

**Minutes of the Council Public Meeting
Remote – Via Zoom
On Tuesday, 28 June 2022 @ 09:30**

	<p>Agenda Item - Present</p>	<p>Council Members: Dr Jim Livingstone (President) Mr Jonathan Patton (Vice President) Mr Mark McCrudden Ms Alison Ragg Prof Patrick Murphy Ms Carol Moore Ms Colleen Duffy Mr Brendan Garland Mr Philip Knox Mr Barry Mimmagh Mr Scott Gill Ms Chanel Jones</p> <p>Visitors: Ms Colette Higham – PSA</p> <p>In Attendance: Mr Trevor Patterson (Chief Executive) Ms Laura Hughes (Registrar & Director of Regulation) Mr Mark Neale (Director of Public Affairs) Mr Peter Hutchinson (Policy Standards & Engagement Lead) Mr Ryan Duffy (Interim Project Manager) Ms June Alexander (Executive Assistant)</p>	<p>Apologies Sandra Cooke Gary McMurray</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--	--

			Action
1.0	Welcome & Apologies	The President welcomed Council members and Colette Higham, PSA, to the meeting. Apologies were accepted from Council members Sandra Cooke and Gary McMurray.	
2.0	Deputations	The President was in attendance throughout. No deputation required.	
3.0	Conflicts of Interest	No conflicts of interest were raised.	
4.0	Tabling of Any Other Business	No other business was tabled.	
5.0	Minutes & Key Actions from last meeting For Approval	<p><u>Minutes:</u></p> <p>Council approved and adopted the Minutes of the Public meeting of 17 May 2022 as a true and accurate record of events.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Key Decision / Action: Council approved and adopted the Minutes of the Public meeting of 17 May 2022 as a true and accurate record of events.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Chanel Jones Seconded by: Alison Ragg</p>
6.0	Retention & Destruction of Council papers For Approval	<p>The DPA advised that the Audit & Risk Committee had discussed this matter at its recent meeting on the basis of a 15-year retention of papers. Following research into the retention policies of other regulators which showed that they had longer retention periods, the recommendation is for a 50-year retention of Council papers.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the cost of storage of documents was currently circa £2,000 per annum. Council was reminded that the retention proposal before them was for Council documents only and that the issue of the accuracy of records came to light during the fees and pension issue when</p>	

	<p>boxes of documentation were retrieved from storage but their contents did not match the inventory.</p> <p>The importance of having a searchable resource was noted and the President asked the Senior Management Team to price the digitisation of all other records and advise Council.</p> <p>The CEO advised that the next stage was to start the destruction of documentation that had exceeded its life expectancy under the current retention policy. The President proposed that those documents that had exceeded their life expectancy be destroyed prior to the pricing of the digitisation of the remaining documents.</p> <p>Council noted that there was an argument for not destroying all papers as some may be historical in relation to pharmacy in NI and ROI which may be of interest to researchers in the future and that it may be a worthwhile exercise to liaise with the Public Records Office in relation to Council documents of historical interest.</p> <p>The Vice President advised that the volume of documents and the resultant storage costs would increase year on year and, therefore, the digitisation costs should be reviewed by Council prior to a decision being made.</p> <p>It was agreed that the ease of access to the correct documents was imperative and that the process for managing the accurate storage and retrieval of documents should be clearly delineated.</p> <p>In response to a Council query about a 50-year retention being excessive, Council was advised that the retention period for registration and fitness</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>to practise documentation was 100 years. The recommendation for a 50-year retention period was purely for Council documents.</p> <p>The CEO advised Council that irrespective of how documents were stored, Council needed to decide on the retention period. In terms of the possibility of aligning retention periods, the DPA advised that there were different levels of retention for different reasons, for example, staff and financial records were retained for a period of 7 years.</p> <p>It was agreed that, if Council decided on a retention period of 50 years for Council documents, this could apply to both digitised and paper documents.</p> <p>Council agreed the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council documents, going forward, would be retained for a period of 50 years; and 2. The Senior Management Team was requested to return to Council with the costs for digitising documents to enable the organisation to dispense with the cost of document storage and to ensure that documents were more easily accessible. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Key Decision: Council approved that documents, going forward, would be retained for a period of 50 years.</p> <p>Action: The Senior Management Team was requested to return to Council with the costs for digitising documents to enable the organisation to dispense with the cost of document storage and to ensure that documents were more easily accessible.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Mark McCrudden Seconded by: Brendan Garland</p> <p>Proposed by: Brendan Garland Seconded by: Scott Gill</p>
--	---	---

