Council meeting
11 July 2019
14:30 to 16.00 approx.
Council Room 1, 25 Canada Square, London E14 5LQ

Public business

1. Attendance and introductory remarks
   Nigel Clarke

2. Declarations of interest
   Public items
   All

3. Minutes of last meeting
   Public session on 13 June 2019
   Nigel Clarke

4. Workshop summary – 13 June 2019
   Nigel Clarke

5. Actions and matters arising
   Nigel Clarke

6. Initial education and training of pharmacists – our approach to finalising the standards
   For noting
   Mark Voce

7. Revising the criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician
   For approval
   Mark Voce

8. Council appointments for 2020
   For approval
   Laura McClintock

9. Any other public business
   Nigel Clarke
Confidential business

10. Declarations of interest
   Confidential items
   All

11. Minutes of last meeting
    Confidential session on 13 June 2019
    Nigel Clarke

12. Confidential actions and matters arising
    Nigel Clarke

13. Any other confidential business
    Nigel Clarke

Date of next meeting

Thursday, 12 September 2019
Minutes of the Council meeting held on Thursday 13 June 2019 at 25 Canada Square, London at 13:30

TO BE CONFIRMED 11 July 2019

Minutes of the public session

Present

Nigel Clarke (Chair)  
Neil Buckley  
Digby Emson  
Mark Hammond  
Penny Hopkins  
Ann Jacklin  
Jo Kember  
Alan Kershaw  
Elizabeth Mailey  
Rima Makarem  
Evelyn McPhail  
Arun Midha  
Aamer Safdar  
Jayne Salt

Apologies

None

In attendance

Duncan Rudkin (Chief Executive and Registrar)  
Carole Auchterlonie (Director of Fitness to Practise)  
Laura McClintock (Chief of Staff)  
Francesca Okosi (Director of People)  
Mark Voce (Director of Education and Standards)  
Jonathan Bennetts (Associate Director of Finance and Procurement)  
Vanessa Clarke (Head of Finance)  
Julian Graville (Head of Inspection)  
Rachael Oliver (Head of Communications)  
Osama Ammar (Head of Professional Regulation)  
Suzannah Nobbs (Corporate Communications Manager)
19. Attendance and introductory remarks

19.1 The Chair welcomed all present to the meeting.

20. Declarations of interest

20.1 Council agreed that members would make any declarations of interest before each item.

21. Minutes of the last meeting

21.1 The minutes of the public session held on 16 May 2019 were confirmed as a fair and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

22. Actions and matters arising

22.1 Action 100.2 was covered in the Communications and engagement report (paper 19.06.C03).

22.2 Action 113.6 – the work to scope and sequence the development of a fees policy had been reported in the workshop session.

22.3 There were no matters arising.

23. Workshop summary – 16 May 2019

23.1 The Chair reminded members that they could suggest topics for workshops or people from whom they would like to hear, from both inside and outside pharmacy.

23.2 Council noted the discussions from the May workshop.

24. Review of the annual report and accounts 2018/19

24.1 Duncan Rudkin (DR) introduced 19.06.C.01 which set out the annual accounts, annual report and fitness to practise report for 208/19 and the report of the external auditors.
24.2 The GPhC was required to submit to the Privy Council each year:

- annual accounts, with the external auditors’ report;
- an annual report, including how we adhere to good practice on equality and diversity;
- an annual statistical fitness to practise report, with the Council’s observations; and
- a strategic plan.

24.3 The GPhC submitted the first three statutory reports following the June Council meeting each year and the strategic plan following its October meeting. The combined report and accounts submitted in June were laid in both Houses of Parliament and the Scottish Parliament and a copy was provided to the Welsh Assembly.

24.4 Members had already had an opportunity to review an earlier draft of the reports and had provided helpful comments and suggestions. The draft report had also been scrutinised by the Audit and Risk Committee. A small number of further minor amendments were noted.

24.5 The Council:

i. Approved the combined annual accounts, annual report and fitness to practise report for 2018/19;

ii. Noted the report of the external auditors; and

iii. Authorised the Chair of Council to sign the letter of representation as required by the external auditors.

24.6 The Chair signed the letter of representation.

25. Performance monitoring and Annual plan progress report

25.1 DR introduced 19.06.C.02, which reported operational and financial performance and progress against the annual plan from January to March 2019 and also gave an overview of progress as part of year-end reporting for 2018/19.

Performance monitoring report

Contact Centre and registrations

25.2 On the Contact Centre (table 1.4 in the Performance Monitoring Report or PMR), Mark Voce (MV) advised the Council that the ongoing work with the Contact Centre had shown considerable progress which had been reported in detail to the Finance and Planning
Committee. The figures showed considerable improvement in the fourth quarter but, while this was a genuine improvement, it also needed the caveat that the fourth quarter always saw the lowest volume of calls.

