
Council

Minutes of the 77th meeting of the Health Professions Council held as follows:-

Date: Thursday 5 July 2012

Time: 10:30 am

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

Present: Anna van der Gaag (Chair)

Pradeep Agrawal

Jennifer Beaumont

Frank Burdett

Mary Clark-Glass

Malcolm Cross

John Donaghy

Sheila Drayton

Julia Drown

Richard Kennett

Jeff Lucas

Morag MacKellar

Arun Midha

Penelope Renwick

Keith Ross

Eileen Thornton

Joy Tweed

Diane Waller

In attendance:

Alison Croad, Policy Officer

Guy Gaskins, Director of IT

Abigail Gorrings, Director of Education

Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards

Louise Hart, Secretary to Council

Teresa Haskins, Director of HR

Kelly Johnson, Director of Fitness to Practise

Jacqueline Ladds, Director of Communications

Tim Moore, Interim Director of Finance

Steve Rayner, Secretary to Committees
Greg Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
Marc Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar
Charlotte Urwin, Policy Manager

Item 1.12/107 Chair's welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed all members and observers to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed in particular, Frank Burdett, the new lay council member and Robert Templeton, the social work registrant member who would take up position on the day of the transfer of the register from the GSCC.
- 1.3 The Chair informed the Council that Deep Sagar had resigned from his position of Council member. The Chair wished to place on record her thanks for his contribution since his appointment in 2009.
- 1.4 The Council noted that the Secretary to Council would be writing to the Privy Council to seek permission to hold the vacancy open.
- 1.5 The Chair drew members' attention to a new HPC research report that had recently been published, detailing the history of the CPSM from 1960-2002.

Item 2.12/108 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Penny Renwick.

Item 3.12/109 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Council approved the agenda subject to the inclusion of a tabled paper in relation to item 16, "Annual report and accounts."

Item 4.12/110 Declaration of Members' Interests

- 4.1 Keith Ross declared an interest under item 9 since his wife is a member of CHRE.

Item 5.12/111 Minutes of the Council meeting of 19 June 2012 (report ref:- HPC73/12)

- 5.1 The Council considered the minutes of the 76th meeting of the Health Professions Council.

- 5.2 In relation to the minute relating to the “Student Suitability Scheme”, the suggestion was made that the words “help to” should be inserted into bullet point four of paragraph 7.4 so that the sentence read, “There was consensus that the proposed transitional Scheme would **help to** protect the public and ensure sufficient safeguard in the interim.” The Council agreed this amendment.
- 5.3 The Council agreed that, subject to the amendment detailed under 5.2 and any minor typographical errors, the minutes should be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Item 6.12/112 Matters arising

- 6.1 There were no matters arising.

Item 7.12/113 Chair’s report (report ref:- HPC74/12)

- 7.1 The Council received a report from the Chair.
- 7.2 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- The Chair and Chief Executive continue to hold productive meetings with professional bodies;
 - The Chair and Chief Executive attended the reception hosted by the GSCC on 25 June. This was attended by Paul Burstow, Minister for Care Services. The Chair noted that the GSCC had now published its legacy reports;
 - The Chair noted that she had attended the annual pioneer lecture at the Royal Society of Medicine delivered by Sir Muir Gray on Quality in healthcare. The main points she brought away from the lecture was Muir Gray’s observation that that the “20th century was the century of the professions and the 21st century is the century of the patient”, that culture within the healthcare setting is the element that gets the least attention but is most important and, finally, in relation to the impact of the Francis Inquiry, there was a need to cultivate greater openness amongst health professionals and in organisations;
 - The Chair noted that she had attended the first of three meetings at the King’s Fund to discuss healthcare delivery after the enactment of the Health and Social Care Act 2012. The main points of discussion were that the future was all about integration of services and change to the relationship between patients and professionals. New incentives would be needed to encourage the health service to keep people out of hospital and this would inevitably lead to reconfiguration of the workforce

- The Council noted that the Scottish Government had been reconfiguring their workforce over the last 7-8 years and had recently published a report on the subject;
- The Council noted that the reconfiguration of the workforce and the drive to keep patients out of hospital had had an impact on the paramedic workforce and so different skills were now required. In response, it was noted that the Executive were mindful of this hence the need to keep the standards under review;
- The Council noted an issue in relation to rehabilitation prescription since hospitals are paid for setting up the programmes but the communities are not paid for delivering these. It was noted that the introduction of “personal budgets” may change this.

