

Council

Public minutes of the 58th meeting of the Health Professions Council held as follows:-

Date: Thursday 10th December 2009

Time: 10:30am

Venue: The Council Chamber, Health Professions Council, Park House, 184 Kennington Park Road, London SE11 4BU

Present:

Anna van der Gaag (Chair)
Patricia Blackburn
Mary Clark-Glass
John Donaghy (For items 1-12 inclusive)
Julia Drown
Richard Kennett
Jeff Lucas
Arun Midha (For items 1-12 inclusive)
Penelope Renwick
Deep Sagar
Eileen Thornton
Annie Turner
Joy Tweed
Diane Waller
Neil Willis

Mr J Bracken, Solicitor to HPC
Mr G Butler, Director of Finance
Ms S Carini, Events Manager
Mr G Gaskins, Director of Information Technology
Ms E Gayle, Press & Public Relations Manager
Mrs A Gorringe, Director of Education
Mr M Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Ms L Hart, Secretary to Council
Ms T Haskins, Director of HR
Ms Johnson, Director of Fitness to Practise
Mr J Jones, Publications Manager
Mrs J Ladds, Director of Communications
Mr S Mars, Policy Officer
Mr M Potter, CPD Communications Manager

Mr S Rayner, Secretary to Committees
Mr G Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
Ms M Scott, Policy Manager
Mr M J Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar
Ms C Urwin, Policy Manager

Item 1.09/194 Chair's welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed all members and members of the public to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed the large number of psychotherapists and counsellors present and in addition, the representatives from the Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors.
- 1.3 The Chair highlighted some important housekeeping issues to ensure the safety of Council and those members of public in the gallery.

Item 2.09/195 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from John Harper.

Item 3.09/196 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Council approved the agenda.

Item 4.09/197 Declaration of Members' Interest

- 4.1 There were no interests declared.

Item 5.09/198 Minutes of the Council meeting of 7 October 2009 (report ref:- HPC194/09)

- 5.1 It was agreed that the minutes of the 57th meeting of the Health Professions Council be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Item 6.09/199 Matters arising (report ref:- HPC195/09)

- 6.1 The Council noted the action list as agreed at the last meeting.

Item 7.09/200 Chair's report (report ref:- HPC196/09)

- 7.1 The Council received a paper from the Chair.
- 7.2 The Chair congratulated the Chief Executive and Registrar on his two recent appointments; the first as a Director on the Board of CLEAR, the first European Director to be appointed to the Board and second, to the Department of Health's Professional Standards Programme Oversight Board.
- 7.3 In response to a question regarding the meeting with a Minister of the Welsh Assembly Government, the Council noted that there was support for the statutory regulation of psychotherapists and counsellors within Wales.
- 7.4 The Council noted the report.

Item 8.09/201 Chief Executive's report (report ref:- HPC197/09)

- 8.1 The Council received a paper from the Chief Executive.
- 8.2 The Chief Executive drew Council's attention to two important projects underway at HPC; Firstly, the online renewals project which was progressing well following a period of successful testing and secondly, the upgrade to the Fitness to Practise Case Management System.
- 8.3 The Council noted that there had been a steady rise in the number of allegations received. With regards to page 10b, Council were pleased to note that the number of pending cases remained relatively flat. This was largely down to a reallocation of resources within the organisation to ensure that targets for case times were met.
- 8.4 During the course of discussion, the following points were raised:-
 - That there was a sharp rise in complaints to the registrations department between May and July of last year following the renewal period of physiotherapists. Council noted that measures have now been introduced to ensure customer service is not compromised during peak periods of renewals. These include introducing an evening shift and training registration staff in more than one discrete area of work.
 - Council noted that the Executive considered complaints on a monthly basis to see if any trends could be drawn out and in addition, what measures could be introduced to improve service and processes. A copy of the complaints report considered by the Executive on a monthly basis would be submitted to the next appropriate Council meeting for information.