7.0	IP Consultation Report For Approval	<p>The CEO directed Council’s attention to the consultation report in the papers provided. He advised that the IP regulations stipulated a number of things about the qualifications that pharmacists must have before being entitled to an accreditation. Departments of Health across the UK have stated that, by 2026, they would prefer that pharmacists enter onto the Register as IPs.</p> <p>He noted that this was a high-level policy consultation to see if there was a general consensus for changing the regulations for 2026 and for recognising that there was a large legacy workforce.</p> <p>The following five recommendations were highlighted:</p> <p>Recommendation 1</p> <p>To inform the Education Reform Implementation Group (ERIG) that, based on the response to its consultation, Council agrees in principle to remove from the 1994 Regulations the requirement that a person is only entitled to have an IP annotation where they have been registered as a pharmacist for a period of two years.</p> <p>Recommendation 2</p> <p>The PSNI is to engage with the GPhC and relevant stakeholders in the development of Guidance (to be approved/endorsed by Council) to further define the requirements for course entry in advance of the changes being introduced.</p> <p>Recommendation 3</p> <p>The findings of this consultation should be presented to the ERIG at the earliest opportunity.</p>	

	<p>Recommendation 4</p> <p>We should engage with GPhC on the post-registration assurance of practice group as it considers any further requirements as part of its initial work, whilst ensuring appropriate engagement with local stakeholders.</p> <p>Recommendation 5</p> <p>Subject to the cross-reference with the GPhC on final wording of the changes to the Standard for Education and Training of pharmacist independent prescribers (2019), Council is asked to endorse that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the two-year requirement for entry onto stand-alone pharmacist independent prescribing courses, containing in the Standards for Education and Training of Independent Prescribers, replacing it with an assessment, by course providers, of competence to enter the course. b) the requirement to have relevant experience in a specific clinical or therapeutic area be removed and replaced with the requirement to have relevant experience in appropriate clinical setting(s). <p>The CEO advised that the Department had asked PSNI to set up the ERIG; the group is an advisory group to Council. The group's proposals and recommendations to amend regulations and standards would be brought to Council .</p> <p>It was noted that the term “clinical setting(s)” provided a wider range of areas in which pharmacists could operate and would more easily facilitate the legacy workforce. The CEO advised that currently approximately 800 of the 3,000 registered pharmacists were IPs. There would be a need for more pharmacists to have training in clinical settings. As IPs moved into community pharmacies, training settings would develop and increase the options for the legacy workforce. Before new IPs enter onto the Register in 2026, Council will need to think about a support framework for these</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>pharmacists in the early part of their career, perhaps as part of post registration education and training.</p> <p>It was hoped that the proposed legislation would be in place before 2026. This would be dependent on a functioning Assembly as it may require ministerial approval of the Departmental approach. The CEO advised that the Department and other colleagues in ERIG were keen to progress work.</p> <p>The PSEL advised that some of the feedback was on post-registration ability to immediately practise, particularly in the community pharmacy setting where the provision of services is much less developed. It is hoped to regularise and support the sector in terms of education and training. There was also feedback in relation to the role of employers in ensuring that pharmacists are fit to provide services. These will form part of the work that will be undertaken in conjunction with GPhC.</p> <p>The CEO advised that the timeline for IPs providing services in community pharmacy will be a matter of contract with the Department and those independent business providing the service. It will be influenced by the availability of suitably qualified and experienced IPs. He advised that there are lots of task & finish groups in the Department working on this and ERIG is involved in its development.</p> <p>The Registrar assured Council that the ERIG was fully across the wider and particular detail of this work including funding and the fitness for purpose of clinical settings.</p> <p>The President noted that the five recommendations sat naturally together as an entity and proposed that Council consider them as such when deciding whether or not to approve.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>Council approved the five recommendations as set out in the papers provided.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;"> <p>Key Decision: Council approved the five recommendations as set out in the papers provided.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Barry Mimmagh Seconded by: Philip Knox</p>
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Appointment of new Scrutiny Committee Member For Approval</p>	<p>The DPA advised that Mr Colin Kennedy's eight-year tenure as a lay member of the Scrutiny Committee ended in June 2022.</p> <p>Ms Jennifer Knape was the next ranked lay reserve on the Scrutiny Committee 2020 reserve list. She had been approached and had confirmed that she was willing to assume the role of lay member of the Scrutiny Committee, if approved by Council.</p> <p>He confirmed that the reserve list is for three year and can be extended for a further year and that the list would come to Council next year to consider such an extension.</p> <p>Council approved the appointment of Ms Jennifer Knape as lay member of the Scrutiny Committee and the President confirmed that he would send a letter, on behalf of Council, to Mr Colin Kennedy thanking him for his service and valuable contribution to the work of the Committee.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;"> <p>Key Decision: Council approved the appointment of Ms Jennifer Knape as lay member of the Scrutiny Committee Action: The President is to send a letter, on behalf of Council, to Mr Colin Kennedy thanking him for his service and valuable contribution to the work of the Committee</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Mark McCrudden Seconded by: Jonathan Patton</p>

