

**Minutes of the Council Public Meeting**

**Remote – Via Zoom**

**Monday, 15 March 2021 @ 09:30**

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Apologies</b>
		<p>Dr Jim Livingstone (President)                      Mr Jonathan Patton (Vice-President)                      Ms Carol Moore                      Prof Patrick Murphy                      Mr Barry Mimmagh                      Ms Alison Ragg                      Ms Chanel Jones                      Ms Colleen Duffy                      Ms Sandra Cooke</p> <p><b>In Attendance</b></p> <p>Mr Trevor Patterson (Chief Executive)                      Mrs Laura Hughes (Registrar)                      Mrs Joan Duffy (Head of Business Operations)                      Mr Mark Neale (Head of Public Affairs)                      Mr Peter Hutchinson (Policy &amp; Standards Engagement Lead)                      Mrs June Alexander (Executive Assistant)                      Ms Sheena Kenny (Boardroom Apprentice)                      Ms Siobhan Carson (Professional Standards Authority)</p>	<p>Mr Mark McCrudden</p>

			<b>Action</b>
1.0	Welcome & Apologies	The President welcomed the representative from PSA and all Council members.	
2.0	Deputations	The President was present for the entirety of the meeting – no deputation required.	
3.0	Conflicts of Interest	The registrant members raised a potential conflict of interest in relation to agenda point 7.	
4.0	Tabling of Any Other Business	None.	
5.0	Minutes & Key Actions from last meeting <b>For Approval</b>	<p>Council approved and adopted the Minutes of the 26 January 2021 Council meeting as a true and accurate record of events.</p> <p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>No actions outstanding.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><b>Key decisions</b> Council approved and adopted the Minutes of the 26 January 2021 Council meeting as a true and accurate record of events.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Chanel Jones Seconded by: Barry Mimmagh</p>
6.0	Scrutiny Committee Annual Report <b>For Approval</b>	<p>The HPA advised this year’s report is shorter than usual, reflecting the lesser number of cases processed, and was written by the new Chair of the Scrutiny Committee. No major issues are raised within the report.</p> <p>In response to a Council member query regarding pre-reg student training and the role of the Inspectorate and another issue regarding DoH grants</p>	

		<p>to tutors, it was clarified that these matters were not matters for the Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The Registrar reassured Council that, in relation to the pre-reg issues raised, they had been acknowledged and were reflected in various conversations with the Department and other entities. Pre-reg training is in the process of an orderly transfer to NICPLD for 2021/2022 and beyond</p> <p>Council discussed the observations in the paper and agreed that they were appropriate.</p> <p>Council reviewed and approved the Scrutiny Committee Annual Report.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><b>Key Decisions</b></p> <p>Council reviewed and approved the Scrutiny Committee Annual Report and agreed the observations in the paper.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Jonathan Patton Seconded by: Colleen Duffy</p>
7.0	<p>CPD Arrangements 2020/21 and 2021/2022 &amp; Covid-19 <b>For Decision</b></p>	<p>The President reminded Council that, at this time last year, Council had taken several steps to recognise the pressures that pharmacists were facing due to Covid-19. At that time, Council delayed the CPD submission date and the payment of retention fees, as they are indirectly linked, to 31 August 2020.</p> <p>The current arrangements for CPD, in accordance with that decision, are:</p>	

	<p><u>CPD Year 2020/2021 (01 September 2020 until 31 May 2021)</u></p> <p>The time requirement for portfolio submissions have been reduced as follows: Full portfolio: reduced to 22.5 hours including 3.75 hours documentation time Partial portfolio: reduced to 11.25 hours including 2 hours documentation time</p> <p><u>CPD year 2021/2022 (01 June 2021 until 31 May 2022)</u></p> <p>In accordance with new CPD framework</p> <p>In light of the continued pressure upon pharmacists during Covid-19 response, Council was now being asked to reaffirm their decision regarding CPD arrangements for the current year 2020/21 and for the introduction of the new CPD Framework in 2021/2022 or to discuss and select one of the following alternatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Delay the submission date</li></ol> <p>If this alternative were selected, the date of annual retention would have to be moved to the same date and CPD and retention are aligned.</p> <p>The implementation of the new CPD Framework would be delayed, shortening its first year by 3 months.</p> <p>In addition, consideration would need to whether the quantum of CPD hours would need to be restored to 30 hours to reflect the 12-month CPD year.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>2. A reduction in the quantity of CPD required</p> <p>The quantity required for the current CPD year had already been reduced. A further reduction may impact on the adequate measurement of a portfolio's CPD compliance.</p> <p>3. CPD submissions but no assessment</p> <p>At present, 10% of submitted portfolios are assessed and, typically, around 20 registrants have not met standard at the first assessment. In addition, around 4 registrants have not met standard at the second assessment but have done so by the final assessment. This demonstrates the importance of the CPD process.</p> <p>Following further discussion, Council voted to reaffirm its decisions of March 2020: the submission of a reduced CPD portfolio by 31 May 2021; annual retention to remain at 01 June 2021; and the implementation of the new CPD Framework to begin in June 2021.</p> <p>Registrants are to be notified by the end of the current week.</p> <div data-bbox="719 1093 1691 1382" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #f0f0f0; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>Key Decisions</b>              Council reaffirmed its decisions of March 2020: the submission of a reduced CPD portfolio by 31 May 2021; annual retention to remain at 01 June 2021; and the implementation of the new CPD Framework to begin in June 2021.</p> <p><b>Action</b>              Registrants are to be notified by the end of the current week.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by:              Alison Ragg              Seconded by:              Barry Mimmagh</p>
--	--	--	---