- Following a question on improving the efficiency of the Fitness to Practise process, it was agreed that the next meeting of the Fitness to Practise Committee in February would consider the type of information that it would be helpful to provide to all members of Council so they are kept up-to-date on the performance of the FtP function.
- Council noted the Executive's commitment to ensuring the delivery of the Fitness to Practise function through further readjustment of the organisational structure to enhance the effective running of the department and the reallocation of resources across the organisation.
- The Executive were asked to consider the correlation between the number of Registrants and the number of Fitness to Practise complaints received to see if there was a rise in the number of complaints following the statutory regulation of practitioner psychologists.

8.5 The Council noted the report and the actions arising therein.

Strategy and Policy

The Chair introduced the two papers relating to Psychotherapists and Counsellors to provide some background on the process followed by HPC to date.

Council noted that in February 2007, the Government published the White Paper Trust Assurance and Safety - The regulation of Health Professionals in the 21st Century, paragraph 7.16 of which stated:

"...psychologists, psychotherapists and counsellors will be regulated by the Health Professions Council, following that Council's rigorous process of assessing their regulatory needs and ensuring its system is capable of accommodating them. This will be the priority of future regulation."

Council noted that the practitioner psychologists part of the HPC Register opened on 1st July 2009.

In relation to psychotherapists and counsellors, it was noted that the HPC agreed on 13 December 2007 to consider the issues identified in the White Paper.

The Council noted that consideration was firstly given to whether the regulatory 'building blocks' which the HPC uses (protected titles, standards of proficiency) can be used to meet the regulatory needs of psychotherapists and counsellors; and secondly, whether it can be done in a manner which can be accommodated by the HPC and importantly, without detriment to the

discharge of the HPC's functions in relation to the professions it currently regulates.

The Chair thanked the Professional Liaison Group (PLG) for their contribution to the process having met 5 times, totalling some 8 days to consider the issues. In addition, over 1000 responses were received as part of the public consultation carried out between July and October of this year.

Item 9.09/202 Psychotherapists and Counsellors Consultation Responses (report ref:- HPC198/09)

- 9.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 9.2 The Council noted that the issue of the structure of the Register had generated the highest number of comments through the consultation process. The Council noted two current options regarding differentiation. The arts therapists part of the Register includes art therapists, music therapists and dramatherapists. There are separate approved training programmes for each of these groups, as well as distinct standards of proficiency and at least one protected title for each group. In contrast, for the chiropodists and podiatrists part the Register there is one set of approved training programmes, one set of standards of proficiency and both titles are protected but there is no distinction between titles and they may be used interchangeably by practitioners.
- 9.3 During discussion on the consultation paper, the following points were raised:-
 - There was agreement that this was a well-balanced, objective paper, presented in a structured way;
 - The paper had reinforced the complexity of the task before the Council and the need to do further work particularly around differentiation between psychotherapists and counsellors;
 - The consultation had attracted a wide range of perspectives, some of which required further exploration and follow up;
 - The value of consultation was highlighted here given the differing perspectives provided on some issues;
 - There were differing views expressed amongst the field;
 - That there was a strong disagreement around the proposals to differentiate between psychotherapists and counsellors;
 - There was a reaffirmation of the Council's commitment to ensuring the protection of the public;

- The views being expressed were not new concerns for a profession embarking on statutory regulation for the first time; and
- That further consideration needed to be given to whether there should be any differentiation on the Register between practitioners qualified to work with children and young people and those qualified to work with adults.

9.4 The Council agreed the text of the document for publication on the HPC website (subject to any minor editing amendments prior to publication).

Item 10.09/203 Conclusions on the proposed statutory regulation of Psychotherapists and Counsellors (report ref:- HPC199/09)

10.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.

10.2 The Chief Executive introduced the report stating that he intended to take the Council through the conclusions one by one as he had done when Council had discussed the paper on the governance arrangements for the restructured Council.

