed. Since we last spoke, he indicated that the GMC has accepted this line of thinking and is giving consideration to 'credentialing' for medical professionals seeking to operate in this area within the next couple of years. Some general blurb on credentialing here <https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/projects/credentialing>

All in all, it was a useful conversation and reinforced [REDACTED] belief that we have a pretty robust qualification pending through EduQual. Also, that we appear to thinking along the same lines as the JCCP on how to 'manage' this sector. I advised that we would likely seek a meeting with JCCP no later than September.

Hope this helps.

[REDACTED]

2

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 May 2018 16:46
To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Subject: EduQual - Diploma in Injectables

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

Good to speak to you earlier. As discussed, it sounds very much as if we are singing from the same hymn sheet and we would be happy to consider some kind of arrangement for sharing information around the approval of qualifications and subsequent regulation.

It would be useful to see the agreement that you have with our colleagues at Ofqual to see if we can replicate it in the same way. Also, we are happy to contact you again around September with a view to a meeting as we will be in London to meet our EduQual colleagues.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

3

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 October 2019 12:31
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: FW: Advice re regulators

FYI

4

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 October 2019 11:32
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Advice re regulators

Good morning [REDACTED]

Some initial thoughts of my own have been added below.

However, I have forwarded the questions on to our senior management team for thoughts/consideration. I'll get back to you as soon as I get an 'official' position.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

5

From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Sent: 06 October 2019 08:22
To: [REDACTED]@ofqual.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: FW: Advice re regulators

[REDACTED]

Could you advise on this please. Seems a grey area.

[REDACTED]

6

From: [REDACTED]@northumbria.ac.uk>
Sent: 04 October 2019 16:51
To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: Advice re regulators

Hi [REDACTED],

Having recently undertaken several review of qualifications for AOs and providers, we have hit some queries regarding the following which I have discussed with [REDACTED]

- **Who owns qualifications awarded by AOs?**- we think AOs do My initial thought is that we would adopt the same position. This is based upon the fact that our key stakeholder in the accreditation process is the AB/AO. It is the AB/AO that seeks accreditation of a qualification and we contract with such organisations for that purpose. (Of course, a definition of the term 'own' might be an issue. Particularly when considering the question around intellectual property rights.)
- **Who is responsible for making required amendments to qualifications to meet JCCP standards?**- we think AOs are but they are pushing it back to providers and asking them to undertake this or pay for specialist consultant advice/input. Again, I tend to agree but only to a point. For example, in the case of SVQs, the body that would lead the amendment process would be an SSC/SSB. AB/AOs would be part of this process but they wouldn't necessarily directly undertake the development work. However, for the majority of other non-SVQ accredited qualifications, we would expect the AB/AO to undertake the work but in conjunction with the sector, which should include providers.
- **Who own the intellectual property of the content of courses developed to meet the AO specification?** - we think the providers do if they have developed it- currently some AOs are asking them to hand this over for the AO to exploit ,despite the provider putting in significant investment (hence to legal challenges currently occurring between some AOs and providers) Again, broadly speaking, I would agree with your position but I wonder if the actions you describe are being coloured by what is stated in any contractual agreement between the AB/AO and provider?

■■■■ suggested you might use your connections at Ofqual to ask these questions in a generic way rather than specifically regarding any particular organisation and same again with SQA?

Speak to ■■■■ if you need more info as I'm away for 2 weeks

Thanks

■■■■

7

From: ■■■■

Sent: 07 August 2018 10:50

To: ■■■■@jccp.org.uk>

Cc: ■■■■@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: FW: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Good morning ■■■■

Further to our telephone call, ■■■■ has confirmed that she would be happy for JCCP to undertake a little more investigation around the advert and offer a perspective on how to handle such scenarios. An opportunity for JCCP to highlight any concerns around such practice in general.

I've attached a copy of the screenshot for information. Original enquiry is part of the email chain.

Any queries, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind regards

■■■■

8

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2018 10:17
To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot'; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot;
[REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@ggc.scot.nhs.uk
Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Good morning [REDACTED]

Happy to meet on 23 October as requested. I'll add to my diary and await details.

I'll also liaise with [REDACTED] at JCCP regarding the advert and organisation in question.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

9

From: [REDACTED]@gov.scot <[REDACTED]@gov.scot>
Sent: 07 August 2018 09:42
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot;
[REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@ggc.scot.nhs.uk
Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Dear [REDACTED]

This is a very helpful reply. We would be delighted if you speak to [REDACTED] and follow-up on this business. We also wondered whether it is possible to meet with you and [REDACTED], plus the Chair of the cosmetic interventions regulation group, [REDACTED] (cc'd above) shortly before the next meeting (which is on the 23rd October). If that sounds possible, we will be in touch with dates, and aim to meet in Glasgow - where you and [REDACTED] work.

Best wishes, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Planning and Quality
Directorate of Healthcare Quality & Improvement
Health & Social Care
The Scottish Government
Room GE06
St Andrew's House
Regent Road, Edinburgh
EH1 3DG
[REDACTED]

10

From: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 06 August 2018 16:58

To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>; [REDACTED]@gov.scot>;

[REDACTED]@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

Many thanks for forwarding the information and screenshot. (Not sure if a single screenshot was the intention as the information/letter references others?)

In respect of your query regarding best practice and governance, first thing to say is that the advert by the Aesthetic Beauty Academy UK seems to be a good example of what we are led to believe, by our colleagues at the Joint Council of Cosmetic Practitioners (JCCP), occurs across much of the rest of the UK. In effect the discounting and packaging of (non-regulated) training courses, as well as practice, in the hope of generating business.

