



REGULATION COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

DRAFT Minutes

14 June 2016

Attendees and Apologies

Regulation Council		
Patricia	Le Rolland	Lay Chair
Christine	Forde	Lay Member
Ian	Shackell	Lay Member
Nabila	Zulfiqar	Lay Member
Jonathan	Arthur	Professional Member
Robert	Farley	Professional Member
David	Stirling	Professional Member
In attendance		
Kerry	Tinkler	Registrar, Regulation Council
Louise	Collins	Registrations Administrator, AHCS
Janet	Monkman	CEO, AHCS

Key Discussion Points and Actions

No.	Subject	Minutes/Action	Owner	Action / Due
1.	Welcome and Apologies	<p>The Chair welcomed members and the AHCS Chief Executive Officer.</p> <p>One apology was received in advance of the meeting. The Council was declared quorate.</p> <p>It was confirmed that David Bennett had stepped down as the Deputy Registrar which was due to his role changing within the AHCS. The Chair thanked David Bennett for his help and support.</p> <p>The Registrar informed Council that an Interim Equivalence Director has been appointed to support the Equivalence process. The post has been created to enable the Registrar to focus on the AHCS Regulation work and new business. The Chair welcomed Mike Hallworth, the new Interim Equivalence Director to the Academy.</p>		
2.	Confidentiality	The Chair stressed that confidentiality should be adhered to at all times, all were in agreement.		
3.	Declarations of Interest including annual renewal	<p>One Professional Member declared that they are currently the treasurer of the Association of Clinical Scientists.</p> <p>All Regulation Council members provided signed declaration of interest forms to the Registrations Administrator.</p>		
4.	<p>Minutes of the meeting of the Regulation Council held on 22 February 2016</p> <p>Actions and matters arising</p>	<p>The Chair asked whether the minutes were a true reflection of February's meeting. All agreed that the minutes were a true reflection and two typing errors were noted.</p> <p>Action: make minor amendments and publish the minutes.</p> <p>The joint letter from the Regulation Council to Healthcare Providers was discussed. It was agreed that the letter had helped raise the Regulation Council's profile. The Regulation Council had also reviewed last year's activity and it was agreed that the Regulation Council had not only raised their profile through the joint letter but had also increased dialogue throughout the year amongst a variety of stakeholders.</p>	Registrations Administrator	01/08/2016

		<p>The Regulation Council recognise that members were from mainly within Scotland and Wales but felt that this worked well, however the Chair advised that if there were concerns about inclusion of an 'English' voice that this could be considered and that co-opting could be considered and will be discussed at the next meeting.</p> <p>Action: to include four countries representation in the next Regulation Council agenda.</p>	Registrations Administrator	11/10/2016
5	Annual Plan 2016/2017	<p>The Registrar presented the annual plan and progress to date. There were a number of areas discussed:</p> <p>The annual plan is based on the Regulation Council's 5-year plan (Statement of Regulatory Intent – SORI) which embeds corporate objectives. These strategic objectives under SORI in summary are: sustainability, creditability, standards, working with the public, and where the Regulation Council work fits into the wider regulation landscape.</p> <p>The number of current registrants was discussed and how Practitioner Students could be targeted to increase coverage. It was agreed that it would be beneficial to target students and raise their awareness of the AHCS Register. This could be done by circulating an information pack to NHS trusts, universities and student unions. Maximising coverage of the Register.</p> <p>An important area which the Regulation Council needs to focus on is raising the public's need for patient safety, and the public should be asking the question about registration and regulation. The Chair stated that she is doing some work on this and will discuss further under marketing.</p> <p>The Registrar advised that the marketing action plan and the KPIs are live documents and would be updated at each Regulation Council meeting. The CEO asked that as the annual plan is a public document any new business is business sensitive and so should be outlined only at high level. It was also agreed that the KPIs will be removed from the plan as this is the public document and the KPIs will be part of the Council's operational documentation.</p> <p>A Council member sought clarity on the Regulation Council member's role because they thought that the annual plan had moved their role from that of a strategic one to an operational role. The Registrar confirmed that their role is strategic however where members offer support and are</p>		

		<p>happy to meet with stakeholders this would always be welcomed.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the annual plan would be reviewed by the AHCS Board, their role to check sustainability. The document will not be published until this point.</p> <p>The Regulation Council members all agreed that there should be a key focus on obtaining new business and prioritisation should be in that area to build on the strength of the Register, engaging with wider groups where possible.</p> <p>Council felt that the numbers of registrants are included for business planning purposes and should not be included in a public annual plan.</p> <p>Action: The publically available core document will be reviewed and the above amendments made. It will then be circulated to Council for sign off and presented to the Board.</p> <p>Action: The KPIs will be removed from the plan as they are for internal use.</p> <p>Action: The Regulation Council were asked to provide any additional comments to the annual plan no later than Friday 17th June.</p>	Registrar	19/10/2016
			Registrar	19/10/2016
			Regulation council members	17/06/2016
6.	HCPC consideration of major change to the STP Equivalence application process	<p>The Registrar updated Council on the commissioned project to review the STP equivalence processes including the need for final interview.</p> <p>The Regulation Council would like the reviewer to consider the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges report on the value of interview in such situations.</p>		
7.	HSSR; first few months	<p>The Registrar gave a report on the Higher Specialist Scientist Early Implementers project. There were 51 applicants 21 entered the pilot (the remainder are on a waiting list) 13 were successful at stage 1. Eight have progressed to stage 2 (portfolio).</p> <p>There will shortly be expressions of interest exercise to look at the likely demand and prepare</p>		

		<p>resource accordingly.</p> <p>The Academy is in the process of finalising feedback from the assessors and implementing the final phases in terms of process and systems.</p> <p>There will be a phased role out, however the new Interim Equivalence Director may implement roll out differently.</p>		
8.	Academy update	<p>The CEO gave an overview of Academy activities including:</p> <p>The various opportunities for new business and this will be discussed in more detail in the private part of the meeting.</p> <p>The Academy has a responsibility to take any new curriculum relevant to the HCPC, of which there are several this year.</p> <p>Congress dates confirmed as 30 November – 1 December.</p>		
9.	Registrar's report	<p>The Registrar gave a report. It was noted that there is significant progress in the number of PTP level equivalence applications and it is hoped that these will soon convert into registration applications. There has been one investigation which has been dealt. This was from a self-declaration which resulted in a reference request from their employer. This has been received. A conversation with HR has taken place, advice of the Chair was sought by the Registrar and it was decided that the individual could progress to registration. The Chair thanked the team for dealing with this efficiently.</p>		
10.	Marketing strategy report	<p>The Registrar presented the communication and marketing plan to Council. There was a discussion and the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first and most important stakeholder/audience is patients and the public. • Another vital group is employers. • Accessing the students may be difficult but is vital. The HEE HCS Council for Higher Education Institutions did invite the AHCS to their council meetings in the past but this 		

		<p>group appears to have stopped meeting and the CEO believes that funding has been removed. The Registrar was asked to investigate further as this is a good forum to raise the Regulation Council's profile.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AHCS needs to utilise blogs. The Chair has written her first blog and the Registrar is currently writing a blog. Council members may be asked in the future too. • The Regulation Council workshop at the 2016 Congress should be added to the plan. <p>It was agreed that the following should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Measuring activity on the AHCS website · Having a survey for website visitors to feedback on the website · Reviewing the number of Facebook likes · Setting up a seminar for HEI leads and service leads · Targeting Student Unions · Utilising 'LinkedIn' · Setting up a trainee register <p>Action: Update and implement the plan taking the above comments on board. Action: investigate if the HCS Council for HEIs has been disbanded. Action: Investigate other opportunities via Universities UK.</p>	<p>Registrar Registrar Registrar</p>	<p>29/08/2016 29/08/2016 11/10/2016</p>
11.	PSA accredited registers seminar update	<p>The Registrar and CEO gave a brief summary of a PSA workshop they recently attended.</p> <p>It was an interesting day. Discussion seemed to focus on legal challenge, are Accredited registers trying to be a shadow of a statutory regulator? What are the pros and cons of fitness to practice and the difference between processes when the issue is one of competence compared to professionalism? There was discussion regarding sharing information across the UK Registers and Council were asked if they had any objection to sharing information regarding any sanctions imposed. Council did not object as we follow good governance regarding data protection. It was agreed that the data that would be shared is in the public domain.</p>		

		Action: Registrar to respond positively to the request for data sharing.	Registrar	29/07/2016
	Next meeting	11 th October2016		
	Close of meeting			