GPhC associates and Remuneration Committee remit

Purpose
To clarify the remit of the Remuneration Committee in relation to GPhC associates.

Recommendations

The Council is asked to:

i. agree that the remit of the Remuneration Committee in relation to GPhC associates should be to advise the Council on remuneration policy for the Council's non-statutory committees and those associate groups established under legislation;

ii. agree to amend the Scheme of Delegation to clarify that the Chief Executive & Registrar has authority to determine remuneration packages for non-employees who are not covered by the Remuneration Committee’s remit; and

iii. affirm the principle that there should be a single GPhC expenses policy.

1.0 Background

1.1 The current remit of the Remuneration Committee was agreed by the Council in December 2010 and states that the Committee should advise the Council on remuneration and expenses policy for all GPhC associates i.e. non-employee groups that help the GPhC to fulfil its regulatory functions.

1.2 Since that time, work has been done to identify all the associates currently working with the GPhC. This will inform further work on the governance arrangements applying to these groups. However, it has already become
apparent that some associate groups are formal structures such as committees or are established under legislation, whereas others are more akin to contractors, consultants or occasional workers.

1.3 Under the Council’s Scheme of Delegation, the Remuneration Committee is authorised to approve or reject the remuneration framework for GPhC employees. However, the Chief Executive & Registrar is authorised to:

- determine and administer the GPhC’s employment procedures and processes;
- determine the remuneration packages and terms & conditions for employees of the GPhC, within the overall remuneration framework agreed by the Remuneration Committee;
- appoint or remove all other employees of the GPhC; and
- tender, award or vary contracts.

All delegations under the Scheme require the decision-maker to exercise the delegated power in a manner which is consistent with relevant legislation, including the Pharmacy Order 2010 and the GPhC Constitution Order, and with the Council’s policies.

1.4 Groups falling within the current, very broad description in the Remuneration Committee’s remit include the statutory and non-statutory committees together with groups such as: legal advisers, clinical advisers, CPD reviewers, visitors, overseas application reviewers, assessors/examiners, pharmacy technician application reviewers, exam question writers and medical assessors.

1.5 At one end of this governance spectrum are members of the Appointments Committee and the statutory committees while, at the other end of the spectrum, some associate workers are essentially occasional piece-workers performing operational duties. If remuneration and expense issues for all these workers continue to fall within the Remuneration Committee’s remit, there is a risk that the Committee’s and the Council’s time is taken up with matters that are not appropriate for consideration at this level, to the detriment of other issues.

1.6 It is therefore proposed that that the Remuneration Committee’s remit, other than its roles relating to GPhC employees and the Council itself, should be to advise the Council on remuneration and expenses policy for the Council’s non-statutory committees, and those non-employee groups which are established under legislation. This would mean that the Remuneration Committee would cover:

- the Council’s non-statutory committees i.e., the Audit & Risk Committee, the Remuneration Committee itself and the Appointments Committee;
- the statutory committees;
- legal and clinical advisers appointed under the Pharmacy Order (arts 63-64);
• assessors/examiners appointed under the Pharmacy Order (art 44(1)(c)); and
• visitors/accrreditors appointed under the Pharmacy Order (art 45(1)).

Remuneration packages and terms & conditions for other groups would be determined by the Chief Executive & Registrar. If this is acceptable to the Council, the Scheme of Delegation would be amended to reflect that, so as to provide clarity. The relevant groups are shown in the table at appendix 1.

1.7 It would also be helpful to confirm formally the principle that the GPhC has a single expenses policy, so that the possibility of different approaches arising to expenses, whether by accident or design, is eliminated: expenses should be payable when they are properly incurred on GPhC business, within a consistent and fair policy, without reference to status. This would not undermine the Chief Executive & Registrar’s responsibility for determining the expenses policy for employees: the intention is that the CE&R would choose to adopt for employees the expenses policy agreed by the Council for Council and committee members.

1.8 The Audit & Risk Committee has identified a need to ensure that appropriate reporting and accountability arrangements are in place for the various associate groups, so that their work is aligned with the GPhC’s strategic aims and values. This paper does not deal with these arrangements. These will be covered in a paper for consideration at a subsequent Council meeting.

2.0 Equality and diversity implications

2.1 All remuneration proposals, whether they fall within the remit of the Remuneration Committee or the Chief Executive & Registrar, would be considered in line with the principle of fairness, including consideration of equality and diversity implications.

3.0 Communications implications

3.1 The remit of the Remuneration Committee is published on the GPhC’s website.

4.0 Resource implications

4.1 The work outlined should be covered within agreed budgets.

5.0 Risk implications

5.1 The proposals outlined above should mitigate the risk that the Committee’s and the Council’s time is taken up with matters that are not appropriate for consideration at this level, to the detriment of other issues. They should also
guard against the possibility of different approaches arising to expenses, whether by accident or design.

Recommendations

The Council is asked to:

i. agree that the remit of the Remuneration Committee in relation to GPhC associates should be to advise the Council on remuneration policy for the Council’s non-statutory committees and those associate groups established under legislation;

ii. agree to amend the Scheme of Delegation to clarify that the Chief Executive & Registrar has authority to determine remuneration packages for non-employees who are not covered by the Remuneration committee’s remit; and

iii. affirm the principle that there should be a single GPhC expenses policy.
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**Appendix 1**

**Groups whose remuneration and expenses would be considered by the Remuneration Committee or by the Chief Executive & Registrar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered By Remuneration Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advisers (to statutory committees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical advisers (to statutory committees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors (to oversee development and delivery of the registration examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors/ accreditors (to report on the nature, content and quality of instruction, and the facilities provided, at an education institution or provider)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covered by Chief Executive &amp; Registrar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD reviewers (to review registrants’ CPD records against the GPhC’s criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assessors (medical practitioners who examine registrants and provide written reports relating to their fitness to practise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments panel (to consider candidates’ requests for adjustments to the registration examination relating to disabilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy technician application evaluators (to evaluate information about the professional practice of prospective pharmacy technicians who have an approved qualification but do not meet the work experience criteria for automatic registration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas applications panel (to consider applications for registration as a pharmacist from EEA applicants who do not have a qualification that meets the requirements for automatic recognition and non-standard overseas applications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question writers (to write questions for the registration examination)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>