

**UKPHR Education and Standards Committee**

**Minutes of meeting on 7 October 2025**

Present		Apologies	
NAME	ORGANISATION	NAME	ORGANISATION
Marianne Coward Chair (MC)	UKPHR Board	Ranjit Khutan	UKPHR Board
Jessica Lichtenstein (JL)	UKPHR CEO	Gill Jones	UKPHR Registrar
Ben Humphrey (BH)	UKPHR Board	Joanna Dowd	UKPHR Board
Jenny Douglas (JDouglas)	UKPHR Board	William Roberts	Royal Society for Public Health
David Evans (DE)	UKPHR Board		
Irfan Ghani (IG)	UKPHR Practitioner Moderator		
Samantha King (SK)	Royal Society for Public Health		
Zaira Ejaz (ZE)	Secretariat, UKPHR		

Item 1 - Welcome, apologies and declaration of interest

1. MC acted as the chair in Ranjit’s absence and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance and apologies were all listed above. There were no declarations of interest.

Item 2 – Minutes of previous meeting

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2025 were agreed as a true record.

Item 3 - Action Points and matters arising

***ACTION: Review and update the current list of MSF tools on UKPHR’s website.***

3. ZE met with the Registrar in September and reviewed and updated the current list of MSF tools and removed any tools that were out of date or not relevant. The updated list is now published and available on UKPHR’s website.

***ACTION: Review the Fitness to Practise Project Initiation document (PID) following comments from the Committee.***

4. The Committee’s comments from the last meeting were incorporated and updated in the Fitness to Practise Project Initiation document (PID).

***ACTION: Produce an analysis of existing fitness to practise concerns raised to UKPHR with relevant findings in time for the next Education & Standards meeting.***

5. ZE produced an analysis of existing fitness to practise concerns, and this would be discussed later as a separate item on the agenda.

#### Item 4 – Fitness to Practise Review

*Analysis of previous concerns, flowchart of process and guidance to be developed*

6. JL introduced the discussion on the Fitness to Practise (FtP) work to date, summarising updates to the process since the previous meeting. The meeting focused on reviewing findings from the analysis of historic concerns, outlining the proposed FtP process (including a new triage stage), and identifying next steps for policy refinement.
7. JL reiterated that UKPHR, as an accredited register, has a responsibility to act if registrants fail to meet required standards. The current FtP process remains largely untested due to the very small number of concerns reported. There are ongoing conversations with the DHSC regarding regulatory gaps and how to ensure the FtP process is fit for purpose.
8. The Committee were presented with the report on the analysis of previous concerns received by UKPHR, a high-level flow chart of the proposed new FtP process as well as a list of guidance and resources to be developed to support this process.
9. ZE presented the report on the analysis of concerns received between 2019 and July 2025 (six cases in total). Approximately half of the concerns were anonymous, and half were made directly by identifiable complaints. Most cases, related to professional and personal conduct, fairness and cooperation. Of the six concerns, one was formally investigated but not upheld. The remaining five were declined by the Registrar due to insufficient evidence or not meeting the threshold for investigation. All processes and outcomes were properly documented, often with HR involvement. Although historically low, a slight increase in the number of concerns has been noted in the past year.
10. DE queried whether complainants have ever challenged outcomes when complaints were closed. JL confirmed that no such challenges have occurred. The only formal appeal route currently applies to registrants appealing sanctions; there is no process for complainant appeals. It was suggested to review how other regulators handle appeal processes to ensure fairness and transparency.
11. There was a query on what framework guides the Registrar's decision not to investigate a concern. There is a threshold referenced in the FtP rules, but not a comprehensive framework. Work will be undertaken to articulate a more detailed threshold and decision criteria. Demographic data monitoring for FtP cases was also raised, noting literature showing disparities in concerns based on ethnicity. JL acknowledged the significance of this issue. As the numbers are quite low for meaningful analysis, available data has shown all registrants involved to date have been white, and most have been male.
12. A new high-level flowchart introducing a triage stage was presented to the Committee to manage low-level or inappropriate concerns more efficiently. Thresholds for action have not yet been defined; this will form part of the next phase of policy work.
13. It was suggested to review procedures again after the first substantial FtP case following the new process to capture learning and improvements.
14. The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussions. The Committee noted the progress made to date. FtP will also remain as a standing item on the agenda so the Committee is regularly updated on development, and an updated FtP progress report will be provided at the next scheduled meeting.

#### Item 5 – FPH curriculum and assessment review

15. JL provided a verbal update on the FPH's formal review of the curriculum and assessment system, initiated at the request of the GMC. Most colleges and faculties are conducting similar reviews, and the outcomes are expected to have a direct impact on UKPHR due to the alignment between the FPH's curriculum and UKPHR's portfolio assessment standards. UKPHR currently accepts the Faculty Part 1 (Diploma) exam as evidence of knowledge competencies in the portfolio route. Therefore, ongoing assurance that the curriculum and assessments remain compatible with registration requirements is essential.
16. JL confirmed that she sits on both the Curriculum Steering Group and Assessment Steering Group, chaired by Richard Jarvis, which allows strong insight and input into developments. The new curriculum is expected to be implemented by 2027, providing sufficient lead-in-time for alignment and adjustments. The intention is to invite the FPH to present the updated curriculum to the Committee, as was done during the previous 2022 curriculum review.
17. IG noted that this represents a major review, contrasting with the previous light-touch update. Significant changes to the curriculum are anticipated. He highlighted the availability of multiple consultation platforms for stakeholder feedback and encouraged committee members to contribute to the process.
18. JL confirmed that a questionnaire has been circulated by the FPH as part of the consultation. This has been forwarded to the specialist moderators who oversee the portfolio assessment route to ensure UKPHR's feedback is included.

#### Item 6 – FPH EDI strategy

19. JL provided an update on collaborating with the Faculty of Public Health (FPH) regarding fairer training initiatives with the focus being on analysis of exam performance among trainees and non-trainees, identifying trends and addressing disparities. The FPH recently published a report highlighting significantly lower exam success rates among candidates from Black and ethnic minority backgrounds.
20. An action plan is in place, overseen by a steering group which JL sits on, aimed at offering targeted support and exploring causes of differential outcomes. Recent efforts have broadened the scope to include non-trainees, such as public health professionals pursuing the Specialist Registration via the Portfolio route. An information sharing agreement has been signed to allow anonymised EDI data sharing between the two organisations.
21. JL also updated the Committee on UKPHR plans for publishing EDI data. The original intent was to include EDI data in the annual report, but richer data has only recently been obtained following the summer renewal period. Pav is preparing a short report as a point-in-time snapshot detailing all protected characteristics from the register. This will be shared with the Committee and Board to facilitate internal discussion before it is published.

#### Item 7 – Any other business

None.

#### Item 8 - Next meeting

22. **Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2026 at 14.30hrs** was proposed and agreed.