We undertook a little bit of research into this particular business which is based in Rotherham and with that in mind, the use of levels and the formatting of 'training' titles within the advert makes sense. In essence, it is a format that *could* be intended to lead stakeholders to believe that the provision is recognised by Ofqual and sits within the Regulated Qualifications Framework (RQF). It is also interesting to note that the Clinical and Training Director of the business concerned indicates that she holds qualifications in the areas identified in the advert but without reference to levels or specific awarding bodies:

<https://aestheticbeautyuk.co.uk/about-us/>

Certainly, as stated in the letter within your email, the assertion that there are no regulated Level 7 qualifications as described by the advert available within the UK is almost certainly correct. You will be aware, Industry Qualifications (IQ) Awarding Organisation does have the following qualification, *IQ Level 7 Certificate in Injectables for Aesthetic Medicine*, recognised by Ofqual but I would be surprised if this is what the advert is alluding to here.

I assume the advertisement to be in a trade magazine available across the UK and as such could impact upon Scottish learners/businesses. Particularly as the Clinical and Training Director is available to support other training centres as a teacher/assessor/IQA on a freelance basis. There is certainly nothing to stop them being available in Scotland but it is difficult to say if this is currently the case because they appear to be non-regulated.

We can, with your permission, speak to [REDACTED] at the JCCP to see if they are aware of this business and of any delivery in Scotland if you feel this would be useful. (I believe you already have a scheduled meeting with Paul on 19 September?)

All things considered, we would not consider this to be an acceptable advert as in a number of ways it is misleading. Certainly, if this provision was regulated by SQA Accreditation we would be engaging with the awarding body concerned to seek an understanding of how the centre is being managed and why it has been allowed to package provision in this way, to ensure that delivery was not comprised by such a process and remained fit for purpose, as well as insisting and that the qualifications are promoted correctly to stakeholders.

I hope this reply helps in some way and if you require any further feedback please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

█

11

From: █@gov.scot <█@gov.scot>

Sent: 06 August 2018 11:31

To: █@sqa.org.uk; █@sqa.org.uk

Cc: █@gov.scot; █@gov.scot; █@gov.scot

Subject: FW: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Dear █ and █

I look forward to meeting you █, at the next cosmetics intervention meeting. In the meantime we have been sent screen shot of advertisements for training courses (attached). We are not sure of the status of these in Scotland and would value your views as to whether the way they are worded is consistent with best practice and good governance ? Best wishes, Sara

█

Planning and Quality
Directorate of Healthcare Quality & Improvement
Health & Social Care
The Scottish Government
Room GE06
St Andrew's House
Regent Road, Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

█

12

From: █@doctors.org.uk

Sent: 04 August 2018 11:10

To: █@gov.scot

Cc: █@ggc.scot.nhs.uk; █@gov.scot;

█@ayrshire.ac.uk; █@gov.scot;

█@glasgow.gov.uk; █@gov.scot;

█@dermalclinic.co.uk; █@nhs.net; █@babtac.com;

█@aberdeenshire.gov.uk; █@ftt.scot;

█@gov.scot; █@templemedical.co.uk

Subject: Re: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Hello All,

Hope you are well.

I wanted to bring to the attention of all involved in Phase II the attached letter from Jane Freeman who is (as far as I am told) Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport.

██████████, one of the owners of the Face&Body Clinic in Edinburgh has been speaking with his MSP, advising him of the rise in non medics injecting, the harm many of them are causing, and the letter attached is the reply his MSP received.

I've read the letter twice and am still confused. The sentence that confuses me the most is "Through these meetings, should non-medically qualified individuals wish to undertake such work, a suitable course of study will be available to them, to enable them to do so".

Granted, I've missed a couple of meetings, but when was the above decided? Has this actually been decided by 'the powers that be'? In which case has the Phase II board merely been a futile exercise? This is in complete contradiction to what was discussed at the last meeting. There are other statements in the letter which are bold and seem to be plucked out of thin air.

I'd like to draw everyone's attention to the first image attached. A non medic has found a new way to make more money out of a pre-packed syringe intended for single person use. Use a small amount of the syringe for many people! Is she injecting everyone from the same syringe? Is she decanting it each time? Who knows? Does it matter? After all, she's allowed to do what she wants.

There was recently a picture on facebook that a non medic put up of her 'patients' post facial needling and PRP (where a patient's blood is taken, centrifuged and then re-injected into the face). The girls were covered in their own blood, hugging, their foreheads touching. This case was in England.

I know we need evidence to support our educated opinion backed by our experience, years of medical training and common sense. The calibre, morals and ethos of what we see on social media by many non medics is infuriating and dangerous. There is also an image attached of non medics teaching claiming to be offering "level 7" teaching. These people are out for financial gain. What they are doing is criminal and putting the public at risk. If we let them proceed, we are equally responsible for the resulting harm.

Attached is an image from 'NK aesthetics' detailing her/his qualifications. Not only are they a complete and utter farse but also lies. There is no level 7 course she/he could have completed in injectables since. She/he might believe they are level 7 qualified because of the lies from courses in the previous image.

I hope everyone on the board who is not on the front line is starting to get an impression of what non medics in Aesthetics are like. These are only a small handful of cases. I will happily send you another 50 (with no exaggeration). I hope the board is getting a sense of where their interests lay (financial gain) and perhaps most importantly, the limitations of their education, training and moral compass.