<p>9.0</p>	<p>Safe Staffing Levels - Update For Approval</p>	<p>The CEO advised that this was in relation to those persons responsible for governance in pharmacy taking account of appropriate factors when deciding staffing levels. He noted that the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there was little available in terms of guidance, regulation and standard for employers; • Whilst Council was primarily responsible for registered staff, legislation did give Council leave to set standards for non-registered staff. <p>The Inspectorate had advised that they would require a benchmark against which to inspect this aspect of premises standards.</p> <p>He advised that the Premises Standards, which do include provisions to ensure adequate staffing levels, had not been commenced by the Department as yet, pending the completion of an inspection regime. At a recent meeting, the Department advised that they had not yet developed their IT requirements, somewhat reducing the urgency for the publication of standards. He advised that Council may wish to take some time to consider the proposals and get some reassurances and that the consultation could be brought to Council in September. This would not delay the Premises Standards coming into operation.</p> <p>The President noted that the Department was not advancing quickly, he was inclined to delay to allow fuller consideration.</p> <p>It was noted that there were no recommendations for GP practices – only for pharmacists within a community team and it was agreed that a well-constructed checklist/assessment framework would be useful for practitioners.</p>	
------------	---	--	--

		<p>The Vice President advised Council that it was making big changes and taking more time would result in a better decision.</p> <p>Council agreed that it would not make a decision at this time and instructed the Executive Team to bring this matter back to Council in September 2022.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #f0f0f0; padding: 5px;"> <p>Key Decision: Council agreed that it would not make a decision at this time and instructed the Executive Team to bring this matter back to Council in September 2022.</p> <p>Action: The Executive Team is to bring this matter back to Council in September 2022.</p> </div>	
10.0	<p>Removal of Names from the Register For Approval</p>	<p>The Registrar advised Council that she required its approval to remove from the Register the names of those pharmacists who had been issued with a demand for payment of retention fees under Article 15 of the Pharmacy NI order but who had not paid by 15 August 2022.</p> <p>The Registrar advised Council that pharmacists who had not paid their retention fee and who were also non-compliant with the CPD Framework would be removed for non-compliance with the CPD Framework.</p> <p>The CEO advised that the statutory process was well documented. A statutory demand was posted to the registrant's current address, as held on record, in line with legislation. The burden of proof of posting sits with the organisation and postal records are kept accordingly. He advised that a few payments may possibly be received before 15 August as some registrants did not pay until they had received their "red notice". Council</p>	

		<p>was, therefore, asked to give approval for the removal of those names who had not paid at the cut-off point of 15 August 2022.</p> <p>The Registrar advised that the removal of a pharmacist's name from the Register was the last resort. The current position was that 68 pharmacists had not paid the retention fee, 27 of whom were also non-compliant with the CPD Framework. Therefore, if the current position did not change, on 16 August 2022, with Council approval, 41 pharmacists' names would be removed from the Register for non-payment of retention fees. The remaining 27 pharmacists would be added to the list of those to be removed for non-compliance with the CPD Framework.</p> <p>Council asked that the relevant numbers of those to be removed for non-payment of retention fees, non-compliance with the CPD Framework and those who fell into both categories, be clearly tabled for next year.</p> <p>Council directed the Registrar to remove names of those persons with retention fees remaining unpaid two months after the date of the statutory notification, except for those subject to current Fitness to Practise and non-compliance with CPD submission requirements.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; background-color: #f0f0f0;"> <p>Key Decision: Council directed the Registrar to remove names of those persons with retention fees remaining unpaid two months after the date of the statutory notification, except for those subject to current Fitness to Practise and non-compliance with CPD submission requirements.</p> <p>Action: Council asked that the relevant numbers of those to be removed for non-payment of retention fees, non-compliance with the CPD Framework and those who fell into both categories, be clearly tabled for next year.</p> </div>	<p>Proposed by: Jonathan Patton Seconded by: Brendan Garland</p>

11.0	President's Report For Information	<p>The President advised that the Council recruitment process was proceeding and that he expected an announcement of appointments to be made in August.</p>	
11.1	Membership of post-registration assurance of education & training group	<p>The President advised that he had joined this group and attended a meeting which was hosted by GPhC and PSNI which had secured three places on the committee. It was a difficult meeting with 29 attendees, 28 of whom were registered pharmacists. It was expected that this important group would meeting monthly and will be based on Task & Finish groups addressing individual issues. The President asked for two registrant representatives to attend the group. Those appointed may have the opportunity to draw in other colleagues from Council.</p>	
12.0	CEO's Report For Information	<p>The CEO advised that papers were in the In Committee agenda in relation to a recent CEORB discussions around the DoH reforms and the status of regulatory bodies.</p> <p>In addition, he advised that he had received an email from the CPO advising that the near-final version of the Pharmacy Technician Consultation Report was imminent. He believed that it would be positive and would be favourable to moving on with the registration of pharmacy technicians.</p>	
13.0	Report on Progress Against Strategy For Information	<p>Council reviewed the content of the report presented and noted little change since the last Council meeting, with no additional amber or red ratings. The CEO advised that anything related to pharmacy technicians would probably change status prior to the next Council meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that the Corporate Strategy Addendum was available on the organisation's website.</p>	

14.0	Fitness to Practise Manual To Note	The DPA advised that, following the FtP training course and subsequent feedback– which went well, there are no real changes to the FtP manual.	
15.0	Correspondence Log For Information	None.	
16.0	Any Other Business For Information	In the absence of Carol Moore, Chair of the Council Learning & Development T&F Group, Philip Knox advised that, since the last Council meeting, a tender specification has been circulated to six organisations with receipt of tenders closing on 25 May 2022.	
17.0	Date of Next Council Public Meeting	The next Public Council meeting is scheduled for 09:30 on Thursday, 15 September 2022. It is hoped that this meeting will be in person.	