

Minutes of the meeting of the UKPHR Board held on Wednesday 21 June 2023 via Teams and 16a McLaren Building, 46 Priory Queensway, Birmingham, B4 7LR at 14.00 hours

**Present:** Andrew Jones (AJ) (Chair)  
Viv Speller (VS) (Vice Chair)  
Jessica Lichtenstein (Chief Executive)  
Gill Jones (GJ) (Registrar)  
Duncan Vernon (DV)  
James Sandy (JS)  
Linda Smith (LS)  
Ranjit Khutan (RK)  
Marianne Coward (MC)  
Helen Featherstone (HF)  
Ben Humphreys (BH)  
Joanna Dowd (JD)  
Jenny Douglas (JDo)

**Apologies:** David Evans  
Helen King

**As observers:** Pavenpreet Johal (PJ) (Secretariat)

**1. Welcome, apologies for absence and new declarations of interest**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted as above. There were no new declarations of interest.

**2. Minutes of Board meeting held on 20 April 2023**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2023 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Publish 20 April 2023 Board minutes on website	ASAP

**3. Actions and matters arising**

All actions were on track except for two that did not meet their deadline. JL reported that a joint letter, communicating the advantages of practitioner registration to be circulated to DsPH with the FPH, has been delayed due to receiving final approval from the Faculty Council. It was acknowledged that circulation was imminent, and a final copy would be circulated to Board members.

The other overdue action was in relation to the Audit, Risk and Remuneration Committee considering a policy for corporate sponsorship/involvement in UKPHR business. This was originally discussed in relation to corporate sponsorship for the practitioner conference. Due to the 2023 conference to be held virtually, it has not been a priority and it will be more relevant if an in-person conference is held in 2024.

**4. Governance forward planner**

The planner is an indicative document and continuously updated. The Board acknowledged the forward planner.

**5. UKPHR Reserves Policy**

JL reported that it was agreed in principle to not set an upper or lower baseline for reserves but to set out in principle approximately how much reserves would be need for certain activities such as being in a position to close down the business; facing increase legal fees or extended staff leave due to sickness or parental leave. Approximate operating costs have been calculated to ascertain an upper and lower limit as part of budget discussions.

DV reported on the ARRC discussions, implementing a RAG rating on reserves to help keep them on track. The committee also discussed various scenarios where the reserves would need to be used and acknowledged that the reason for using the reserves would define how much we would need.

HF commented that the GMC aim to set reserves at approximately 20-30% of annual turnover, which JL noted was approximately the percentage that was outlined in the draft policy. The Chair also acknowledged that the organisations risk to reserves and mitigations if the reserves depleted rapidly, are continually considered by the ARRC.

The Board agreed to adopt the policy in principle, with any additional detailed comments from Board members sent to JL.

	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
ACTION	JL	Adopt UKPHR Reserves Policy, including any possible comments received post meeting	ASAP

**6. UKPHR Strategy - timeline**

The Board were presented an indicative timeline of drafting the new strategy. JL thanked Board members on the strategy working party who helped draft the timeline. The aim is to bring a draft strategy and targeted (key stakeholders and internal wider workforce) consultation document to the September Board meeting. An advanced, if not final draft is hoped to be presented to the November Board meeting and a launch before the financial year; either end of January or March 2024 is proposed. The Board acknowledged the timeline.

**7. Committee/RPG recommendations for Board decision**

**ARRC:**

**a. 2022-23 Q4 accounts**

The Board were presented the draft 2022-2023 Q4 accounts, which have been discussed at the ARRC. JL acknowledged that there was a lot of reconciliation yet to occur after the end of the financial year, with additional income still to be received from local practitioner schemes. JL had viewed a more up to date version of the annual accounts, which will be presented at the July meeting of ARRC and the Board in September and they look healthy. DV reported the ARRC discussions on the cyclical nature of income which may result in reserves lowering throughout the year. The Chair also noted that the with the implementation of monthly Direct Debits to spread the cost of renewal fees, income will be spread throughout the year in the following year. The Board acknowledged the Q4 accounts.

**b. Practitioner Scheme Review Policy**

JL reported that at the last Board meeting revised appeals rules were approved. This exercise led the RPG to consider a policy to review local verification panel decisions for practitioner registration, which are not covered by the appeal rules, as no decision is being made to admit to the Register, rather the outcome is a recommendation to the RAC to admit or not admit. The Board were presented with a draft policy which allows individuals to review a verification panel

decision that does not recommend a practitioner to UKPHR for registration. The policy is clear that there are specific grounds, similar to an appeal, which includes a serious procedural issue or new material evidence that was unable to be considered as part of the original decision. The policy has been welcomed by the scheme coordinators and considered by practitioner moderators.

JS queried whether there was a limit on the number of reviews that could be requested. JL commented that someone could only challenge once for a single verification panel decision, but an application may be presented to subsequent verification panels. JL would consider whether this needs to be clarified in the policy. VS queried whether the 28 days to submit a review was adequate as its likely that the issue would initially be attempted to be dealt with locally between the moderator, coordinator and assessor and a review would likely be submitted if this was not satisfactory to the practitioner. JL responded that an individual would need to decide between the remediation advised by the verification panel or submit a review, they would not be able to have both. However, if they decided the remediation and the application was returned to another verification panel, they would have another option of review from the second panel. The practitioner guidance has also been refined to make it clearer on the process of involving moderators etc. The Board approved the practitioner registration review policy.

	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
ACTION	JL	Revise policy in light of Board discussion and adopt Practitioner Scheme Review Policy	ASAP

#### 8. Chief Executive's report (including Chair decisions and meetings)

The People in UK Public Health Group previously was provided administration support by PHE but since it was disbanded, the responsibilities were handed over to DHSC and OHID. However they are no long able to provide support as an English department to a four-country agenda. The group is continuing to discuss how to support the group and JL has made it clear that it was not appropriate for a regulator to be leading the agenda for workforce. JL also reported that she would be taking over chairing the group once Sally Pearson from the FPH steps down. PJ would attend as UKPHR representative once JL steps into the role of Chair.

JL reported that she was going to attend a public health workforce summit that is being run by the NHS workforce training and education directorate. The intent is to address some of the consistent workforce issues and produce an action plan that all organisations around the table can sign up to. Whilst it is being run from an English perspective and it's unclear whether representatives from other nations have been invited, the Board acknowledged the importance of a four nations approach to workforce, particularly regulation.

Progress has been made with the revalidation review and the Board is expected to receive a recommendations report in the autumn. A revised policy is currently being scrutinised by the task and finish group and the education and standards committee. The intention is to satisfy several requirements that are currently being met by evidence submitted directly to UKPHR to be satisfied via the appraisal, for example, CPD is already considered during an appraisal and a registrant would not be required to submit to UKPHR again for the purposes of revalidation. It is hoped that these changes will make the process more straightforward. The role of the responsible officer is still being considered and unsurprisingly most employer organisations do not have the capacity to take on this role for UKPHR registrants. It was also acknowledged that as a result of the revalidation review, re-registration for practitioners would also be considered to streamline the process.

The advanced practitioner report has not yet been published; it is envisaged it will be published at the end of June with a foreword from UKPHR. Progress is being made to prepare for practitioner applications via the apprenticeships. The first endpoint assessments are taking place in September/October. Practitioner moderators are involved as assessors from the first cohort from Salford University. The role of an end point assessor will be a paid role but to prevent assessors

leaving their scheme roles, only individuals who are able to commit to scheme work and have additional capacity for end point assessments will be considered.

JL thanked Board members who have supported in the preparation for the practitioner conference. The theme is around inclusivity. The agenda is still being drafted but William Roberts, RSPH Chief Executive has been confirmed as a keynote speaker, who is an engaging speaker on inclusivity. It is also hoped that the FPH's EDI and health disparities specialist interest group can deliver a session. The logistics of running country specific sessions is also being considered and the Board agreed that whilst there may not be practitioner registrants from Northern Ireland, space should be protected for them to use as they see fit. JL welcomed any ideas for sessions. Nominations for awards were also open.

PJ reported that the new registration system has continued to be working well. Annual Renewal season was well under way with approximately 60% of registrants completing renewal ahead of 1<sup>st</sup> July. The new offer of monthly Direct Debit has been taken up positively by approximately 50% of registrants renewing. The workload of renewals has been considerably less in the office, which will be evaluated further as a whole. Positive feedback has also been received from registrants. Microsoft has initiated some changes to PowerBI which has delayed access to reports but access should be regained soon. JL added that the part-time fixed term administrative support role would be rescoped after the renewal season and the Board will be expected to receive a report on the two part-time fixed term roles later this year.

There is an increased focus on the SRbPA route as one of the potential solutions to workforce issues across the system. Specialist moderators are enthusiastic to conduct a light touch review so that the system can be improved and streamlined.

JL also reported that she met with VS and LS who are approaching the point that they will no longer be able to revalidate and will have to relinquish their registration. A discussion was held on some sort of associate registration that could be explored to offer people withdrawing their registration due to retirement or career change who still have the capacity to contribute to UKPHR's wider workforce as assessors, verifiers etc, but require UKPHR registration. The next step is to measure the level of interest to consider whether this is a project to resource. It was acknowledged that this would not be a significant income stream. It is envisaged that a scoping document is presented to the next Board meeting.

## **9. Registration report**

The Board received the registration statistics, minutes of the Registration Approvals Committee and Registration Policy Group. GJ reported that RAC had held a really good EDI training session and SRbPA workshop with moderators. This was to support members feel more comfortable in decision making. It was welcomed to hold similar sessions each year to continually support members in their knowledge of routes to registration. JL also reported that the RPG responded positively to additional clarification on the oversight of the board and committee structure and changes made to the agenda to consider Board minutes in light of feedback.

## **10. Audit, Risk and Remuneration Committee report**

In addition to previously discussed items, DV added that the Committee discussed previous set of KPIs that Marcial had drafted. It was agreed that many felt no longer relevant and for others there were other means of seeking reassurance. It was agreed that most of it was already covered by the revised registration statistics.

## **11. Education and Training Standards Committee report**

JL reported that there had been no meeting since the previous Board meeting. RK is due to Chair the next committee in HK's absence.

## **12. Any other business**

There was no other business raised.

**13. Date, time and venue of next meeting**

Thursday 14th September 2023, Board and AGM at 11am till 3pm in person at UKPHR Office.

**Action points from this meeting**

<b>ACTIONS</b>	<b>WHO</b>	<b>WHAT</b>	<b>BY WHEN</b>
	JL	Publish 20 April 2023 Board minutes on website	ASAP
	JL	Adopt UKPHR Reserves Policy, including any possible comments received post meeting	ASAP
	JL	Revise policy in light of Board discussion and adopt Practitioner Scheme Review Policy	ASAP

The Chair closed the meeting at 15.15 hours.