7.3 The Council noted the report.

Item 8.12/114 Chief Executive’s report (report ref:- HPC75/12)

8.1 The Council received a paper from the Executive.

8.2 During discussion, the following points were made:-

- The results of the consultation on the GMC and GDC constitution had now been published and their Councils would be reduced to 12 members not eight as originally proposed. The consultation on the HCPC was anticipated to take place in Spring 2013;
- CHRE had published their annual performance review on all of the regulators. The Executive would be considering the report at their meeting on 13 July and a paper submitted to the September meeting of Council;
- CHRE had also published their review of the NMC. The Executive would be considering this report on 13 July and a report would be submitted to the September meeting of Council;
- CHRE were about to publish their economic review of regulators and CHRE would be presenting a draft of the report to the Executive at their meeting on 13 July;
- The grandparenting period for practitioner psychologists had now closed and there had been an increase of applications in the last week;

- The report on the Mid Staffs Inquiry was due to be published on 15 October;
- That the Chief Executive was due to meet officials from the Department of Health on 9 July and they would be discussing adult care workers and the forthcoming consultation on professional indemnity insurance;
- The Scottish Government's Annual Regulatory Conference would be taking place in Glasgow on 6 November 2012;
- In response to a question on a recent newspaper article on podiatric surgery, the Council noted that information had been provided to the journalist on HPC's position. However, it was then a decision of the journalist as to how that information was used. The Council further noted that the communications strategy was an integral part of the project to annotate the Register;
- The Council noted that a clear message would be communicated to the Department of Health at the forthcoming meeting that HPC cannot deliver government policy unless sufficient funding has been agreed;
- The Council noted that there had been a peak in new UK applications during the summer of 2011 and this was as a result of graduates applying for registration for the first time;
- In response to a question about interim orders, the Council noted that these were dealt with as a matter of priority and were prioritised by the scheduling team over all other work;
- The Council noted that an annual budget allocation is made to cover High Court costs although an insurance policy is also in place;
- Clarification was sought as to which new profession was being referred to under page 2c of the management information pack. The Council noted that this referred to practitioner psychologists and hearing aid dispensers. It was agreed that the column headings needed to be reviewed since the two professions referred to were not considered to be new professions;

8.3 The Council noted the report.

Strategy and Policy

Item 9.12/115 Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (CHRE) consultation on draft standards for accreditation of voluntary registers (report ref:- HPC76/12)

- 9.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 9.2 The Council noted that the CHRE was consulting on draft standards which it would use in accrediting organisations that hold voluntary registers. The Council was asked to discuss a draft response to the consultation, which had been prepared by the Executive and included in the paper.
- 9.3 During discussion, the following points were made:-
 - The word “other” should be deleted in paragraph E10 on page 12 of the consultation document so that the sentence reads: “The organisation takes due account of decisions made by regulatory bodies and other registers...”;
 - That the statement “The organisation can demonstrate that it is respected within its field” is subjective and difficult to qualify and so should not be used to measure eligibility. The suggestion was made that this statement related to whether there were a sufficient number of individuals making up the profession to warrant establishing a voluntary register. The Executive noted in response that the CHRE had stated its intention not to set requirements for the number of practitioners on voluntary registers before they could be accredited; instead the emphasis within this outcome statement was the credibility of the voluntary register with its stakeholders;
 - That the statement under A7 “The organisation can demonstrate that there is either a sound knowledge base underpinning the profession or it is developing one and makes that explicit to the public” is at odds with the statement under C4 which states “The organisation bases its standards of competence upon a defined body of knowledge.” It was noted that this would be picked up as part of HPC’s response although it appeared that the first of these statements was referring to the evidence base or efficacy of the practise of an occupational group;
 - That the statement under E4 “The organisation checks at appropriate intervals that registrants continue to be fit to practise” was contradictory to the “right-touch” approach to regulation. In addition, the Council were unsure as to what this statement was referring to; was it self-certification, revalidation or continuing professional development?