10.3 The Chief Executive explained the next steps in terms of the legislative timetable. The Council noted that, if the Government decided to proceed with the regulation of psychotherapists and counsellors, the Department of Health would consult on a Section 60 Order under the Health Act 1999. Once finalised, this would then be progressed through both the UK Parliament in Westminster and the Scottish Parliament. The publication of the Section 60 Order would be followed by a HPC consultation on standards of proficiency and standards of education and training. It was further noted that the HPC anticipated a delay in the legislative timetable owing to the 2010 General Election.

10.4 The Council noted that the DH would consult on the protection of titles and the grandparenting period through the Section 60 Order consultation and the HPC would consult on the Standards of Education and Training and the Standards of Proficiency once Council had considered and approved the recommendations of the Education and Training Committee.

Structure of the Register

10.5 During the course of discussion, the following points were made:-

- that deciding at this stage to not differentiate in the structure of the Register between different modalities, would not preclude

the HPC from any future decision about differentiation between psychotherapists and counsellors;

- that further work is required in order to draw any conclusions on the issue of differentiation in the structure of the Register between psychotherapists and counsellors; and
- further work was needed around the scope(s) of practices of psychotherapists and counsellors before any decision on differentiation in the structure of the Register between psychotherapists and counsellors could be made.

10.6 It was concluded that: **One additional Part of the Register should be established for “Psychotherapists and Counsellors” and modalities should not be reflected in the structure of the Register. Further consideration should be given to the issue of differentiation.**

Protected Titles

10.7 During the course of discussion, the following points were made:-

- In response to a question, Council noted that the reference to “dual registration” in the paper referred to practitioners that were either registered on two different parts of HPC’s Register or registered with the HPC and another regulator;
- Council noted that CHRE were looking into “distributed regulation” and the findings were due to be published in Summer 2010. This may iron out some of the issues around dual registration
- It was further noted that the work around protected titles would not inhibit the ongoing work around differentiation.

10.8 It was concluded that:

- (i) **the titles “psychotherapist” and “counsellor” should be protected; and**
- (ii) **the HPC should adopt the approach to dual registration outlined in section 5.1 of the paper.**

‘Eligible Registers’

10.9 Council noted that currently there were in excess of 40 registers of psychotherapists and counsellors and, in order to successfully transfer

these across to the HPC Register, a three-staged approach would be needed.

- 10.10 In response to a question about whether 12 weeks would be a sufficient timeframe for stage two of the process, Council noted that these were working figures as it was only possible to estimate the number of registers in existence. However, the HPC would hope to have greater clarification on the issue prior to the Section 60 order being drafted and so the timeframes could be amended accordingly.
- 10.11 Council noted the process for removing duplicate entries once the multiple Registers were transferred across to the HPC.
- 10.12 It was concluded that: **the inclusion of names in the HPC register from other eligible registers should be performed by means of a three stage process as outlined in the paper.**

Transitional Provisions

- 10.13 The Council noted that a transitional 'grandparenting' period of three years had been recommended owing to the complexity of the profession.
- 10.14 Concern was expressed over the recommendation to have a three year grandparenting window given that the grandparenting period for the first 12 professions regulated by the HPC had been two years and because the HPC's primary concern is public protection. It was noted that a longer grandparenting period would lengthen the period before existing practitioners would be required to register. The Council noted that this would be consistent with the transitional provisions for practitioner psychologists and, in addition, would be practical given the uncertainty around the number of existing practitioners who are not members of the existing voluntary registers.
- 10.15 The Council noted that one argument given in the consultation for a longer grandparenting period was the length of professional training in the field. The Council agreed this was not a relevant factor in its decision because the grandparenting period only relates to those practitioners who do not hold an approved qualification but who have been in practice before the opening of the Register.
- 10.16 It was concluded that: **the transitional 'grandparenting' period for those professions should be three years.**

Standards of Proficiency

- 10.17 Council noted that the Education and Training Committee were undertaking a review of the generic standards of proficiency, and were taking account of previous consultation responses about the standards, some of which had said the existing standards were too focussed on the "medical model" in their language. The recommendations from this

work would be consulted on and submitted to Council for approval in due course.

- 10.18 Council were in agreement that it would be imprudent to consider the Standards of Proficiency for Psychotherapists and Counsellors until the review of the generic standards of proficiency had been concluded.
- 10.19 Council noted that any change to the generic standards would be subject to a full consultation and those that responded to the consultation on the statutory regulation of psychotherapists and counsellors would have the opportunity to respond in the usual way.
- 10.20 It was concluded that: **Further consideration of draft standards of proficiency for psychotherapists and counsellors is deferred until such time as the Council has concluded the current review of its existing generic standards.**

Education and Training

- 10.21 The Council noted that the standards of education and training and the standards of proficiency were inextricably linked and therefore no conclusions could be drawn at this stage about the appropriate level or levels until further work is undertaken on the standards of proficiency.
- 10.22 It was concluded that: **“No conclusion can be drawn at this stage until further work is undertaken on the standards of proficiency.”**

In summing up a detailed discussion, the Council noted that there was considerable complexity surrounding certain issues and this would need to be addressed through further work. However, it was agreed that the work on the introduction of statutory regulation of psychotherapists and counsellors by the HPC should proceed.

10.23 The Council agreed the following:-

- (i) Whilst there was further work to be done in certain areas, the Council were satisfied that the HPC's systems were capable of accommodating and meeting the regulatory needs of psychotherapists and counsellors;
- (ii) To instruct the Registrar to inform the Secretary of State of the Council's conclusions;
- (iii) To publish the text of the conclusions document on the HPC website;
- (iv) The conclusions detailed under paragraphs 10.6, 10.8, 10.12, 10.16, 10.20 and 10.22 of the minutes;
- (v) The need to do further work in certain areas in collaboration with members of the counselling and psychotherapy professions and other stakeholders. This work was to be carried out with the assistance of the

PLG, whose governance arrangements would be subject to Council approval following a full review; and

- (vi) The proposed PLG workplan to be submitted to Council for approval in due course.

A vote of thanks was proposed and seconded to the Director of Policy and Standards and his team for their hard work in undertaking the consultation exercise. In addition, thanks were given to the members of the PLG for their invaluable contribution.

Item 11.09/204 CHRE Review of the conduct function of the General Social Care Council (England): Learning points for HPC (report ref:- HPC200/09)

- 11.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 11.2 The Council noted the Executive's proactive decision to scrutinise internal procedures following events in the wider regulatory world.
- 11.3 Council were in agreement that this was a useful, worthwhile exercise and gave reassurance on the effectiveness of the Fitness to Practise function and the willingness to identify weaknesses.
- 11.4 With regards to a question regarding those Registrants registered with the HPC and another Regulator, Council noted that should a complaint be received about a Registrant, it was dependent upon the nature of the complaint as to whether the other regulator would be notified.
- 11.5 Council noted the measures in place to ensure that there was adequate support for the case managers both on a personal basis through the employee assistance programme and in terms of additional staff when case loads increased.
- 11.6 There was discussion on the MORI polling work being carried out and the Council were informed that Registrants had been involved in this work through workshops. The Council noted that once the results of the polling exercise were known, a work plan would be drafted to outline how the recommendations would be implemented.
- 11.7 The Council recommended that consideration be given to how the Council can assure itself as to the quality of Fitness to Practise decisions at the next Fitness to Practise Committee in February 2010.

Item 12.09/205 Consultation on the statutory regulation of dance movement therapists – responses and conclusions (report ref:- HPC201/09)

- 12.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 12.2 The Council noted that the professional body, with some 300 members, had carried out a large amount of work in terms of consultation with its members, hence one of the reasons why the number of consultation responses was relatively low.
- 12.3 The Council were informed of the background to the application for statutory regulation of Dance Movement Therapists, which dated back to the tenure of the CPSM. At that time, when it was hoped that Dance Movement Therapists would be regulated under the umbrella of “arts therapists”. It was noted that they were a well-organised, respected profession who had been patient in their approach to statutory regulation.
- 12.4 There was a discussion around the standards of education and training for this profession and Council were assured that the suggested threshold level of entry would not disadvantage anyone since there were currently no programmes delivering courses below level 7 or its equivalent.
- 12.5 The Council noted the typographical error relating to the conclusion on the impact of regulation which should in fact read “dance movement therapists should be regulated by the HPC.”
- 12.6 The Council agreed:-
- (i) The text of the documents for publication on the HPC website (subject to any changes suggested by the Council and any minor editing amendments prior to publication); and
 - (ii) the recommendations to be made to the Secretary to State and Scottish Ministers concerning the statutory regulation of dance movement therapists, subject to the amendment detailed above.

The Council broke for lunch at 1pm and recommenced at 1:40pm.

Item 13.09/206 Presentation by the Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors (report ref:- HPC202/09)

- 13.1 The Council received a paper and presentation from the Association of Genetic Nurses and Counsellors.
- 13.2 During the course of discussion, the following points were made:-

- clarification was sought on the qualifications currently required to gain access to the voluntary register;
- Council noted that currently the Register comprised two-thirds nurses and one-third individuals who had gained access through the Masters level qualification. There was a continuing shift towards more “direct entry” by those not registered elsewhere;
- there was no other country which currently regulated genetic nurses and counsellors and the only existing model that could be explored further was the licensing model used by some states in the USA;
- current training courses were generic in their nature and that specialisation for counselling provision for specific disorders was carried out post-qualification;
- whilst it was difficult to quantify the risks posed by continued absence of statutory regulation of this profession, there were growing concerns about the increase in practitioners working in the private sector who were not on any voluntary register.

13.3 The Council agreed to recommend the regulation of this aspirant profession to the Secretary of State for Health and the Scottish Ministers under Article 3 (17) (a) of the Health Professions Order 2001.

At 14:10 hrs, with the meeting having been convened for three hours in total, Council agreed to suspend Standing Order No. 13 in order that the rest of the business could be transacted that day.

Item 14.09/207 Consultation on Health References (report ref:- HPC203/09)

- 14.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 14.2 The Council noted that the Health reference requirement was costly for applicants to the Register. The removal of such a requirement would be a proportionate course of action, particularly given the very small number of health cases investigated by the Fitness to Practise Department since the enactment of the Health Professions Order.
- 14.3 The Council agreed:-

- (i) to consult on removing the health reference as a requirement for registration; and
- (ii) the text of the consultation document.

Item 15.09/208 Research Strategy (report ref:- HPC204/09)

- 15.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 15.2 During the course of discussion the following points were made:-
- whilst no reference was made to the resourcing of such a strategy, it was noted that this document was a statement of intent;
 - it would be useful to see a prioritisation of projects within the strategy in due course;
 - it would be helpful to have a statement detailing research governance as this would make any findings more meaningful.
- 15.3 The Council agreed that the strategy, as detailed within the document, be approved.

Item 16.09/209 Revalidation Project Update (Report ref:-HPC205/09)

- 16.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 16.2 During the course of discussion, the following points were made:-
- The Council noted that the researchers would be appointed through a formal tender exercise;
 - That it was important to not focus solely on Registrants working within the NHS;
 - The Council noted that should sufficient CPD data not be forthcoming, expert statistical advice would be sought to assess the limitations of the data;
 - there were no caveats placed upon the grant from the Department of Health except that it must not be used for any revalidation scheme;

- it would be useful to understand potential gaps between what the current Fitness to Practise processes identifies and the risks posed by registrants practising 'just below' the level where Fitness to Practise concerns have been identified (Figure 2 of the paper).
- 16.3 The Council noted that with regards to the legal framework, depending on the solution arrived at, a Section 60 Order may not be necessary for the implementation of further tools for revalidation.
- 16.4 The Council approved the revalidation project brief.