Sincerely,

██████████

13

On 2018-08-02 11:37, [REDACTED]@gov.scot wrote:

Dear All,

The next Cosmetics Interventions Group meeting will be on **Tuesday 23rd October** from **10.30am to 1pm** at **St Andrew's House in Edinburgh**.

I would be grateful if you could hold this date and time in your calendar and, if possible, confirm if you will be able to attend and whether this will be in person or via teleconference.

Please find attached the notes from the last meeting on 8 May. Further details, including the agenda, will follow separately and closer to the date of the meeting.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Policy Officer

14

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 April 2019 09:51

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk

Cc: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: FW: JCCP Fast Track Assessment Process - Draft Proposal for Consultation

I've given this quick read and I can now see why JCCP are so twitchy about the SCQF level 11 being embedded in any legislation. It will be threat to a speedy increase in registered practitioners. However, to be honest, I'm at a loss to see the value in the process. Surely beneficial to promote the first two 'Routes to entry'?

[REDACTED]

15

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 April 2019 08:44

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: JCCP Fast Track Assessment Process - Draft Proposal for Consultation

[REDACTED]

Pleased see attached the paper I spoke about re Fast Track Assessment Centres.

[REDACTED]

16

From: [REDACTED]@icloud.com>

Sent: 01 April 2019 08:33

To: [REDACTED]@bacn.org.uk; [REDACTED]@manchester.ac.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@lpsa.co.uk>; [REDACTED]@gmail.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@nhs.net>; [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@nhs.net>; [REDACTED]@me.com>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@me.com>

Cc: [REDACTED]@northumbria.ac.uk>

Subject: JCCP Fast Track Assessment Process - Draft Proposal for Consultation

Good Morning Friends!

As you are aware the JCCP is proposing to introduce a fast track assessment process for experienced and competent health care professionals from June this year. The JCCP launched a consultation paper/exercise last month which I attach again for your reference.

We are most keen to receive feedback on the proposals from as many people as possible and as such I would be grateful if you could circulate the paper again to your members as soon as possible. The deadline for comments is currently the 11th April but we can extend this date by a further week without difficulty.

Thank you for you're support.

Kindest regards

[REDACTED] icloud.com

17

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 08 March 2021 13:37

To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>

Subject: FW: Shared from BBC News

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

I hope your well given the ongoing situation. It does seem to be dragging on somewhat but I guess we need to stick with things and hope the vaccine programme gives us a way forward.

Anyway, the reason for my email is that [REDACTED] and I have a quick catch-up scheduled with the SCIEG early next week and I wondered if you there is anything from a JCCP perspective that you would like us to feedback. Perhaps about developments around regulated/non-regulated provision in the rest of the UK? Developments around JCCP's proposed fast-track approval system, etc?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

18

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 December 2020 15:40
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Shared from BBC News

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

As indicated earlier, I forwarded your query regarding NOS to Karen Crawford. Her responses is as follows:

The Aesthetic suite was developed in 2018/19 (these were for less complex beauty related treatments & practices). However, last year Habia/SkillsActive also developed an Adv Aesthetic suite (which included botox & dermal fillers as well as other modalities). These were developed in the absence of any other NOS and to try to set a standard in the absence of any legislation. It was difficult to word them correctly but they definitely took into account JCCP/CPSA standards/requirements as well as Prescriptions only Medicine (POM) legislation (as it applies to botox).

If Paul can provide a little more detail around any specific concerns, (for example modalities?), then I can try and point him in the right direction or to the right person.

Hope this helps.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

19

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 December 2020 10:27
To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: RE: Shared from BBC News

Good morning [REDACTED]

Hope you are well.

In terms of Scot Gov policy around recognising aesthetics qualifications, I am not aware of anything. More specifically, I know that EduQual withdrew its initial accredited provision back in September:

Diploma in Clinical Aesthetic Injectable Therapies (SCQF level 11)
Certificate in Clinical Aesthetic Injectable Therapies (SCQF level 11)

The awarding body had already accredited alternative provision in August:

Certificate in Skin Rejuvenation and Hair Reduction for Aesthetic Practitioners (SCQF level 7)
Award in Laser and Light-Based Hair Reduction (SCQF level 7)
Award in Non-Ablative Laser and Light-Based Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)

Award in Chemical Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)
Award in Micro Needling Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)

With regard to NOS developments, I'll ask [REDACTED] if she is aware of anything.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

20
From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Sent: 16 December 2020 22:45
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: RE: Shared from BBC News

[REDACTED]

Just a quick enquiry. Has anything happened in Scotland with regard to recognizing any qualifications in aesthetics and secondly the creation of National Occupational Standards (NOS) covering aesthetics. We have a problem in England with NOS developed by the beauty/non medical sector that are different to the JCCP framework. The JCCP will not recognise any qualifications above L5 for nonmedical practitioners.

[REDACTED]

21
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2020 13:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Shared from BBC News

Hi [REDACTED]

Hope you are keeping well during the ongoing pandemic. Thought you might find the following article of some interest.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-54057811>

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

22

From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>

Sent: 22 March 2021 20:59

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>

Subject: Fwd: VTCT

Good evening [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] I am delighted to advise you that the JCCP formally approved VTCT's Level 7/11 Qualification for injectables and dermal fillers today. I also had an excellent conversation with [REDACTED] and colleagues and advised of this decision. The Scottish government team were very interested in this development!

All best wishes

Professor [REDACTED]

23

From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>

Sent: 03 August 2018 12:20

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: JCCP and IQ

[REDACTED]

Thank you for such a helpful discussion this morning. For your information I enclose:

1. JCCP paper on entry requirements for the register.
2. JCCP press Release re non -practitioners.

Look forward to hearing from you next week.

[REDACTED]

24

From: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 29 March 2019 11:56

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>;

[REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: RE: SCIEG

Colleagues

Not surprisingly, I got a call from [REDACTED] of JCCP in the afternoon following Tuesday's SCIEG asking for an 'urgent' tele-KIT.

He was looking for an update on events in Scotland but had clearly been advised on the secondary legislation plan and the role that any level 11/level 7 qualification would play in it. Although delighted with the broader intentions around regulation, he was concerned that the qualification approach may be 'too rigid' and at too high a level.

His primary concern seemed to be around the possibility that existing medically qualified staff in the sector would have to undertake a full level 11 qualification to continue to operate effectively in the sector. He was also concerned about the perceived lack of progression opportunities for both medical and non-medical staff. He then went on to say that JCCP were/or had developed a 'fast-track assessment' model for use by centres to as a mapping exercise for medically qualified staff. He indicated that he would forward it for information in due course. I advised that this is something that we expect ABs/approved centres to do anyway as part of normal assessment activity, but we would be interested in seeing what JCCP are proposing.

He went on at length about progression opportunities and his concern that the level 11 may be beyond the reach of non-medical staff. He noted that HABIA, following the approval of the recent NOS, were proposing qualifications in England at a range of levels below level 7 (SCQF level 11) including a level 6 qualification which will cover injectables. I suspect his fears are around the possibility that these will not be regulated as such. Not sure where he was going with this and I stuck to a line that noted we were up to speed on HABIA's NOS activities through [REDACTED] as she was key to the approval process, that qualification development at lower levels would be viewed favourably by us as an indication that appropriate progression pathways were under development, and that SCIEG is the best place to bring such nuances to the attention of Scot Govt. ([REDACTED] has already spoken to [REDACTED] from Scot Govt who attends SCIEG and is keen to speak to [REDACTED] also.)

Some other points/developments of interest from the tele-KIT:

JCCP have signed an MOU with our friends at IQ (I spotted this a few months back via LinkedIn). However, [REDACTED] described it as a 'reluctant MOU'. Despite what I believed, IQ still haven't refreshed the Level 7 qualification to reflect to JCCP's competency framework and the MOU states that this must happen no later than May 2019, which is the point at which the qualification is due for review by Ofqual. [REDACTED] indicated that if this refresh doesn't happen at this point then they may very well pull the MOU.

VTCT are currently developing a level 7 qualification. JCCP in dialogue with the AB to ensure that the proposed qualification meets the competency framework. They expect this process to take no more than a couple of months. JCCP will then provide the necessary support to for Ofqual recognition of the qualification. It would be interesting to monitor this development and it it comes to fruition, to see if VTCT would seek accreditation in Scotland? If so, it might appease Scot Govt's anxieties around the need for 'Scottish assessment centres' given VTCT's established links with the college network?

Last point regarding the VTCT development and possible impact on IQ.....another partial reason for JCCP's 'reluctant MOU' with IQ is to support a large training company on the their register, [REDACTED], which has around 500 candidates registered for the IQ level 7 qualification over time. Said training academy has 'no confidence' (my polite phraseology!) in IQ at all, but feels that it has to work with them as it wants the candidates to gain an Ofqual recognised qualification at level 7. It has already indicated to JCCP (in confidence) that, should the VTCT qualification gain recognition, it will transfer all its candidates across to that AB asap. [REDACTED] feels that such a move may very well tip IQ over the edge given its current financial state.

(George - as an aside to the above, it would appear that Qualification Wales have not contacted JCCP as yet).

Regards

25

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 March 2019 09:26
To: George Brown ; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: SCIEG

Hi George

I think a 'mandatory register' could be quite some way off as it may require new legislation (which they have decided is not an option for now in Phase 2). As [REDACTED] mentioned the proposal is for an extension/add on to existing legislation/licencing relating to 'skin piercing and tattooing'.

We also had a chat with Healthcare Improvement Scotland (HIS) who regulate/register the independent clinics offering these treatments. They said they would welcome the requirement for a qualification as it would assist them in their inspection duties. We also asked the HIS rep if they would consider an MoU with us and she said she would discuss it with colleagues (seemed quite positive).

26

From: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>
Sent: 28 March 2019 11:36
To: John Byrne <John.Byrne@sqa.org.uk>; Julie Carruth <Julie.Carruth@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Subject: RE: SCIEG

Brilliant, thanks. Will they be looking to set up a mandatory register? Or do they have other plans?

Cheers
George

George Brown
Head of Accreditation
SQA Accreditation

27

From: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Sent: 28 March 2019 11:35
To: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>; Julie Carruth <Julie.Carruth@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Subject: RE: SCIEG

We met on Tuesday.

Lots of sector info that was a bit above my head.....but it looks as if we are still on track for a 'secondary legislation', based around changes to current legislation on skin piercing/tattooing to encompass injectables/derma fillers. Scot Govt lawyers will determine if this option will fly and if they give it the go ahead, could take about 9 mths to go through parliament. Part of this will be a recognition that practitioners will need to evidence that they hold an SCQF level 11 qualification.

██████████

28

From: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 28 March 2019 11:29

To: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk

Cc: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk

Subject: SCIEG

How are things going with the above? Any signs of legislation making it mandatory for us to accredit qualifications in the aesthetic sector?

Cheers
George

George Brown
Head of Accreditation
SQA Accreditation

29

From: ██████████

Sent: 29 March 2019 12:27

To: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>; ██████████@sqa.org.uk

Cc: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk

Subject: RE: SCIEG

Wow – your ears must have been bleeding after that!!

I did know about the fast-track assessment and that JCCP intend to 'approve' training providers to offer this. However, like you, I see this as a normal approach to RPL which should be considered and offered by all AB approved providers (albeit that they might need some additional guidance provided by the AB).

I think it is interesting that JCCP now seem to be willing to accept/consider accepting qualifications which are likely to be below RQF Level 7 given that they have already set the benchmark via acceptance of the RQF Level 7 qualification.

At least we have an MoU with JCCP and they are keen to continue to communicate with us and provide some very interesting pieces of info!

██████████

30

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2018 11:15
To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Thanks [REDACTED].

No rush on the advert scenario.

I've had a chat with [REDACTED] who is fine with the IQ spec review. As I said on Friday, [REDACTED] is also fine in principle with it. Just need to bring [REDACTED] line manager, [REDACTED], up to speed with the plan. I've copied him in to the message but likely to be tomorrow before we can fully bring him up to speed.

Does that sound okay?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

31

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2018 10:51
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Cosmetics Interventions Group

[REDACTED]

I will come back later today. Any news re request to review IQ qualification spec [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

32

On 7 Aug 2018, at 10:50, [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk> wrote:
Good morning [REDACTED]

Further to our telephone call, [REDACTED] has confirmed that she would be happy for JCCP to undertake a little more investigation around the advert and offer a perspective on how to handle such scenarios. An opportunity for JCCP to highlight any concerns around such practice in general.

I've attached a copy of the screenshot for information. Original enquiry is part of the email chain.

Any queries, please don't hesitate to call.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

33

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2018 10:17
To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot;
[REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@ggc.scot.nhs.uk
Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Good morning [REDACTED]

Happy to meet on 23 October as requested. I'll add to my diary and await details.

I'll also liaise with [REDACTED] at JCCP regarding the advert and organisation in question.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

34

From: [REDACTED]@gov.scot <[REDACTED]@gov.scot>
Sent: 07 August 2018 09:42
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot;
[REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@ggc.scot.nhs.uk
Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Dear [REDACTED]

This is a very helpful reply. We would be delighted if you speak to [REDACTED] and follow-up on this business. We also wondered whether it is possible to meet with you and [REDACTED] plus the Chair of the cosmetic interventions regulation group, [REDACTED] (cc'd above) shortly before the next meeting (which is on the 23rd October). If that sounds possible, we will be in touch with dates, and aim to meet in Glasgow - where you and [REDACTED] work.

Best wishes, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Planning and Quality
Directorate of Healthcare Quality & Improvement
Health & Social Care
The Scottish Government
Room GE06
St Andrew's House
Regent Road, Edinburgh
EH1 3DG
[REDACTED]

35

From: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 06 August 2018 16:58

To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>; [REDACTED]@gov.scot>;

[REDACTED]@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

Many thanks for forwarding the information and screenshot. (Not sure if a single screenshot was the intention as the information/letter references others?)

In respect of your query regarding best practice and governance, first thing to say is that the advert by the Aesthetic Beauty Academy UK seems to be a good example of what we are led to believe, by our colleagues at the Joint Council of Cosmetic Practitioners (JCCP), occurs across much of the rest of the UK. In effect the discounting and packaging of (non-regulated) training courses, as well as practice, in the hope of generating business.

We undertook a little bit of research into this particular business which is based in Rotherham and with that in mind, the use of levels and the formatting of 'training' titles within the advert makes sense. In essence, it is a format that *could* be intended to lead stakeholders to believe that the provision is recognised by Ofqual and sits within the Regulated Qualifications Framework (RQF). It is also interesting to note that the Clinical and Training Director of the business concerned indicates that she holds qualifications in the areas identified in the advert but without reference to levels or specific awarding bodies:

<https://aestheticbeautyuk.co.uk/about-us/>

Certainly, as stated in the letter within your email, the assertion that there are no regulated Level 7 qualifications as described by the advert available within the UK is almost certainly correct. You will be aware, Industry Qualifications (IQ) Awarding Organisation does have the following qualification, *IQ Level 7 Certificate in Injectables for Aesthetic Medicine*, recognised by Ofqual but I would be surprised if this is what the advert is alluding to here.

I assume the advertisement to be in a trade magazine available across the UK and as such could impact upon Scottish learners/businesses. Particularly as the Clinical and Training Director is available to support other training centres as a teacher/assessor/IQA on a freelance basis. There is

certainly nothing to stop them being available in Scotland but It is difficult to say if this is currently the case because they appear to be non-regulated.

We can, with you permission, speak to [REDACTED] at the JCCP to see if they are aware of this business and of any delivery in Scotland if you feel this would be useful. (I believe you already have a scheduled meeting with [REDACTED] on 19 September?)

All things considered, we would not consider this to be an acceptable advert as in a number of ways it is misleading. Certainly, if this provision was regulated by SQA Accreditation we would be engaging with the awarding body concerned to seek an understanding of how the centre is being managed and why it has been allowed to package provision in this way, to ensure that delivery was not comprised by such a process and remained fit for purpose, as well as insisting and that the qualifications are promoted correctly to stakeholders.

I hope this reply helps in some way and if you require any further feedback please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

36

From: [REDACTED]@gov.scot <[REDACTED]@gov.scot>

Sent: 06 August 2018 11:31

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk

Cc: [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot; [REDACTED]@gov.scot

Subject: FW: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Dear [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I look forward to meeting you [REDACTED], at the next cosmetics intervention meeting. In the meantime we have been sent screen shot of advertisements for training courses (attached). We are not sure of the status of these in Scotland and would value your views as to whether the way they are worded is consistent with best practice and good governance ? Best wishes, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Planning and Quality
Directorate of Healthcare Quality & Improvement
Health & Social Care
The Scottish Government
Room GE06
St Andrew's House
Regent Road, Edinburgh
EH1 3DG
[REDACTED]

37

From: [REDACTED]@doctors.org.uk>

Sent: 04 August 2018 11:10

To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>

Cc: [REDACTED]@ggc.scot.nhs.uk; [REDACTED]@gov.scot>;
[REDACTED]@ayrshire.ac.uk; [REDACTED]@gov.scot>;
[REDACTED]@glasgow.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@gov.scot>;
[REDACTED]@dermalclinic.co.uk; [REDACTED]@nhs.net; [REDACTED]@babtac.com;
[REDACTED]@aberdeenshire.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@ftt.scot;
[REDACTED]@gov.scot>; [REDACTED]@templmedical.co.uk

Subject: Re: Cosmetics Interventions Group

Hello All,

Hope you are well.

I wanted to bring to the attention of all involved in Phase II the attached letter from Jane Freeman who is (as far as I am told) Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport.

[REDACTED], one of the owners of the Face&Body Clinic in Edinburgh has been speaking with his MSP, advising him of the rise in non medics injecting, the harm many of them are causing, and the letter attached is the reply his MSP received.

I've read the letter twice and am still confused. The sentence that confuses me the most is "Through these meetings, should non-medically qualified individuals wish to undertake such work, a suitable course of study will be available to them, to enable them to do so".

Granted, I've missed a couple of meetings, but when was the above decided? Has this actually been decided by 'the powers that be'? In which case has the Phase II board merely been a futile exercise? This is in complete contradiction to what was discussed at the last meeting. There are other statements in the letter which are bold and seem to be plucked out of thin air.

I'd like to draw everyone's attention to the first image attached. A non medic has found a new way to make more money out of a pre-packed syringe intended for single person use. Use a small amount of the syringe for many people! Is she injecting everyone from the same syringe? Is she decanting it each time? Who knows? Does it matter? After all, she's allowed to do what she wants.

There was recently a picture on facebook that a non medic put up of her 'patients' post facial needling and PRP (where a patient's blood is taken, centrifuged and then re-injected into the face). The girls were covered in their own blood, hugging, their foreheads touching. This case was in England.

I know we need evidence to support our educated opinion backed by our experience, years of medical training and common sense. The calibre, morals and ethos of what we see on social media by many non medics is infuriating and dangerous. There is also an image attached of non medics teaching claiming to be offering "level 7" teaching. These

people are out for financial gain. What they are doing is criminal and putting the public at risk. If we let them proceed, we are equally responsible for the resulting harm.

Attached is an image from 'NK aesthetics' detailing her/his qualifications. Not only are they a complete and utter farse but also lies. There is no level 7 course she/he could have completed in injectables since. She/he might believe they are level 7 qualified because of the lies from courses in the previous image.

I hope everyone on the board who is not on the front line is starting to get an impression of what non medics in Aesthetics are like. These are only a small handful of cases. I will happily send you another 50 (with no exaggeration). I hope the board is getting a sense of where their interests lay (financial gain) and perhaps most importantly, the limitations of their education, training and moral compass.

Sincerely,

██████████

38

On 2018-08-02 11:37, ██████████@gov.scot wrote:

Dear All,

The next Cosmetics Interventions Group meeting will be on **Tuesday 23rd October** from **10.30am to 1pm** at **St Andrew's House in Edinburgh**.

I would be grateful if you could hold this date and time in your calendar and, if possible, confirm if you will be able to attend and whether this will be in person or via teleconference.

Please find attached the notes from the last meeting on 8 May. Further details, including the agenda, will follow separately and closer to the date of the meeting.

Kind regards,

██████████

████████████████████

████████████████████

Person-centred and Quality Team

39

From: ██████████@jccp.org.uk>

Sent: 10 August 2018 11:08

To: ██████████@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: ██████████@jccp.org.uk>

Subject: RE: Independent review of IQ qualification

█
That's great thank you. If your head of Service needs some more reassurance █
Chair of JCCP – would be happy to talk to him

█
40

From: █
Sent: 10 August 2018 11:05
To: █
Subject: Independent review of IQ qualification

Hi █

Just a quick update regarding the above.

Our senior management team has decided to hold off on a final decision regarding undertaking the above until George Brown, Head of Service, returns from annual leave. (He'll be back early next week.) They just want to make sure that he is comfortable with any decision from a Col point of view and we don't compromise any other activities that we might not be aware of at the moment.

We'll get back to as soon as possible next week once we know his thoughts.

On a more positive note, the Eduqual qualification will be presented for approval to ACG on Wednesday 15 August. Fingers crossed that it gets approved.

Kind regards

█

41

From: █
Sent: 03 August 2018 13:28
To: █@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: RE: JCCP and IQ

Thanks █. Good to speak to you earlier.

For information, I've spoken to █ regarding the possibility of a third party review of the IQ qualification. She's happy with the idea in principle but wants to give some thought around how this would be done and the issue of possible Col.

We're meeting Wednesday of next week to discuss further and I'll get back to you quickly thereafter.

Have a good weekend.

█

42

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 August 2018 12:20
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: JCCP and IQ

John

Thank you for such a helpful discussion this morning. For your information I enclose:

1. JCCP paper on entry requirements for the register.
2. JCCP press Release re non -practitioners.

Look forward to hearing from you next week.

[REDACTED]

43

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 August 2018 13:38
To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: RE: MoU

Thanks [REDACTED]

44

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 August 2018 13:37
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: MoU

Yes

Sent from my iPhone

45

On 8 Aug 2018, at 12:58, [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk> wrote:
Hi [REDACTED]

Very quick question.....Has Ofqual signed up to the MoU with the JCCP?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

46

From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Sent: 10 August 2018 11:07

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Subject: RE: MoU

Super thank you [REDACTED]

47
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 August 2018 10:57
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: MoU

Hi [REDACTED]

Just a quick update on the MoU.

[REDACTED] and I had a meeting with our legal advisors on Wednesday to give them a little bit of background on the kind of information/data that we might be sharing with JCCP. Broadly speaking, they were happy enough with what we were describing but indicated that they think that the MOU might be 'a bit light' and need to consider something that is tighter from a confidentiality/data protection point of view.

Consequently, they are going to provide us with a re-drafted version so that we can better understand what they feel is necessary. We have advised them that we are already sharing information with yourself and Scottish Govt and this is likely to continue given the nature of ongoing discussions. We've also advised them that we will be meeting with you/JCCP in September and would like to be in a position to have at least shared the re-draft, if not have it signed by that date.

I'll keep you posted if there are any other updates.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

48
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 March 2019 11:56
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: RE: SCIEG

Colleagues

Not surprisingly, I got a call from [REDACTED] of JCCP in the afternoon following Tuesday's SCIEG asking for an 'urgent' tele-KIT.

He was looking for an update on events in Scotland but had clearly been advised on the secondary legislation plan and the role that any level 11/level 7 qualification would play in it. Although delighted with the broader intentions around regulation, he was concerned that the qualification approach may be 'too rigid' and at too high a level.

His primary concern seemed to be around the possibility that existing medically qualified staff in the sector would have to undertake a full level 11 qualification to continue to operate effectively in the sector. He was also concerned about the perceived lack of progression opportunities for both medical and non-medical staff. He then went on to say that JCCP were/or had developed a 'fast-track assessment' model for use by centres to as a mapping exercise for medically qualified staff. He indicated that he would forward it for information in due course. I advised that this is something that we expect ABs/approved centres to do anyway as part of normal assessment activity, but we would be interested in seeing what JCCP are proposing.

He went on at length about progression opportunities and his concern that the level 11 may be beyond the reach of non-medical staff. He noted that HABIA, following the approval of the recent NOS, were proposing qualifications in England at a range of levels below level 7 (SCQF level 11) including a level 6 qualification which will cover injectables. I suspect his fears are around the possibility that these will not be regulated as such. Not sure where he was going with this and I stuck to a line that noted we were up to speed on HABIA's NOS activities through Julie as she was key to the approval process, that qualification development at lower levels would be viewed favourably by us as an indication that appropriate progression pathways were under development, and that SCIEG is the best place to bring such nuances to the attention of Scot Govt. ([REDACTED] has already spoken to [REDACTED] from Scot Govt who attends SCIEG and is keen to speak to [REDACTED] also.)

Some other points/developments of interest from the tele-KIT:

JCCP have signed an MOU with our friends at IQ (I spotted this a few months back via LinkedIn). However, [REDACTED] described it as a 'reluctant MOU'. Despite what I believed, IQ still haven't refreshed the Level 7 qualification to reflect to JCCP's competency framework and the MOU states that this must happen no later than May 2019, which is the point at which the qualification is due for review by Ofqual. [REDACTED] indicated that if this refresh doesn't happen at this point then they may very well pull the MOU.

VTCT are currently developing a level 7 qualification. JCCP in dialogue with the AB to ensure that the proposed qualification meets the competency framework. They expect this process to take no more than a couple of months. JCCP will then provide the necessary support to for Ofqual recognition of the qualification. It would be interesting to monitor this development and it it comes to fruition, to see if VTCT would seek accreditation in Scotland? If so, it might appease Scot Govt's anxieties around the need for 'Scottish assessment centres' given VTCT's established links with the college network?

Last point regarding the VTCT development and possible impact on IQ.....another partial reason for JCCP's 'reluctant MOU' with IQ is to support a large training company on the their register, Harley Training Academy, which has around 500 candidates registered for the IQ level 7 qualification over time. Said training academy has 'no confidence' (my polite phraseology!) in IQ at all, but feels that it has to work with them as it wants the candidates to gain an Ofqual recognised qualification at level 7. It has already indicated to JCCP (in confidence) that, should the VTCT qualification gain recognition, it will transfer all its candidates across to that AB asap. [REDACTED] feels that such a move may very well tip IQ over the edge given its current financial state.

(George - as an aside to the above, it would appear that Qualification Wales have not contacted JCCP as yet).

Regards

████████

49

From: ██████████
Sent: 29 March 2019 09:26
To: George Brown ; ██████████
Cc: ██████████
Subject: RE: SCIEG

Hi George

I think a 'mandatory register' could be quite some way off as it may require new legislation (which they have decided is not an option for now in Phase 2). As ██████████ mentioned the proposal is for an extension/add on to existing legislation/licencing relating to 'skin piercing and tattooing'.

We also had a chat with Healthcare Improvement Scotland (HIS) who regulate/register the independent clinics offering these treatments. They said they would welcome the requirement for a qualification as it would assist them in their inspection duties. We also asked the HIS rep if they would consider an MoU with us and she said she would discuss it with colleagues (seemed quite positive).

████████

50

From: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>
Sent: 28 March 2019 11:36
To: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk
Cc: ██████████@sqa.org.uk; ██████████@sqa.org.uk
Subject: RE: SCIEG

Brilliant, thanks. Will they be looking to set up a mandatory register? Or do they have other plans?

Cheers
George

George Brown
Head of Accreditation
SQA Accreditation

51

From: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 28 March 2019 11:35

To: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: RE: SCIEG

We met on Tuesday.

Lots of sector info that was a bit above my head.....but it looks as if we are still on track for a 'secondary legislation', based around changes to current legislation on skin piercing/tattooing to encompass injectables/derma fillers. Scot Govt lawyers will determine if this option will fly and if they give it the go ahead, could take about 9 mths to go through parliament. Part of this will be a recognition that practitioners will need to evidence that they hold an SCQF level 11 qualification.

[REDACTED]

52

From: George Brown <George.Brown@sqa.org.uk>

Sent: 28 March 2019 11:29

To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: SCIEG

How are things going with the above? Any signs of legislation making it mandatory for us to accredit qualifications in the aesthetic sector?

Cheers
George

George Brown
Head of Accreditation
SQA Accreditation

53

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 December 2020 10:27

To: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>

Subject: RE: Shared from BBC News

Good morning [REDACTED]

Hope you are well.

In terms of Scot Gov policy around recognising aesthetics qualifications, I am not aware of anything. More specifically, I know that EduQual withdrew its initial accredited provision back in September:

Diploma in Clinical Aesthetic Injectable Therapies (SCQF level 11)
Certificate in Clinical Aesthetic Injectable Therapies (SCQF level 11)

The awarding body had already accredited alternative provision in August:

Certificate in Skin Rejuvenation and Hair Reduction for Aesthetic Practitioners (SCQF level 7)
Award in Laser and Light-Based Hair Reduction (SCQF level 7)
Award in Non-Ablative Laser and Light-Based Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)
Award in Chemical Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)
Award in Micro Needling Skin Rejuvenation (SCQF level 7)

With regard to NOS developments, I'll ask [REDACTED] if she is aware of anything.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

54

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 December 2020 22:45
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Shared from BBC News

[REDACTED]

Just a quick enquiry. Has anything happened in Scotland with regard to recognizing any qualifications in aesthetics and secondly the creation of National Occupational Standards (NOS) covering aesthetics. We have a problem in England with NOS developed by the beauty/non medical sector that are different to the JCCP framework. The JCCP will not recognise any qualifications above L5 for nonmedical practitioners.

[REDACTED]

55

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2020 13:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Shared from BBC News

Hi [REDACTED]

Hope you are keeping well during the ongoing pandemic. Thought you might find the following article of some interest.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-54057811>

Kind regards

█

56

From: █@jccp.org.uk>

Sent: 18 March 2021 15:53

To: █@sqa.org.uk>

Cc: █@jccp.org.uk>

Subject: Re: Today's meeting

Hi █

Thank you so very much it was really good to share a mutual agenda together. Thank you so much for provision g the time to speak with us.

I attach the Qualifi MoU with you as advised.

Speak soon.

Best wishes

█

jccp.org.uk

57

On 18 Mar 2021, at 15:40, █@sqa.org.uk> wrote:

█

Thanks for your time this afternoon. I found it most useful. We are definitely singing from the same hymn sheet, so to speak.

Apologies for the poor connection and dropping in and out of the meeting. Sky not having a good day it would seem!

Speak soon.

Kind regards

█

58

From: █

Sent: 12 March 2021 14:26

To: █@jccp.org.uk>

Cc: █@sqa.org.uk>

Subject: RE: VCTC Update - Strictly Confidential

That's great news, █

Obviously, VTCT are of more interest to us than OHTM, as the former already holds awarding body approval status. I assume that the VTCT qualification will not be radically different from the former IQ qualification but we would be keen to see it, and consider it for accreditation up here. There are

no guarantees that it would gain that status, of course, but meeting JCCP standards and subsequent approval means it would stand an excellent chance. [REDACTED] can be tough!

Regarding a further catch-up with yourself and [REDACTED], if still on offer, Karen and I are available next Wednesday or Thursday afternoon. MS Teams would be good.

Have a good weekend.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

59

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 March 2021 13:06
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: VCTC Update - Strictly Confidential

Yes of course. It will be automatic as it aligns with the JCCP framework and our M of U with Ofqual.

[REDACTED]

60

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 March 2021 13:04
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: VCTC Update - Strictly Confidential

Thanks [REDACTED]

I assume, thereafter, they will seek Ofqual recognition?

[REDACTED]

61

From: [REDACTED]@jccp.org.uk>
Sent: 12 March 2021 13:03
To: [REDACTED]@sqa.org.uk>
Subject: VCTC Update - Strictly Confidential

[REDACTED]

VCTC L7 qualification to be approved by the JCCP by the end of March 2021. OHTM by end of April 2021.

[REDACTED]