- That, if the primary objective of accreditation of voluntary registers was to protect the public, then the statement under A4 in relation to risks should have a higher profile;
- Concern was expressed that confusion existed about what a voluntary register actually is. It was noted that this confusion may be further exacerbated since CHRE will not be able to protect titles. Furthermore, in terms of complaints made about registrants of voluntary registers accredited by CHRE, the CHRE would not have the powers to demand information in relation to the case nor could they demand that witnesses attend hearings. The Council further noted that registrants who were the subject of fitness to practise proceedings under this regime could in fact deregister;
- The Council noted that the word “assured” had now been dropped and so the emphasis was on “voluntary register” as opposed to “assured voluntary register.” Concern was expressed that the language used within this document was straying into the language of statutory regulation and this could cause confusion for the public in terms of differentiating between the two models;
- The Council noted that section 5 was entitled “standards” when in fact they should be called “criteria;”
- The suggestion was made that the general concerns in relation to the principles of voluntary registers should be outlined in the introductory part of HPC’s consultation response. The Council concurred with this suggestion.

9.4 The Council agreed the text of the consultation response subject to further consideration being given by the Executive to the suggestions that arose during the course of discussion.

Item 10.12/116 Standards of conduct, performance and ethics review – workplan (report ref:- HPC77/12)

- 10.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 10.2 The Council noted the HPC periodically reviewed all its standards to ensure they remained fit for purpose and up-to-date. The paper set out a proposed workplan for the review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics between July 2012 and early 2015. The paper set out the background to the review, the proposed review process and suggested key dates for each part of the review.

- 10.3 The Council noted that the next planned periodic review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics had originally been due to commence in 2013-14. However, given the significant growth in the Register since 2008 and the forthcoming regulation of social workers in England, the paper proposed to bring forward the start of the review to mid-2012. By doing this, the HPC would be able to take account of feedback already received about the existing standards, particularly from professions that had recently joined the Register, as well as other relevant policy developments.
- 10.4 The Council noted that it was proposed that the review be delivered in three phases – research (2012-13); a professional liaison group (in 2013); and a public consultation (in 2014).
- 10.5 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- That as part of the work, HPC should benchmark against the standards of conduct, performance and ethics of other regulators;
 - That consideration should be given to benchmarking against standards in place internationally;
 - The Council noted that this was a timely piece of work given that the Mid Staffs Inquiry was due to be published in October. In response to a question about whether Council would have the opportunity to comment on the research brief, the Chair undertook to work closely with those members that were interested in being involved. Whilst updates would be provided to future meetings of Council, it would not be possible given the timeframe to submit the research brief for consideration by Council. However, it was intended that the research would involve focus groups with registrants and service users;
 - It was noted that the indicative timetable for the review may need to be amended to take account of the restructuring of Council which was due to take place in July 2013.
- 10.6 The Council agreed the workplan in relation to the review of the Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Item 11.12/117 Service user involvement in Education and Training Programmes (report ref:- HPC78/12)

- 11.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 11.2 The Council noted that, during 2011 and 2012, the Education and Training Committee had considered the involvement of service users in

the design and delivery of approved programmes. In particular, the Committee had discussed whether the standards of education and training should be amended to require service user involvement in approved programmes.