Item 17.09/210 First Continuing Professional Development (CDP) Report (Report ref:-HPC 206/09)

- 17.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 17.2 Various suggestions were made in terms of the contents of the report:-
- It would be useful to mention "service-users" under the section relating to "people who might find this document useful."
 - A reference to the CPD self-declaration carried out by all Registrants when they renewed their registration was required under the explanation of the CPD process;
 - the graphs at the end of the publication needed to be presented in a consistent manner;
 - it would be useful to have a table containing the figures as well as the maps for the audit selection;
 - it would be useful to better understand the reasons for voluntary deregistration; and
 - a note regarding how a change in HPC's standards to include a reference to 'copycat' profiles has eradicated the issue.
- 17.3 A suggestion was made that the amended version of the report be presented to the next Education and Training Committee in March 2010 and the Committee should have delegated authority to agree the report in its final form on behalf of the Council.
- 17.4 The Council agreed to delegate approval of the final print ready version of the report for publication following further consideration at the Education and Training Committee meeting in March 2010.

Item 18.09/211 Consultation on Amendment of the Health Professions Council (Registration and Fees) Rules 2003 – key decisions (Report ref:-HPC 207/09)

- 18.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 18.2 The Council agreed the text of the key decisions document for publication on the HPC website.

Item 19.09/212 The Health Professions Council (Registration and Fees) (Amendment) Rules 2010 (Report ref:-HPC 208/09)

- 19.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 19.2 The Council agreed
 - (i) the draft Rules in principle; and
 - (ii) that approval of the Rules in their final form be given by means of electronic resolution once the Health Professions (Hearing Aid Dispensers) Order 2009 has been approved by Parliament; and subject to the Solicitor to Council providing a report confirming that either (1) no amendments have been made to the draft Rules or (2) that any amendments which have been made do not constitute material changes to the content of those draft Rules.

Item 20.09/213 Partner Recruitment (Report ref:-HPC 209/09)

- 20.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 20.2 The Council noted that a proposal for delegation of such reports was currently being looked at and a report would be submitted to Council in due course.
- 20.3 The Council approved the appointment of the partners, names of which were set out in the appendix to the report.

Corporate Governance

Item 21.09/214 Nomination of the Education and Training, Fitness to Practise and Communications Committee Chairs (report ref:- HPC210/09)

- 21.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 21.2 The Council endorsed the decisions of the Education and Training, Fitness to Practise and the Communications Committees and appointed Eileen Thornton, Keith Ross and Sheila Drayton respectively as Chairs.

Item 22.09/215 HPC Representatives on external bodies (report ref:- HPC211/09)

- 22.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 22.2 The Council approved the following appointments:-
- (i) Annie Turner to the Advisory Board for Higher Education Academy Learning & Teaching in Health;
 - (ii) Jois Stansfield* to the scoping project board to reform Nursing Midwifery and Allied Health Professionals education programmes in Scotland;
 - (iii) Jeff Seneviratne* to the Information Standards Board for Health and Social Care;
 - (iv) John Donaghy to the Joint Royal Colleges Ambulance Liaison Committee;
 - (v) Stephen Wordsworth* to the Intraoperative Cell Salvage Strategy Group.

* Members of the newly appointed Education and Training Committee

Item 23.09/216 Reappointment of Internal Auditor (report ref:-HPC211/09)

- 23.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 23.2 The Council noted the importance of having a “critical friend” and the current procedure for the appointment of the internal auditor. After discussion, it was agreed that a full review would be carried out in the Autumn although members should not rule out the reappointment of PKF.

- 23.3 The Council endorsed the decision of the Finance and Resources Committee to appoint PKF as the internal auditor for the HPC for the financial year 2010-2011.

Item 24.09/217 Council meeting dates 2010-2011 (report ref:- HPC212/09)

- 24.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 24.2 The paper set out the proposed council meeting dates for July 2010 until December 2011, with the dates up till then having been previously agreed. In response to a question as to why the Council away day in 2011 was on a Tuesday/Wednesday, the Executive undertook to re-examine these dates.
- 24.3 The Council agreed the following dates:-

17 September 2010
13-14 October 2010 (Away day)
9 December 2010
10 February 2011
31 March 2011
12 May 2011
7 July 2011
22 September 2011
6 December 2011

With dates of the October 2011 Away day to be confirmed.

Item 25.09/218 Public Minutes of the Audit Committee held on 29 September 2009 (report ref:-HPC214/09)

- 25.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 25.2 The Council approved the recommendations therein.

Item 26.09/219 Public Minutes of the Fitness to Practise Committee held on 22 October 2009 (report ref:-HPC215/09)

- 26.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 26.2 The Council approved the recommendations therein.

Item 27.09/220 Public Minutes of the Communications Committee held on 5 November 2009 (report ref:-HPC216/09)

- 27.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 27.2 The Council noted that queries had been raised over the Standing Orders of the Communications Committee which would be addressed at the next meeting, with any changes being subject to Council approval.
- 27.3 The Council approved the recommendations therein.

Item 28.09/221 Public Minutes of the Finance and Resources Committee held on 17 November (report ref:-HPC217/09)

- 28.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 28.2 The Council approved the recommendations therein.

The Council noted the following papers:

Item 29.09/222 Update on the Independent Safeguarding Authority (ISA) and the Central Barring Unit (CBU) (report ref:-HPC218/09)

Item 30.09/223 Reports from Council representatives at external meetings (report ref:-HPC219/09)

Item 31.09/224 International Financial Reporting Standards of Conversion of Accounts (report ref:-HPC220/09)

Item 32.09/225 22-26 Stannary Street Limited (report ref:-HPC221/09)

Item 33.09/226 Public Minutes of the Education and Training Committee held on 22 September 2009 (report ref:-HPC222/09)

Item 34.09/227 Any other business

- 34.1 There was no other business.

Item 35.09/228 Date and time of next meeting

35.1 Thursday 11 February at Park House, SE11 4BU. Council noted that the meeting would be followed by a strategy session.

Subsequent meetings on:

Thursday 25 March 2010

Thursday 20 May 2010

Wednesday 7 July 2010

36. Resolution

The Council agreed to adopt the following resolution:-

“The Council hereby resolves that the remainder of the meeting shall be held in private, because the matters being discussed relate to the following;

- (i) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or application for registration;
- (ii) information relating to an employee or office holder, former employee or applicant for any post or office;
- (iii) the terms of, or expenditure under, a tender or contract for the purchase or supply of goods or services or the acquisition or disposal of property;
- (iv) negotiations or consultation concerning labour relations between the Council and its employees;
- (v) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Council;
- (vi) action being taken to prevent or detect crime to prosecute offenders;
- (vii) the source of information given to the Council in confidence; or
- (viii) any other matter which, in the opinion of the Chair, is confidential or the public disclosure of which would prejudice the effective discharge of the Council's functions.

Item	Reason for Exclusion
37	i
38	-
39	v
40	iii
41	ii and iii

Summary of those matters considered whilst the public were excluded

Item 37.09/229 Minutes of the Private part of the Council meeting held on 7 October 2009 (report ref:-HPC223/09)

37.1 The Council considered and approved the minutes of the private part of the Council meeting held on 7 October 2009.

Item 38.09/230 Matters arising

38.1 The Council noted that there were no matters arising from the private part of the Council minutes of 7 October 2009.

Item 39.09/231 Report on Pending Legal cases (report ref:-HPC224/09)

39.1 The Council considered a report relating to pending legal cases.

Item 40.09/232 Minutes of the Private part of the Audit Committee held on 29 September 2009 (report ref:- HPC225/09)

40.1 The Council considered the private minutes of the Audit Committee held on 29 September 2009 and agreed the recommendations therein.

Item 41.09/233 Minutes of the private part of the Finance and Resources Committee held on 17 November 2009 (report ref:-HPC226/09)

41.1 The Council considered the private minutes of the Finance and Resources Committee held on 17 November 2009 and agreed the recommendations therein

Item 42.09/234 Any other business for consideration in private

42.1 There were no items for consideration in private.

Chair:

Date: