

Present: Duncan Vernon - Chair (DV)
David Evans (DE)
Jenny Douglas (JDoug)
Joanna Dowd (JDowd)

Jessica Lichtenstein (JL)
Pav Johal (PV)

Apologies: Helen Featherstone
James Sandy
Linda Smith

Item 1 – Welcome, apologies, and declarations of interest

1. DV welcomed the group and noted apologies from Helen Featherstone, James Sandy, and Linda Smith. There were no new declarations of interest.

Item 2 – Minutes from last meeting

2. The committee noted the minutes from 18 July 2023 as an accurate record.

Item 3 – Action points and matters arising

3. Outstanding actions from the last meeting were discussed.
4. JL provided updates on all open actions. A risk appetite statement would be considered after the new organisational strategy is finalised.
5. Actions related to prediction of portfolio numbers would be considered as part of the light touch SRbPA review- this will include engagement with local support programmes so we might be able to better understand applications in the pipeline and know whether we have the resources to deal with the volume expected. It was noted that a related risk has been added to the Risk Register.
6. CAF Bank account is now open and everyone who needs access has it. PJ is in the process of shifting funds to the new account, while ensuring all invoices and direct debits can continue to be paid. Once all money is transferred, we will discuss with the Bank how much they recommend moving into the interest-bearing account, which is fully accessible.

Item 4 – Q1-2 2023/24 Accounts

7. JL introduced the accounts and confirmed that income and spending is approximately in line with what was budgeted. She noted that these are cash accounts so provide a point-in-time picture. Some payments and expenses happened in this financial year so are listed here, but were reconciled to the 22/23 EOY accounts; these should not be included when comparing income and expenditure to the budget and account for most of the variance.
8. There is a discrepancy in how income is distributed over the year. We'd budgeted for approximately 40% of registrants paying by direct debit when much less than that did- the

rest paid in full at the time of renewal over the summer. This means a significant summer spike in income. It's expected that over time more registrants will move over to direct debit, and we'll promote this option in communications about renewals next year.

Item 5 – Registration support officer role

9. JL introduced a proposal for the continuation of the Registration support officer role. The original intention was that this role would be temporary until the new Registration Online System was embedded, after which it would no longer be needed. The ROL evaluation indicates that the system has indeed saved approximately 1/3 of the time associated with this role. A role evaluation indicates that the other 2/3 of the role, prior to ROL implementation, was spent providing the rest of the team with general admin support, managing communications and enquiries, and providing support to the CE. So in reality, the role shaped up to be something slightly different than originally envisaged, and highly valuable to the team and the UKPHR's growth trajectory. The Role description has been updated, and additional support tasks have also been added- these allow the rest of the team to take on development work (ie revalidation streamlining, SRbPA review) which is ongoing.
10. The financial benefits of this role are difficult to quantify, as it provides support across all areas of UKPHR work. However, it's clear that if UKPHR is going to be able to fulfil the ambitions outlined in the new strategy, appropriate administrative support is essential.
11. Financial projections mean that some of the costs associated with the role won't be fully funded during the next two years- some reserve spending (approximately £14,000/pa) will be required. However, the spending will still be within the confines of the Reserves Policy.
12. Several options were discussed. It was agreed that it was not appropriate at this time to end the contract in March 2024, considering the strategic commitments being made for the next 5 years. However, there will be significant changes happening still over the course of the next year or two, and the role description may need to change further. Because of this, and because the funding of the role is not yet going to be covered by income, the Committee agreed to recommend to the Board that the contract should be extended by another year until March 2025 according to the same conditions and at 3 days per week. At that point a decision will need to be made about whether to end the role or make it permanent- it's not appropriate to continue to extend year by year indefinitely.
13. The committee was very clear about the intrinsic value of administrative support and acknowledge that it is required for the team to undertake the more developmental aspects of their roles and for the UKPHR to continue on its growth trajectory.
14. JDowd left the meeting after this agenda item, and the Committee remained quorate.

Action: Submit to Board for final approval

Item 6 – Registration Online evaluation

15. PJ presented the ROL report she'd drafted. She noted that six months after implementation there had been significant positive impact on the work on the team. Registrants had also

reported improvements in their experience. Fortesium is keen to use some of the report in their materials, and we've given them permission.

16. The Committee acknowledged the positive report and noted the improved staff and registrant experience. They accepted that the time saved allows the team to focus on more developmental work and will ensure that we meet the goals outlined in the new Strategy. This report will be highlighted to the Board in the Committee update.

Item 17 – Expense policy

17. With in-person meetings becoming more frequent and several dates for staff and moderator travel in the diary, it's time to re-examine the approach to expenses. Although UKPHR has had general rates for reimbursement in place, it has not had an expense policy. The rates for reimbursement are also out of date. PJ drafted an expense policy based on best practice, which covers potential eventualities and circumstances.
18. The Committee felt this was a sensible approach. They suggested that we clarify that the policy only applies to the individual doing work for the UKPHR. They also felt it appropriate that going over the recommended spending ceiling could be granted by exception, to ensure an individual's personal safety- UKPHR has a duty of care. The section regarding hotel cancellations also requires clarification. It was also suggested that a review date is added, as standard rates for reimbursement may increase.

Action: Make amendments to the expenses policy as per above

19. JL confirmed that the policy is affordable; there are limited direct costs affiliated with in person Board meetings and staff travel that are budgeted for, but most travel required by moderators for SRbPA programmes will be re-imbursed to the UKPHR from the hosting organisation. The Committee agreed that this provides structure for expenses and is a good tool for controlling costs.

Action: Submit to Board for final approval.

20. The Committee considered the top Risk Register. The Change log indicated amendments made since the previous meeting.
21. Risk 7 addresses the portfolio route. JL updated the risk to include content about managing a significant influx of applications. The team are mitigating by keeping the pool of assessors active, involved, and trained. The risk rating was updated from Green to Amber, as we know there are several applications being prepared but are unsure about numbers and timelines.
22. The ARRC reiterated that one of the intentions of the pre-application was to understand numbers preparing for full portfolio submission, and that this first stage would be light-touch; a sense-check rather than an assessment. It was noted that originally the process involved one assessor but was felt to be a high stakes decision so two became involved. JL noted that the light touch review of the SRbPA was coming up and the pre-application process would be considered.

Action: to ensure the SRbPA review considers the original intentions of the pre-application process to be as light touch as possible.

23. JL confirmed that the review outputs will be reported to the Education & Standards Committee, with the risk elements reflected in the risk register.
24. Risk 8 was updated with detail around practitioner/verifier shortages due to easing of some local barriers- the situation had been improving slightly but this area is still a risk.
25. Risk 9 was re-framed to focus more on the financial risks discussed as part of the reserves policy discussion, and less on 'lack of effective financial systems'; the ARRC agreed that systems are now in place and they are assured reporting is accurate. The risk overall was downgraded to 'green' and reflects updated mitigations.
26. Overall, the ARRC agreed that if a risk is 'green' for 3 quarters it should probably be closed. JL noted that there were several risks that were framed as 'risks to the public' that are intrinsic to a regulator and have been green for some time. It was agreed that at future meetings, the ARRC discussion would include consideration of risks that had been green for 3 or more quarters.
27. As such, Risk 10, relating to lack of security and risk of infection had been green for some time and was more relevant during the pandemic period. It was agreed to close this risk. It was also agreed that PSA- recommended risks to the public should be clearly grouped together, as should those that are outside of our control and those we can control.
28. It was noted that with the new strategy coming in next year, it would be a good time to fully review and perhaps re-frame the risk register, linking individual risks to strategy themes. This could tie in with a conversation around risk appetite.

Action: close risk 10 relating to the physical safety of staff.

Action: amend risk register to group together three different types of risks: inherent, system-wide, and UKPHR-controlled.

Action: re-frame risk register according to strategy, and include risk appetite discussion on agenda as part of this discussion at a future meeting, perhaps January or March 2024.

Item 10 - Next meeting

29. JL noted that she hadn't updated this item on the agenda- the next meeting will be 18th January 2024.