- 11.3 The Council noted that, in March 2011, the Committee had agreed for the Executive to commission externally-delivered research on this topic. The research was completed by Kingston University London and St George's, University of London and included a literature review; research with education providers; and focus group research with educators, students and service users.
- 11.4 The Council noted that at its meeting in March 2012, the Education and Training Committee had agreed that a consultation should be held on amending the standards of education and training and guidance to make service user involvement an express requirement for approved programmes. At its June 2012 meeting, the Committee had agreed the text of a consultation document (subject to suggestions made at the meeting and minor editing amendments) and recommended its ratification by the Council. The paper included the draft consultation document.
- 11.5 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- There was a typographical error on page 13 and the penultimate paragraph should read "You may want to explain how you manage and evaluate the involvement of service users in your programme;"
 - The suggestion was made that in the first paragraph of the document, we explain why HPC supports service user involvement;
 - A divergence of views remained in relation to the use of "service user and carer" versus "service user" although it was agreed to discuss this further once the results of the consultation were known;
 - The suggestion was made that the document needed to make reference to the wide diversity of clients that all professions work with, a suggestion that Council concurred with;
 - In response to a suggestion in relation to the penultimate paragraph on page 13 that there should be an express requirement to evaluate the involvement of service users in programmes, the Council noted that it may be too prescriptive at this stage to make this a specific requirement. Instead, the guidance would encourage education providers to evaluate service user involvement which over time would contribute to building the evidence base for involvement;

- In order to encourage programme providers to evaluate the involvement of service users in their programmes, some additional language needed to be included for example, “it would be helpful if you could manage and evaluate...” or “you are encouraged to...” The Council concurred with the suggestion and furthermore agreed that the paragraph should be conflated with the paragraph above which starts “We do not prescribe the areas of programme.”

11.6 The Council:

- agreed that a consultation should be held on amending the standards of education and training and guidance to require service user involvement in approved programmes; and
- approved the consultation document attached to the paper (subject to minor editing amendments and the changes arising from the Council’s discussion).

At 12:10pm, the Council took a short break and resumed at 12:25pm.

Item 12.12/118 Fitness to Practise Annual report (report ref:- HPC79/12)

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

12.2 The Council noted that the Fitness to Practise Committee, at their meeting in May, had agreed the report subject to minor amendments.

12.3 During the course of discussion, the following points were raised:-

- There had been a long discussion on the report at the recent Fitness to Practise committee in relation to language. The importance of using language relevant to the audience was emphasised;
- There was some discussion on the graph on page 11 and it was agreed that the presentation of this information needed to be reviewed. The Council noted that given the increased sophistication of the reporting available as a result of the new case management system, the format of the report would be reviewed next year.

12.4 The Council approved the 2011-2012 Fitness to Practise Annual report, subject to editorial amendments

Item 13.12/119 Just Disposal Criteria (report ref:- HPC80/12)

- 13.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 13.2 The Council noted that, at its meeting in March 2012, it had approved the operational and procedural approach that should be taken in relation to the transfer of cases from the General Social Care Council (GSCC) to what would become the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). That paper had also provided that, to ensure that the process was fair, just and transparent, the Council would be asked to consider just disposal criteria.
- 13.3 The Council noted that the General Social Care Council (Transfer of Register and Abolition – Transitional and Saving Provision) Order of Council 2012 provided that the HCPC should make arrangements for the just disposal of cases. This was both with reference to the equivalent of HCPC's fitness to practise process and with the disposal of outstanding cases under Articles 5, 7, 10 and 11 of that Order.
- 13.4 The Council noted that the current paper included the proposed just disposal criteria and arrangements for those cases. It was planned that cases would be transferred from the GSCC to the HPC between 6 and 27 July 2012. The Director of Fitness to Practise, Head of Case Management, Head of Investigations and Investigations Manager would review each open case file and, taking into account the just disposal criteria, prepare a case plan for handover to the case management team on 1 August 2012.
- 13.5 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- The suggestion was made that, in relation to the criteria, the first bullet point starting "the time elapsed since the allegation..." should be moved to below the criteria starting "the nature, quality and reliability...", a suggestion members concurred with;
 - In response to a question about how delay is measured, the Council noted that a variety of issues would be taken into account, including the length of time since the complaint was made and whether there were evidential issues created by the delay.
- 13.6 The Council approved:
- (a) the just disposal criteria for fitness to practise cases; and
 - (b) the just disposal arrangements for open cases under articles 5, 7, 10 and 11 of the General Social Care Council (Transfer of Register and Abolition – Transitional and Saving Provision) Order of Council 2012.

Item 14.12/120 Transfer of regulatory functions from the General Social Care Council to HPC (report ref:- HPC81/12)

- 14.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.
- 14.2 In accordance with the decision of Council to be kept informed of ongoing work relating to the transfer of regulatory functions from the GSCC to the HPC, a standard item had been put on the agenda of every meeting of Council.
- 14.3 The Council noted the following points:-
- There was an ongoing series of communication events aimed at social workers and employers;
 - An area of concern raised at the communication events was that some GSCC registrants had recently paid their GSCC registration costs but would be expected to pay the HCPC as well;
 - The Fitness to Practise cases were starting to be transferred on Friday 6 July;
 - An evening shift in the Registration Department would assist in dealing with the increased workload;
 - The Council noted that a “non-disclosure agreement” had been signed with the GSCC;
 - The Council noted that interim order hearing dates had already been scheduled to ensure that were any complaints received whereby an interim order was required, this could be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.
- 14.4 The Council noted the update.

Corporate Governance

Item 15.12/121 National Audit Office Completion report (report ref:- HP82/12)

- 15.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 15.2 The Council noted that the National Audit Office (NAO) had completed their audit of the 2011-12 financial statements.

- 15.3 In response to a question about whether the audit fee was negotiable, the Council noted that this fee level had been approved by the Audit Committee.
- 15.4 The Council approved the NAO report of audit findings for 2011-12 and management letter.

Item 16.12/122 Annual report and Accounts (report ref:- HPC83/12)

- 16.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive. The Council also received a paper setting out some minor amendments to be made to the annual report and accounts, together with the "Statement of responsibilities of the Accounting Officer" for inclusion in the report.
- 16.2 The Council noted that the report had been reviewed and recommended to the Council by the Finance and Resources and Audit Committees at their meetings on 19 June 2012 and 21 June 2012 respectively.
- 16.3 The Council approved the Health Professions Council 2011-2012 Annual report, subject to minor editorial amendments.

Item 17.12/123 Continuation of appointment of the internal auditor (report ref:- HPC84/12)

- 17.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 17.2 The Council noted that, on 25 November 2010, the Audit Committee had agreed to recommend to the Council that Mazars LLP should be appointed as the HPC's internal auditor for a maximum term of four years, subject to an annual review of performance by the Audit Committee and a recommendation to the Council on whether the appointment should continue. On 9 December 2010, the Council had approved this recommendation. The appointment had been made with effect from 1 April 2011.
- 17.3 The Council noted that the first annual review of performance had taken place at the Audit Committee meeting on 21 June 2012. The Committee had agreed to recommend to the Council that Mazars LLP should continue as HPC's internal auditors, subject to an ongoing annual review of performance by the Audit Committee and a recommendation to the Council on whether the appointment should continue. It was further noted that the Chair of the Audit Committee would also meet privately with the auditors on an annual basis.

- 17.4 The Council agreed that Mazars LLP should continue as the HPC's internal auditor, subject to an annual review of performance by the Audit Committee and a recommendation to the Council on whether the appointment should continue.

Item 18.12/124 Code of Corporate Governance – Consequential Amendments (report ref:- HPC 85/12)

- 18.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 18.2 The Council noted that the change of the organisation's name from the Health Professions Council to the Health and Care Professions Council would require the Executive to make consequential amendments to the Code of Corporate Governance. A new Common seal was also required bearing the new name.
- 18.3 The Council agreed:
- (a) that consequential minor editorial amendments be made to the Code of Corporate Governance as a result of the organisational name change; and
 - (b) to adopt as the common seal of the Health and Care Professions Council the seal which appears in the margin of the minutes of this meeting.

Item 19.12/125 Committee Appointments (report ref:- HPC86/12)

- 19.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 19.2 The Council noted that, in September 2011, it had agreed the constitution of the non-statutory Committees for a duration of one year, to be reviewed in July 2012. This was so that any new members of Council appointed in 2012 could be allocated Committee responsibilities. The current paper set out the proposed composition of the non-statutory Committees and the composition of the Council member part of the Education and Training Committee.
- 19.3 The Council noted that those vacancies created by the resignation of Deep Sagar would be filled at the September meeting of Council.
- 19.4 The Council agreed:-
- (i) the composition of the non-statutory committees as set out in paragraph four of the paper for terms ending in July 2013; and

- (ii) the composition of the Council member part of the Education and Training Committee as set out in paragraph 9 of the paper for terms ending in July 2013.

Item 20.12/126 Council Seal (report ref:- HPC87/12)

- 20.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 20.2 The Council noted that, as part of the project to transfer the register of social workers in England to the HPC, the direct debit data currently held by the GSCC would be transferred across to HPC. This has been undertaken in accordance with the process set out by BACS. GSCC registrants had been made aware that their details would be transferred across through a communication sent by the GSCC in mid-May. Further mention would be made within HPC's "welcome letter" due to be dispatched to social workers in England in mid-late July.
- 20.3 The Council noted that part of the process involved a "Direct debit scheme – Bulk Change Deed" being executed by the GSCC as the current service user and then by HPC as the new service user and then sent to the new sponsoring bank. Any deed executed by the Council would need to have the Council Seal affixed to it. Standing Order 23 stated: "The Common Seal shall only be affixed to a document with the consent of Council or of a Committee to which that power has been delegated and where the seal is affixed to a document, it shall also be signed by the Registrar and by a member of Council." Accordingly, Council's approval was sought to affixing the Council Seal to the Deed.
- 20.4 The Council agreed that the Common Seal be affixed to the "Direct Debit Scheme – Bulk Change Deed."

Item 21.12/127 Minutes of the Fitness to Practise Committee held on 24 May 2012 (report ref:- HPC88/12)

- 21.1 The Council received a paper for approval from the Executive.
- 21.2 The Council approved the recommendations therein.

The Council noted the following papers:-

Item 22.12/128 Approved Mental Health Professional Criteria (report ref:- HPC89/12)

Item 23.12/129 Council members' performance and development review 2011-12 (report ref:- HPC90/12)

Item 24.12/130 Reports from Council representatives at external meetings (report ref:- HPC 91/12)

Item 25.12/131 Annual review of actions taken in 2011-12 (report ref:- HPC 92/12)

Item 26.12/132 Minutes of the Education and Training Committee held on 12 June 2012 (report ref:- HPC 93/12)

Item 27.12/133 Any other business

27.1 There was no other business.

Item 28.12/134 Date and time of next meeting

28.1 The next meeting of the Council would be held at 10:30 am on Thursday 5 July 2012.

Item 29.12/135 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
30	iv
31	iv
32	vii
33	v, vii, viii

Item 30.12/136 Minutes of the private part of the Council meeting held on 19 June 2012 (report ref:- HPC94/12)

30.1 The Council considered and agreed the minutes of the private part of the Council meeting held on 19 June 2012.

Item 31.12/137 Transfer of regulatory functions from General Social Care Council to HPC (report ref:- HPC95/12)

31.1 The Council noted the update in relation to the transfer of regulatory functions from the General Social Care Council to HPC.

Item 32.12/138 Herbal Practitioners (report ref:- HPC96/12)

32.1 The Council received an update about the regulation of herbal practitioners including medical herbalists and traditional Chinese medicine practitioners.

The Council noted the following paper:-

Item 33.12/139 Minutes of the private part of the Education and Training Committee held on 12 June 2012 (report ref:- HPC97/12)

Item 34.12/140 Any other business for consideration in private

34.1 There were no other items for consideration in private.

Chair:

Date: