

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of meeting of UKPHR's Education and Training Committee
held on Tuesday 26 July 2022 by Microsoft Teams

At 14.30hrs

Present:

NAME	FOR MINUTES	ORGANISATION
Helen King	Chair	UKPHR's Board
Jessica Lichtenstein	JL	CEO, UKPHR
David Evans	DE	UKPHR's Board
Gill Jones	GJ	UKPHR's Registrar
Ranjit Khutan	RK	UKPHR's Board
Fiona MacDonald	FM	Public Health Scotland
Zaira Ejaz (secretariat)	ZE	UKPHR (secretariat)

Apologies:

NAME	ORGANISATION
Joanna Dowd	UKPHR's Board
Jenny Douglas	UKPHR's Board

1. Welcome, apologies and declaration of interest

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance and apologies were all listed above. There were no new declarations of interest.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2022 were agreed as a true record.

3. Action Points and matters arising

The Chair noted the action points as follows:

22/04 – This action was an item to be discussed on the agenda.

22/05 – The application form to submit a request for extenuating circumstances was created and signed off by the Board at its February 2022 meeting.

22/06 – JL reported that she met with the Faculty of Public Health a few weeks ago to discuss this. Judith Hooper is currently leading on the work on the review of the Specialist Registration by Portfolio Assessment competencies against the Faculty of Public Health's 2022 revised curriculum. JL will pick this up with her when she returns from annual leave as this work is still ongoing.

4. **Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and Reasonable Adjustments**

JL reported to the Committee that there has been some progress made with the work on EDI. Following the workshop at the Board's Strategy Day in April with Belonging Pioneers, the focus was on the organisation's strategic vision for this work. JL said that it was a good opportunity to reflect on the data in terms of thinking about the next steps such as taking the recommendations from the EDI report and grouping them into key themes and turning them into deliverable and manageable actions. The next step will be to focus on how these actions will be delivered. JL commented that the action plan does seem like a lot of work, and it would be best to prioritise what needs to be delivered first such as meeting the legal requirements around policy development and then focusing on the data. JL asked the Committee to provide their thoughts on how best to prioritise the actions in the action plan. JL added that she sought advice from Ishreen at Belonging Pioneers who helped develop the action plan and the grouping of the actions into themes. A session on EDI is planned with the UKPHR staff in September as a first step. The Chair thanked JL for her report and welcomed thoughts and feedback from the Committee. GJ commented on the first theme regarding policies and mentioned that the work on this has been done via the Impact Analysis that was developed when the policies were viewed at the EDI working party, but it may be useful to review this again if needed. RK said that it was good to see this action plan as this helps develop some of the recommendations made as they were quite broad level. It would be good to see this reviewed frequently. DE thanked JL for the action plan and commented on whether the number of actions on the plan would be achievable by a small team. He suggested adding two columns onto the plan such as timescale and owner of action to assign specific tasks to a named person to ease the burden and ensure tasks are distributed evenly amongst staff and possibly Board members. Then focusing on what the real priorities are that we want to achieve over the next year. The Chair agreed with DE's suggestion and offered to come to the office to work with JL on this work. JL agreed with GJ's suggestion about referring to the Impact Analysis when looking at policies and mentioned that this theme was more focused on embedding equality analysis into our thinking when discussing policy. JL mentioned that one of the original recommendations was to review the EDI policy annually and it would be good to have a review of this as some of the recommendations were quite ambitious such as producing an annual board report. This can be changed to periodic so that this is deliverable. The IT upgrade is a really good opportunity to look again at the demographic data that is collected and to collect data on all of the protected characteristics from our registrants. This will make it easier to identify any outliers. The Faculty of Public Health have committed to share some of the work they are currently doing on EDI with UKPHR before it is published in September, including the data on protective characteristics. The Chair commented that it would be helpful to identify other organisations whose work we can carry out on a shared basis and also suggested having a form of impact assessment document in place to check the impact on the policies and procedures being reviewed and how they will be delivered. FM queried about whether communication was referred to in the action plan in terms of building awareness on EDI in the system. JL confirmed that one of the themes in the action plan was communication but that this could be amended to refer to communication across the broader system rather than just with registrants. The Chair said if the Committee had any other thoughts or ideas to share them via email to the Education and Training Committee. The Chair agreed to arrange a date to meet with JL to discuss the prioritisation of the EDI action plan in detail and asked Committee members to come forward if there are any specific areas which they would like to work on from the action plan. GJ said she would be happy to attend the office and work with JL and the Chair on this work.

GJ reported on the reasonable adjustments and mentioned that this has led to UKPHR forming a complex case panel where difficult and challenging cases can be

considered in order to ensure robust decision making. ZE has arranged a doodle poll to identify a date for the training to be held in September for the panel. JL said that there were a surprising number of complex cases emerging especially at the time of revalidation. It appeared that the decision making was not consistent and there was no guidance describing exactly what the expectations are and what evidence is needed to make such decisions on revalidation and re-registration. The Extenuating Circumstances and Reasonable Adjustments policy was developed as a result, but the decision making is quite high risk for the Registrar as an individual, so a panel structure was needed to support with consistent decision making. The Chair supported this and said that as the organisation starts to mature, it is timely to have this in place. The Chair also mentioned that the Board at its last meeting asked the Committee to look at the supervision and implementation of the EDI policy and action plan so this will be a standing item on the agenda.

	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
ACTION 22/07	Helen King	Arrange a date with Jessica to meet in the office to discuss the work on EDI	As soon as possible

5. Revalidation review

JL presented the paper to the Committee on the revalidation review and mentioned that the key message following the revalidation workshop held in May was of the importance of revalidation for UKPHR. However, there are some issues with the process that is currently in place and conflicting ideas around what is equivalence with the medical process and what is realistic for UKPHR to deliver and what registrants can achieve within their defined job roles. UKPHR is an organisation with limited resources so we need think about how to promote the benefits of validation so that Responsible Officers can take on more of the responsibility as UKPHR does not have a Responsible Officer system in place like the GMC. UKPHR undertakes all of the checks that a Responsible Officer would usually do and which could be deferred to local organisations. UKPHR also needs to review the requirements for revalidation in detail, especially in a post-pandemic world and to identify what UKPHR needs to be assured that registrants remain fit to practice and meet standards. A task and finish group has been proposed to undertake this work and ZE has sent a doodle poll to those on the membership list for an initial meeting to be held in September 2022. The task and finish group will look at two themes which are to consider UKPHR's requirements for revalidation and also to consider how best to support UKPHR registrants to meet the requirements across the system. JL informed the Committee that the Audit, Risk and Remuneration Committee were also interested in revalidation and in order to avoid duplicate reporting, JL proposed that the requirements of revalidation were reported to the Education and Training Committee who will make recommendations to the Board on the actual requirements. The risk log will be continuously reported to the Audit, Risk and Remuneration Committee. The Chair thanked JL for her report. DE commented that the report was very useful and emphasises the challenge for a small organisation to try to maintain equivalence with the GMC as an organisation with a lot of resources. DE commented that he firmly supported the idea that UKPHR should adopt something that is proportionate for the scale of the organisation and also recognised the difference in risk with public health practice and medical practice. The Chair agreed with DE's comments and suggested having a registrant who is currently involved in the revalidation process on the task and finish group. JL agreed that it was important for registrants to be represented and some members are registered with UKPHR, but it was important to avoid conflict of interest. The Chair said that it would be helpful to touch base on the progress of this

review at the Education and Training Committee meetings and if there was any support or work needed to be done, then the Committee was happy to help.

6. Any other business

JL informed the Committee that the practitioner moderators raised some concerns regarding the final draft of the apprenticeship guidance as they had not seen this previously. They expressed concerns regarding the moderator role in the process as they are key to decision making and quality assurance. The apprenticeship guidance has now been put on hold for another review and JL and Danielle Stephens will be making some changes to the document with the feedback from the practitioner moderators. As this is time sensitive, JL said that she would like a draft of the amended guidance to be circulated to this Committee for comments alongside the feedback from the moderators, with a view to having this re-approved by the Board at the meeting in September 2022. The document would then be published. JL said that Danielle has undertaken an exercise to determine at what phase the different cohorts are at in this process and it appears the first cohort will be completing their apprenticeship in 2024. FM queried the concerns moderators raised and JL said that the decision-making process was a little ill-defined as it was proposed that UKPHR would undertake office checks and the application would then be taken to the Registration Approvals Committee with the moderator attending and presenting each case. The moderators raised concerns as this was not consistent with UKPHR's other processes such as the Specialist Registration by Portfolio Assessment route where the assessment takes place outside of the governance process. The guidance is also difficult to understand as it contains a lot of technical guidance and not easy to read. The guidance will be amended so that the technical detail about decision making, and Committees is placed in appendices to make this more straightforward. DE commented that as the Committee will be commenting on the changes of the guidance via email, that it is important to ensure the changes in the new version are highlighted very clearly, either with tracked changes or an overarching introduction about what exactly has been changed. JL agreed with this suggestion and agreed to incorporate this. DE also added that it is important to ensure that no extra hoops are added when the proposed changes are made and reviewed. The Chair agreed with this suggestion. FM commented that there is a learning point regarding moving the technical information to appendices and adopting this for other documents for UKPHR's other routes to registration as a future learning point.

7. Next meeting

Tuesday 4th October 2022 at 14.30hrs was proposed and agreed.