
Council

Minutes of the 89th meeting of the Council held as follows:-

Date: Thursday 27th March 2014

Time: 9:30am

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

Present: Anna van der Gaag (Chair)
Elaine Brookes
Mary Clark-Glass
John Donaghy
Sheila Drayton
Richard Kennett
Keith Ross
Robert Templeton
Graham Towl
Joy Tweed
Nicola Wood

In attendance:

Kayleigh Britwistle, Assurance and Development Officer
Liz Craig, PA to the Director of Education
Roy Dunn, Head of Business Process Improvement
Brendon Edmonds, Head of Educational Development
Selma Elgaziari, Policy Officer
Claire Gascoigne, Secretary to Council
Guy Gaskins, Director of Information Technology
Andy Gillies, Director of Finance
Abigail Gorringer, Director of Education
Michael Guthrie, Director of Policy and Standards
Teresa Haskins, Director of Human Resources
Kelly Holder, Director of Fitness to Practise
Sarita Khaira, Head of FtP Service Improvement
Jacqueline Ladds, Director of Communications
Ben Potter, Education Manager
Greg Ross-Sampson, Director of Operations
Tracey Samuel-Smith, Education Manager
Marc Seale, Chief Executive and Registrar
Edward Tynan, Policy Officer

Public Agenda - Part 2

Item 1.14/59 Chair's welcome and introduction

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the second day of the 89th meeting of the Council.

Item 2.14/60 Apologies for absence

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Sonya Lam.

Item 3.14/61 Approval of agenda

- 3.1 The Council approved the agenda, subject to the consideration of a tabled replacement cover sheet to the budget paper HCPC54/14.

Item 4.14/62 Declaration of Members' Interests

- 4.1 Keith Ross declared an interest since his wife is a Council member of the PSA.
- 4.2 Anna van der Gaag and Keith Ross declared an interest in item 15 'Tax status of HCPC Council Members' (report ref:- HCPC55/14).

Item 5.14/63 Reviews of social work education in England (report ref:- HCPC45/14)

- 5.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.
- 5.2 The Council noted that, in February 2014, two independent reviews of social work education in England were published. Martin Narey was asked by the Department for Education to review education for children's social workers. David Croisdale-Appleby was asked by the Department of Health to review social work education.
- 5.3 The Council noted that it was important to reiterate that Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales have alternative regulatory arrangements for Social Workers and that the two reports related to social work education in England.
- 5.4 The Council noted that the discussion paper focused on the six main themes emerging from the report. It was agreed to discuss each in turn.

Genericism versus specialisation

- 5.5 During discussion, the following points were made:-
 - the debate of whether social work should be a 'generic' profession at entry, or 'split' between children's and adult social services is reflected in both reports;

- Narey concludes that students should be able to specialise in work with children after the first year of undergraduate degree programmes whereas Croisdale-Appleby argues that it is important to maintain students' ability to work with all groups;
- other professions regulated by the HCPC have had, and continue to have, similar internal debates about genericism versus specialisation. It was noted that psychology has divided itself with a development year following graduation; and
- other factors beyond education, such as working conditions, should be taken into account when exploring the current workforce shortage within social work.

5.6 The Council discussed the evidence base of the reports. It was noted that in 2011, Professor Eileen Munro published the outcomes of her review of child protection. The Council agreed that it was regrettable that the significant contributions of Munro's work were not referenced in either report, as the social work profession welcomed these findings.

5.7 The Council discussed the recommendations made in the paper relating to genericism versus specialisation. It was noted that children's social work can often require a wider understanding of the issues faced by families as a whole. It was agreed that the issue could not be simplified to an either/or solution, and that it was necessary to look at variations of both models.

Responsibility for the regulation of social workers

5.8 During discussion, the following points were made:-

- Narey recommends that consideration should be given to transferring responsibility for the regulation of social workers to The College of Social Work (TCSW), while Croisdale-Appleby concludes that there is 'little support' for TCSW taking on a regulatory role;
- the role of a professional body is to promote and develop the profession and the role of the professional regulator is to protect the public. Whilst the two organisations work together, their roles are normally considered to be separate; and
- government policy over a number of years has been towards separating these roles to avoid any conflict of interest.

5.9 The Council discussed the observations made in the reports; it was felt that these lacked clarity. It was noted that the social work profession is no different than the other professions regulated by the HCPC in that the professional body provides enhancement and promotion.

- 5.10 The Council noted that the social work profession is undergoing a time of transformation and that lessons learnt by the HCPC in relation to the development its other professions could be beneficial to the social work profession.
- 5.11 The Council discussed the HCPC's relationship with TCSW. It was noted that the working relationship is complementary and that the HCPC will continue to build on this whilst reinforcing the message of the different roles of a regulator and professional body.

Standards

- 5.12 The Council discussed the conclusions of the reports relating to the standards of education and training. It was agreed that, as at the time of writing, the HCPC was part way through its programme of visiting transitionally approved social work programmes, the impact of the standards of education and training could not yet be assessed.
- 5.13 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- both reports are critical of the content of the existing standards of proficiency and education and training;
 - the standards of proficiency for social workers in England were developed by a Professional Liaison Group (PLG), which included key stakeholders from the profession They were also subject to a public consultation;
 - amongst the other professions regulated by the HCPC it is common for the professional body to have developed its own standards for education and practice which are often more aspirational in nature and focused on developing the profession further;
 - the HCPC's recently published review of the first year of social work programme visits shows that none of the programmes visited to date were approved without conditions attached. An average of 6.9 conditions made per programme. This contrasts with the conclusion that the standards fail to be sufficiently challenging;
 - the Executive suggests that the standards of proficiency for social workers should be reviewed once the visits of all transitionally approved social work programmes have concluded—from the end of the 2014-2015 academic year; and
 - the standards of education and training were last published in 2009. The Executive intends to bring a discussion paper to the Education and Training Committee at its meeting in September

2014 looking at the content and scope for a future review of the standards.

- 5.14 The Council discussed the standards of TCSW and the HCPC. It was noted that since the original mapping, progress has been made and that the HCPC continues to be collaborative and willing to work with TCSW to clarify the mapping. It was agreed that a joint badged mapping document would be beneficial.
- 5.15 The Council discussed conclusion of Croisdale-Appleby that there is little appetite amongst education providers for more standards. It was felt that the range of interviews that went into the reports were limited and that the methodology of the reports were not clear and showed a lack of understanding of wider issues involved in developing a curriculum.

Approval of education and training programmes

- 5.16 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- both reports are critical of the HCPC's and TCSW's processes for approving and endorsing education and training programmes against their standards;
 - the quality and availability of practice placements has been a subject for debate in the social work profession for some time; and
 - the HCPC holds joint approval visits with professional bodies, across all the professions, where an education provider has requested this.
- 5.17 The Council discussed education approvals. It was noted that education providers have a wide range of approvals processes to undertake as part of approval, apart from the regulatory requirements, and that effort is made not to duplicate these. It was agreed that the reports did not acknowledge this activity. It was felt that it was unfortunate the authors did not fact verify their observations with the HCPC on a number of points prior to publication.
- 5.18 The Council noted that since the HCPC assumed responsibility for social work programme approvals in England, approximately 60 programmes have been withdrawn by providers. The council agreed that this was a clear indication of the standards of the HCPC having effect.
- 5.19 The Council discussed practice placements. It was agreed that an information gathering exercise on placement quality should be undertaken to inform the future review of standards.

5.20 The Council agreed that the reports were a snapshot of system in transition and that it was unwise to enact further changes as this stage.

ASYE and licence to practise

5.21 During discussion, the following points were made:-

- the Croisdale-Appleby report recommends the creation of a probationary first year of qualification as a social worker. This probationary year would build on a strengthened version of the current Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (ASYE) programme undergone by some newly qualified social workers;
- for a probationary year to be introduced as a part of registration, a change in legislation would be required;
- amongst some of the other professions regulated by the HCPC similar arrangements to the ASYE exist, but these are profession or employer led; and
- the suggestion of a statutory link between the ASYE and registration was discussed by the SWRB. Concerns about a compulsory ASYE included funding, capacity and the assessment model that would be used.

5.22 The Council discussed the possible legislation changes required. It was noted that it is likely that the Law Commission bill will embed licence to practise, but that the secretary of state would need to enact it in each case.

5.23 The Council discussed the HCPC's relationship with the two chief social workers for England. It was noted that the Chair wrote to both upon their appointment, but that so far no response has been received from the Chief Social Worker for Children and Families. The Chair has recently requested a meeting again. A meeting was held with the Chief Social Worker for Adults following her appointment.

Revalidation

5.24 The Council discussed revalidation. It was noted that the Law Commission bill would provide for revalidation, but that the Secretary of State would be required to enact the requirement in each case. It was noted that the HCPC considers the process of revalidation complex and expensive and that the same outcome can be achieved using less costly alternative models.

5.25 During discussion, the following points were made:-

- Croisdale-Appleby's report recommends that social workers should have to revalidate every five years to demonstrate that

they are fit to practise. Social workers would need to pass revalidation in order to retain their licence to practise;

- the HCPC uses the alternative term 'continuing fitness to practise' because this is more outcomes-focused; and because 'revalidation' is poorly defined;
- Social Workers will be audited to check their compliance with HCPC's CPD standards for the first time from September 2014; and
- the HCPC will be commissioning two pieces of work in this area this year. One will look at the cost, benefits and outcomes of the CPD audits to date. The second will look at the views and experiences of stakeholders. This work will inform a review of the CPD process.

5.26 The Council noted that the Chair and Chief Executive had met with the Department for Education and Department of Health and emphasised that they have an obligation to report any concerns about education programmes directly to the HCPC.

5.27 The Council agreed the following points:-

- the issues faced by social work in transforming and defining itself as a profession are similar in nature to those faced by many HCPC professions;
- the importance of a broad understanding of the issues faced by both adults and children within families is important for public protection;
- the HCPC continues to be willing to engage over the issues raised in the reports;
- the HCPC recognises the importance of continuously reviewing standards and working with the relevant professional bodies to do this; and
- the HCPC, as a multi-profession regulator, is best placed to safeguard education standards.

2.28 The Council noted the report.

Item 6.14/64 'A Review of the NHS Hospitals Complaint System Putting Patients Back in the Picture' – HCPC Response (report ref:- HCPC46/14)

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

- 6.2 The Council noted that the report of the 'Review of the NHS Hospitals Complaint System Putting Patients Back in the Picture' by the Right Honourable Ann Clwyd and Professor Tricia Hart was published in October 2013.
- 6.3 The Council noted that the Report makes recommendations which focus on four areas for change: improving the quality of care; improving the way complaints are handled; ensuring independence of the complaints procedures; and whistle-blowing.
- 6.4 During discussion the following points were made:-
- whilst the HCPC is not specifically mentioned in the Report's recommendations, a number of them are relevant to professional regulation and complaint handling more generally;
 - some of the reports recommendations can be used to consider further how the HCPC deal with complaints;
 - the FtP Department will look at ways to enhance feedback mechanisms as part of the department's work plan for 2014-15. This will include a registrant and complainant survey; and
 - the report will be relevant to the work of the Standards of Conduct and Performance (SCPE) PLG.
- 6.5 The Council discussed a current GMC pilot in which the regulator offers face-to-face meetings to complainants. The Council agreed that the results of this pilot would be reviewed with interest.
- 6.6 The Council discussed fitness to practise witness feedback. It was noted that currently around 10% of witnesses provide this feedback, but that recent changes in the way the forms are distributed is hoped to improve this.
- 6.7 The Council discussed how it reviewed organisational complaints. It was noted that the Council receive a review of feedback and complaints on a 6 monthly basis and the Executive review complaints monthly.
- 6.8 The Council agreed the action plan.

Item 7.14/65 Practice Notes (report ref:- HCPC47/14)

- 7.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 7.2 The Council noted that a number of Practice Notes have been produced to aid panels that make decisions relating to fitness to practise cases. The Practice Notes are under regular review to ensure

that they take into account relevant case law, legislation and good practice. The Executive have identified the need for two new Practice Notes on child witnesses and special measures.

- 7.3 The Council discussed the Practice Note relating to child witnesses. The Council agreed that the terminology used should be amended to remove any inference that the aim of the note was to ensure evidence could be given effectively, rather than for the safeguarding of the child's wellbeing. Further consultation with experts in the field would be sought on this Practice Note to ensure nothing of significance had been overlooked.
- 7.4 The Council approved the Practice Notes on child witnesses and special measures.

Item 8.14/66 Communications Strategy (report ref:- HCPC48/14)

- 8.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 8.2 The Council noted that the Communications Strategy was first developed in 2007 and is updated and approved annually.
- 8.3 The Council discussed how success in this area is measured and evaluated. It was noted that feedback is gathered at events and talks as well as web statistics, surveys and media coverage.
- 8.4 The Council discussed the HCPC's audiences. It was noted that the HCPC has a wide range of stakeholders and that a current mapping exercise would inform a more detailed stakeholder strategy. The Council agreed that it was important to maintain an awareness of possible unknown stakeholder groups and that these should be explored in the stakeholder mapping exercise.
- 8.5 The Council approved the Communications Strategy.

Item 9.14/67 Review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics - PLG (report ref:- HCPC49/14)

- 9.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 9.2 During discussion, the following points were made:-
 - the review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics (SCPE) is formed of three phases: a period of research, a Professional Liasion Group (PLG) and a public consultation stage;

- the research phase is now ending. The Council agreed to establish a PLG to consider revisions to the SCPE based on this research at its meeting in July 2012;
 - membership of PLGs consist of Council members and a range of other stakeholders including professional bodies, education bodies, employers, trade unions and service users and carers; and
 - the proposed timetable allows for five meetings of the PLG.
- 9.3 The Council discussed the involvement of service users and carers in the PLG. It was noted that appropriate support mechanisms would be put in place.
- 9.4 The Council approved the SCPE PLG workplan.

Item 10.14/68 Review of the standards of conduct, performance and ethics - Research (report ref:- HCPC50/14)

- 10.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.
- 10.2 The Council noted that the paper was formed two reports from externally commissioned research with service users and their carers.
- 10.3 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- the Focus Group were commissioned to carry out research with a range of registrants and service users about the use and accessibility of the standards in practice;
 - the charity Connect were commissioned to undertake a project to determine the expectations of service users and their carers and explore the accessibility of the standards;
 - Shaping Our Lives were commissioned to explore the understanding and accessibility of the standards in relation to the expectations of social care service users;
 - the HCPC has also worked with other charitable organisations to run joint workshops in order to engage with specific groups of service users and their carers. This has included working with Macmillan and Hearing Link; and
 - the Policy and Standards team have undertaken work around the codes and equivalent standards of other health and care regulators in the UK as well as undertaking an online survey aimed at HCPC panel chairs, case teams and other members of the fitness to practise department.

10.4 The Council discussed the research reports, which were considered to be valuable pieces of work involving an impressive spectrum of stakeholder input. It was noted that the reports would be published on the HCPC website.

10.5 The Council noted the paper.

Item 11.14/69 Consultation on changes to the profession-specific standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists (report ref:- HCPC51/14)

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

11.2 The Council noted that, following a review of the standards by the Institute of Biomedical Science and further input from two biomedical scientist visitor partners, the HCPC is ready to consult publicly on the draft standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists.

11.3 The Council noted that the consultation paper and draft standards for biomedical scientists were considered and recommended to Council for approval by the Education and Training Committee at its meeting in March 2014.

11.4 The Council approved the draft standards of proficiency for biomedical scientists and the text of the consultation paper (subject to minor editing changes and formal legal scrutiny).

Item 12.14/70 Consultation on changes to the profession-specific standards of proficiency for clinical scientists (report ref:- HCPC52/14)

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

12.2 The Council noted that at the start of the review of the profession-specific standards for clinical scientists, the HCPC contacted the Association of Clinical Scientists (ACS) and asked for their suggestions on any changes to the standards they considered necessary. As so few changes were suggested to the standards by the ACS, further advice on the changes from individual clinical scientists has not been sought at this stage.

12.3 The Council noted that this input may be sought from clinical scientist visitor partners following the results of the consultation if necessary.

12.4 The Council noted that the consultation document and draft standards of proficiency for clinical scientists were considered and recommended

to Council by the Education and Training Committee at its meeting in March 2014.

- 12.5 The Council approved the draft standards of proficiency for clinical scientists and the text of the consultation paper (subject to minor editing changes and formal legal scrutiny).

Item 13.14/71 Outcomes of the consultation on profession-specific standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners (report ref:- HCPC53/14)

- 12.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 12.2 The Council noted that, following a review of the standards by the professional bodies for operating department practitioners, the HCPC publically consulted on the draft standards between 15 July and 18 October 2013.
- 12.3 The Council noted that the revision of the standards post-consultation was informed by an operating department practitioner and former member of the Education and Training Committee. The Education and Training Committee considered the consultation response analysis and revised draft standards at its meeting in March 2014.
- 12.4 The Council approved the revised standards of proficiency for operating department practitioners and the text of the consultation analysis document (subject to minor editing amendments and formal legal scrutiny).

Item 14.14/72 Budget 2014-15 (report ref:- HCPC54/14)

- 14.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 14.2 During discussion, the following points were made:-
- budgeted income is £26.0m, which is a £1m (4%) increase on the 2013-14 forecast. £0.3m of the increase is attributable to fee rises and £0.5m is attributable to net growth in registrant numbers over the year;
 - the budget is drawn from the registrant numbers forecast, which stands at 321,000 at 1 April 2014 and is forecast to grow to 331,000 by 31 March 2015;
 - there is a 6% increase in operating costs, from £24m to £25.4m;
 - the total budget for 15 major projects is £3,322k;

- the overall position is a budgeted operating deficit for 2014-15 after depreciation of £95k; and
 - the budget includes a calculation of the target minimum level of reserves in accordance with the Reserves Policy.
- 14.3 The Council discussed the recent OJEU tender exercises. In response to a question it was noted that these processes and contingency costs have been included in the budget.
- 14.4 The Council discussed the reserves policy it was noted that a revised policy would be presented to Council at its May meeting.
- 14.5 The Council approved the budget for 2014-15.

Item 15.14/73 Tax status of HCPC Council Members (report ref:- HCPC55/14)

- 15.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.
- 15.2 The Council noted that Mazars, the HCPC's Internal Auditors and tax advisers, have advised the HCPC that with the evolution of tax law and interpretation, Council members are 'office holders' of a 'constituted body' and as such the daily attendance fee must be paid through PAYE and be subject to tax and NI deductions. It was noted that the advice provides that payment of Council members' daily attendance fee to employers continue.
- 15.3 The Council noted that Partners, as self-employed contractors who undertake more occasional task-based work for the HCPC, are not 'office holders'. They can therefore continue to be paid their fees without tax or NI deducted.
- 15.4 The Council noted that the collection of tax through the PAYE system does not alter the position that Council members are not employees of HCPC and that the same arrangements will apply to the Independent member of the Audit Committee.
- 15.5 The Council noted the paper.

Item 16.14/74 Risk Register update (report ref:- HCPC56/14)

- 16.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.
- 16.2 The Council noted that the Risk Register is published twice yearly, February and September, following a review by the Risk Owners. The Audit Committee receives the risk register for consideration as does the Council.

16.3 The Council noted that the Audit Committee considered the most recent iteration of the risk register at its meeting in March 2014. Following this meeting, two new risks around Partner expense abuse and the OJEU tendering process will be added to the register.

16.4 The Council discussed risk 1.5 'loss of reputation. It was agreed that the risk owners should be amended to the Chair and Chief Executive.

ACTION – Head of Business Process Improvement to amend the risk register as outlined in paragraph 16.4

16.5 The Council noted the report.

Item 17.14/75 FOI publication scheme: definition document (report ref:- HCPC57/14)

17.1 The Council received a paper for discussion from the Executive.

17.2 The Council noted that the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) requires every public authority to have a publication scheme, approved by the ICO, and to publish information covered by the scheme. The ICO are currently updating all definition documents under the FOIA publication scheme

17.3 During discussion the following points were made :-

- proposed amendments include increasing transparency in relation to financial information and inserting the new provisions on datasets;
- these changes are in line with the increasing trend towards Open Data. The government's White Paper Open Data: unleashing the potential sets out government policy in this area;
- the new proposals would require the HCPC to publish details of contracts that exceed £10k. Higher Education has successfully agreed a higher contract value (£25k);
- It is proposed that senior staff salaries should be disclosed in bands of 5k and that the individual posts should be clearly identified;
- some healthcare regulators are registered charities and as such are subject to the Charities Statement of Recommended Practice (SORP). These regulators may resist changes in the definition document which conflict with, or go beyond the Charities SORP; and

- an additional proposed requirement is for the HCPC to publish its Council members and Directors expenses on its website.
- 17.4 The Council discussed the HCPC's response to the consultation. It was noted that the Secretary to Committees had recently met with several other healthcare regulators to agree a joint response.
- 17.5 The Council noted the paper.

Item 18.14/76 Appointment of an independent member to the Audit Committee (report ref:- HCPC58/14)

- 18.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 18.2 The Council noted that, at its meeting on 17 September 2013, it agreed the Code of Corporate Governance. This code requires that the Audit Committee should comprise of two members of the Council and one independent member.
- 18.3 The Council noted that the process to appoint the independent member will take place in a similar manner to the recent process to appoint members of the Council. The process will be managed by the Secretariat Department. The Council will be invited to confirm the decision of the selection panel at its meeting in July 2013.
- 18.4 The Council noted that the core competencies of the independent member role have been adapted from the core competencies used for the appointment of Council members. They have also been informed by a review of competencies used by similar organisations to appoint financially qualified members to their Audit Committees.
- 18.5 The Council agreed the core competencies for the independent member of the Audit Committee and agreed to commence the appointment process.

Item 19.14/77 Anti-Bribery Policy (report ref:- HCPC59/14)

- 19.1 The Council received a paper for discussion/approval from the Executive.
- 19.2 The Council noted that the proposed policy is a 'top level' policy to signify commitment and that the HCPC already has in place specific counter-bribery policies.
- 19.3 The Council discussed criminal records checks. It was noted that these checks are not carried out routinely on all posts within the HCPC. The Executive undertook to inform the Council which posts required such checks.

ACTION – Executive to report to the May meeting of Council on the roles which require criminal records checks within the HCPC.

19.4 The Council approved the policy.

Item 20.14/78 Any other business

20.1 There was no further business.

Item 21.14/78 Meeting evaluation

21.1 The Council noted that it had previously agreed to keep a note of comments made during the meeting evaluation item and review these on a 6 monthly basis.

21.2 During discussion the following points were made :-

- it was valuable to go through the workplans one by one; previously all workplans had been presented as one item. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to do this in future;
- it was agreed that the budget should be considered immediately following the workplans;
- some members felt the meeting room layout needed reviewing along the lines of an open horseshoe shape, with EMT in the public gallery; and
- the Council requested that paper numbering should be consistent with the iPad software.

Item 22.14/79 Date & time of next meeting:

Wednesday 14 May 2014 at 14.00pm and Thursday 15 May 2014 at 9:30am

Item 23.14/80 Resolution

23.1 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;

- (a) information relating to a registrant, former registrant or application for registration;
- (b) information relating to an employee or office holder, former employee or applicant for any post or office;
- (c) 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;

- (d) negotiations or consultation concerning labour relations between the Council and its employees;
- (e) any issue relating to legal proceedings which are being contemplated or instituted by or against the Council;
- (f) action being taken to prevent or detect crime to prosecute offenders;
- (g) the source of information given to the Council in confidence; or
- (h) 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
24	B, D

Private Agenda – Part 3

Item 24.14/81 Minutes of the Remuneration Committee held on 12 February 2014 (report ref:-HCPC60/14)

- 24.1 The Council considered and approved the recommendations contained within the minutes of the Remuneration Committee held on 12 February 2014.

Item 25.14/82 Any other business

- 25.1 There was no further business.

Chair:Anna van der Gaag

Date:14 May 2014