8.0	<b>President's Report For Information</b>	<p>The President advised Council of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council Recruitment – applications had been received already – all for the Lay Council member vacancies. Pharmacy Forum had facilitated two information and training evenings last week with almost 40 registrants attending. Hopefully, applications from registrants will follow. Applications close on 24 March with interviews in April and, hopefully, approval of the Selection Panel's recommendations by the end of May.</li> <li>2. Regulatory Chairs meeting – the regulatory Chairs and CEOs had been meeting on a very irregular basis. A "Chair's Only" meeting had recently taken place. At that meeting, when the issue of regulatory reform was raised, the position taken by some Chairs was that it was solely for government to carry out reform. This was not consistent with the PSNI view which would favour involvement</li> <li>3. Sheena Kenny – the President had a quarterly meeting with Sheena. She reported that her Boardroom Apprentice experience with Council was good thanks, in part, to her mentor – Prof Murphy.</li> <li>4. CPO meeting – in relation to educational reform, progress was being made much faster than anticipated. Very pleasing.</li> </ol>	
9.0	<b>CEO's Report For Information</b>	<p>The CEO advised that most points in his report were elsewhere in the agenda.</p> <p>IN relation to Pharmacy Technician registration, at the last DoH meeting, the Department's view was that there was a need to register Pharmacy Technicians as set out in the workforce review report. Council had approved the release of funding and FieldFisher was now drafting a Keeling schedule and mapping what might need to change to facilitate</p>	

		<p>registration. A meeting was scheduled with the CPO later in March to discuss the Department's view on how this might best progress – Ministerial approval permitting. Research will be required in relation to a consistent entry regime. Work was progressing in the background but work with the Department on some policy matters would be required first.</p>	
10.0	<p>Education Reform (IET) Implementation - Update  <b>For Information</b></p>	<p>The CEO advised Council that the Minutes of the Education Reform Implementation Group were provided by way of update and invited questions or concerns. He highlighted the following:</p> <p>The organisation's priority with education reform was to get the pre-registration programme to commence a transfer to the Foundation Training Year, and in time joining the register ready to or qualified to prescribe – a process that will aim to be complete in 2026. An MOU was sent to NICPLD for their review and completion and this may take some time as the MOU will need to go through the QUB approval process.</p> <p>The operational protocol provided sets out the few changes for Year 1 starting in June 2021 and responsibilities and how they are shared.</p> <p>In future years, there would be a full mapping exercise against learning outcomes, and additional learning activities via SLEs. The Tutors' Network would become the Educational Supervisors' Network. NICPLD would be taking responsibility for SLEs and quality assurance. This organisation would have oversight in order to give reassurance to Council via formal approval.</p> <p>Council was content with progress.</p>	

		<p>The HPA advised that a statement, written by the Group, was currently with all participants and that, once approved, would be released to a very wide audience by the end of the current week. The statement would provide certainty and clarity for existing and incoming tutors and students. It would be NICPLD's responsibility to set out the processes for educational supervisors and our quality assurance would be fed back through Council. We would oversee the running of the programme and this would provide improved reassurances to Council.</p> <p>The CEO advised that, having put all its efforts into the Foundation Training Year, the group had extended an invitation to the universities and work would commence on the introduction of the programme at undergraduate level.</p> <p>In response to a Council query regarding the responsibility for managing matters regarding the behaviour of pre-reg students, the CEO advised that NICPLD would be dealing with matters of competence and behaviour as set out in the MOU. The CEO reminded Council that in 2012, the organisation lost the power to put pre-reg students in front of the Statutory Committee due to a drafting issue. Consequently, the full FtP processes could not be done until they had joined the Register. In future, NICPLD would have the responsibility to manage these matters within the constraints of the programme and inform this organisation accordingly at the time of registration.</p>	
11.0	<p><b>PSA Consultation For Information</b></p>	<p>In relation to organisation's response to the PSA's public consultation on how it should review health &amp; social care professionals, the PSEL advised and highlighted our response as follows:</p> <p>This was the first year that the organisation had been assessed against the PSA's updated Standards of Good Regulation. PSA was now</p>	

		<p>consulting on whether its methodology for assessment was still effective. The three main areas were proportionality of performance reviews, making their methodology more risk based and areas of risk. They were also reviewing the introduction of light touch monitoring (not doing full assessment each year), thematic reviews, a “standards met or not met” approach or a nuanced approach. They were focussing on getting agreement on the performance reviews as working toward the same goal was essential. The Society would want performance reviews to drive performance and good practice.</p> <p>On the risk assessment issue, the Executive had raised some concerns as to how PSA would identify risks posed by particular professions and how that might align with the regulator’s assessment. On routine monitoring, concerns were noted that it might be a disproportionate amount of work for the Society. The Executive questioned the rationale behind thematic reviews given the staggered timing of reviews, the currency of the outcome of enquiries and the burden arising from response. The Executive supported the nuanced approach to reporting outcomes; a traffic light system perhaps showing current status as well as the trend – for example, green for currently meeting but green-amber for meeting but with room for improvement to give more of an understanding to the public and to help regulators over time to track their improvement.</p> <p>The Executive had welcomed the opportunity to respond and noted that it looked forward to engaging with PSA in the future.</p> <p>The President endorsed that approach and the need for a more interactive process, rather than paper based, as this would prove to be more effective.</p>	

12.0	<b>Covid-19 Update For Information</b>	<p>The HPA advised that the paper provided was self-explanatory. The organisation was keeping broadly in step with other regulators with perhaps fewer backlogs in FtP than some. The President endorsed a Council Member’s suggestion that, when the pandemic was over, it would be worthwhile to look at the overall effect on the profession.</p>	
13.0	<b>Report on Progress Against Strategy For Information</b>	<p>The CEO reminded Council that, in the recent past, the status of Pharmacy Technicians and Modernisation of Regulation had been changed. Following meetings with the CPO, it was clear that policy agreement could be secured with DoH but, unfortunately, progress beyond that would be limited due to the lifespan of the current Assembly.</p> <p>It was noted that the initials “BK” remain within the report and these must be changed to read “Registrar”.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><b>Action</b> References within the report to “BK” are to be changed to read “Registrar”.</p> </div>	
14.0	<b>Council Skills Audit To Note</b>	<p>The President advised Council that the analysis report confirmed that Council had a wide range of skills and knowledge. The Chair of the Task &amp; Finish Group advised that the audit was the start of a cyclical process which would be subject to review and refinement. Council would have a bank of data on the skills available individually and collectively to carry out the organisation’s objectives in the best way. This would inform succession planning, recruitment and training. The aim was to have the necessary skills sufficiently covered in Council. An abridged version of the report prepared by the independent consultant had been provided today and a more detailed report would be provided to the President to support appraisal, development, appointment to committees and member development.</p>	

		<p>Some gaps had been identified but not all gaps were of equal weight. As far as possible, skills were linked to objectives to assess where the greater risk lay. Using the traffic light system, it was shown that the areas where Council needed expertise were audit &amp; risk, finance, IT and legal. This would form the basis to start the training strategy.</p> <p>In response to a Council Member's query if legal and financial skills would be sought in the current recruitment exercise, the President advised that the results of the analysis were not available at that time and a judgement had to be made on the best information available. At a previous Council meeting, it had been discussed and agreed that Council specifically required financial skills. Council needed to strike a balance between what skills it needed currently and what skills it would need to buy in as and when required. He also confirmed that the new Council members will complete the skills audit. The bank of skills data would be continually updated as members joined or left Council. As President, he would know what skills sets were available for setting up Task &amp; Finish Groups, etc.</p>	
15.0	Finance & Performance Committee <b>To Note</b>	Council noted the content of the Minutes presented.	
16.0	Any Other Business <b>For Information</b>	None.	
19.0	Date of next Council Public Meeting	The next public meeting of Council was scheduled for 09:30 on <b>Tuesday</b> , 11 May 2021. This meeting will be conducted via Zoom.	

**The Meeting closed @ 10:35**