25.3 The Contact Centre team was congratulated on the improvements. It was likely that there would be another peak in enquiries when registrants were due to submit their reflective accounts for revalidation later in the year and there was a question as to whether the team was prepared.

25.4 MV gave assurance that this was the case. Contact Centre staff had been involved at an early stage in the development of the systems and processes and had been able to spot potential issues at an early stage. This would allow for better proactive communication through a range of channels including information on the website which would be dynamically updated.

25.5 There was some discussion about the reasons for registrants voluntarily removing themselves from the register. Data was recorded and it was known that revalidation had had an impact (as had been expected). It was thought that there were other reasons such as changing career paths but the data was being analysed as part of the ongoing budgeting and planning process and would be shared with Council when it was more developed.

**ACTION: MV**

*Fitness to practise*

25.6 Carole Auchterlonie (CA) gave some context to the fitness to practise (FtP) data. The number of concerns being received continued to rise, although the rate of increase had slowed. Two significant changes were beginning to be reflected in the data – increased senior oversight at the triage stage and application of revised threshold criteria.

25.7 The increased oversight of triage was leading to more cases being closed at that stage and fewer referrals to Stream Two. More cases were being identified which could be better dealt with via other routes, such as the employer, or by using different regulatory levers such as a targeted inspection. While the triage stage was slightly longer, cases that were referred to the later stages of the FtP process had a better start thanks to the work which had already been done at triage. There was no delay in dealing with cases which might need an Interim Order and there had been no rise in organisational complaints about the decisions made.

25.8 The revised threshold criteria had been introduced in March 2018. The intention had not been to reduce the number of cases being referred but that did seem to be one of the outcomes. A full evaluation would be carried out now that 12 months’ worth of data was available and the Professional Standards Authority was conducting an audit which would
also inform the review. Further information would be provided to council at a future meeting.

**ACTION: CA**

25.9 The data included a number of points where the narrative which accompanied it compared it to previous years and members would find it useful to see the comparison data and an indication of whether the performance data was good or bad. The tables would be replaced the balanced scorecard and subsidiary reports which would provide a fuller picture.

25.10 It was important that the reduction in referrals did not give the impression that the process was not protecting the public. The increased oversight of triage gave some assurance in itself and the correspondence with those who raised issues which were not progressed or were referred elsewhere was also being reviewed to make sure that the outcome was fully explained. The FtP strategy work would also look at how the GPhC could derive better insights from concerns that did not progress.

*Inspections*

25.11 Standard 4.3 appeared repeatedly in the list of standards not being met. However, the standard covered a range of activities (‘Medicines and medical devices are: obtained from a reputable source; safe and fit for purpose; stored securely; safeguarded from unauthorised access; supplied to the patient safely; and disposed of safely and securely’) which carried different levels of risk if not being met. More insight was needed in relation to the associated risks to patient safety if this standard was not met. One way to achieve this would be for the standards to be risk-assessed in relation to patient safety, meaning that the implications of them not being met would be clearer.

*People*

25.12 This section of the report prompted a discussion on staff sickness and on turnover. Turnover had increased and proactive initiatives were being developed including ‘stay interviews’ which would help the organisation to understand what employees valued about working for the GPhC. The findings would be reported to the Remuneration Committee.

*Management accounts*

25.13 The Council noted the management accounts, which had already been reported to the Finance and Planning Committee.

*Annual plan progress report*

25.14 This was the closing report for 2018/19. It was noted that the publication of inspection reports would now take place one quarter later than planned. There had been a number of system changes and the inspectors had been trained to write reports in the new way to
ensure that they were useful for the public. The new inspection system was running well.

25.15 **The Council:**
- noted the information provided in the performance monitoring report; and
- noted the report on progress against the 2018/19 annual plan.

26 **Engagement and communications report**

26.1 Rachael Oliver (R)O) presented 19.06.C.03, which outlined the key communications and engagement activities since February 2019 and highlighted upcoming events and activities. Members were encouraged to attend these where relevant and possible.

26.2 Members congratulated the executive on the coverage achieved for the publication of the online guidance, including on radio news.

26.3 **The Council noted the Engagement and communications report.**

27 **Remuneration Committee minutes**

27.1 Elizabeth Mailey (EM) presented 19.06.C.04, the minutes of the Remuneration Committee meetings held on 8 February and 30 April 2019. The meeting in February had been an additional one to allow the committee to review the outcome of the review into reward and recognition.

27.2 **The Council noted the minutes of the Remuneration Committee meetings held on 8 February and 30 April 2019.**

28 **Remuneration Committee annual report to Council**

28.1 EM also presented 19.06.C.05, which provided the Council with a report on the Remuneration Committee’s work from 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019. The committee had considered the remuneration of all staff including the directors and the chief executive, the GPhC’s first gender pay gap report, the remuneration of Council members and associates and had also reviewed the expenses policies. In addition to the cyclical items, it was likely that the committee would review the GPhC’s pension arrangements in 2019/20.

28.2 There was an update to the committee’s terms of reference. In line with the Council’s decision in April 2019, the following was inserted into the terms of reference to make explicit the committee’s role in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion:
The Committee shall ensure that all policies and work within the Committee’s remit take account of and promote the GPhC’s culture and values and commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion.

28.3 The Council:

i  noted the Remuneration Committee’s annual report 2018/19; and

ii  approved the updated Terms of Reference for the Remuneration Committee.

29 Unconfirmed minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee

29.1 Digby Emson (DE) presented 19.06.C.06, the unconfirmed minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held on 22 May 2019. DE noted that the auditors had commended the way in which management actions in the various audit reports had been implemented and thanked the executive for the work which had gone into this. He also thanked Laura McClintock for her work and support while she had been managing the audit and risk function.

29.2 The Council noted the unconfirmed minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting on 22 May 2019.

30 Audit and Risk Committee’s annual report to Council

30.1 DE also presented 19.06.C.07, which provided Council with a report on the committee’s work from 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019. The report covered the outcomes of the ten engagements undertaken by the internal auditors, all of which the committee had reviewed and also outlined the areas of risk which the committee had considered in addition to its regular review of strategic risk.

30.2 Mark Hammond (who was no longer on the committee) and Mohammed Hussain (who had completed his term on Council in March 2019) were thanked for their work while on the committee. Pascal Barras was thanked for all his work in this area.

30.3 There was some discussion about assurance in relation to cyber-security. This would be considered regularly by the committee and there would be an annual assurance report to Council.

**ACTION: JB**

30.4 There was an update to the committee’s terms of reference. In line with the Council’s decision in April 2019, the following was inserted into the terms of reference to make explicit the committee’s role in relation to equality, diversity and inclusion:
The Committee shall ensure that all policies and work within the Committee’s remit take account of and promote the GPhC’s culture and values and commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion.

30.3 The Council:
   i noted the Audit and Risk Committee’s annual report 2018/19; and
   ii approved the updated Terms of Reference for the Audit and Risk Committee

31 Any other business
   33.1 There being no further public business, the meeting closed at 15.05.

Date of the next meeting:
Thursday 11 July 2019
### Council actions log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments/update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Data analysis on voluntary removals to be shared with Council when more developed</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>As part of the September PMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>Evaluation of revised threshold criteria to be shared with Council</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Date to be confirmed as evaluation is underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>Cyber security to be considered regularly by Audit and Risk Committee and an annual report provided to Council</td>
<td>JB</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Added to the ARC agenda – date of annual report to be agreed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting paper

Council on Thursday, 11 July 2019

Public business

Council Workshop Summary

Purpose
To provide an outline note of the discussions at the Council workshop on 13 June 2019.

Recommendations
The Council is asked to note the discussions from the workshop.

1. Introduction
1.1. The Council often holds a workshop session alongside its regular Council meetings. The workshops give Council members the opportunity to:
   - interact with and gain insights from staff responsible for delivering regulatory functions and projects;
   - receive information on projects during the development stages;
   - provide guidance on the direction of travel for work streams via feedback from group work or plenary discussion; and
   - receive training and other updates.

1.2. The Council does not make decisions in the workshops. They are informal discussion sessions to assist the development of the Council’s views. A summary of the workshop discussions is presented at the subsequent Council meeting, making the development of work streams more visible to stakeholders. Some confidential items may not be reported on in full.

2. Summary of the June workshop

The Interim People Plan – impact for Pharmacy in England

2.1 Richard Cattell (Deputy Chief Pharmaceutical Officer, NHSE/I) and Trevor Beswick (Pharmacy Dean, HEE South) gave a presentation on the Interim People Plan which had been launched that week. The context for the plan was the NHS Long Term plan which set the direction and themes for the NHS in England until 2029. The three main ambitions of making sure everyone gets the best start in life; delivering world class care for major health problems;
and supporting people to age well were underpinned by actions required to overcome specific challenges including health inequalities, workforce and data and digital technology. There was a specific plan for pharmacy as part of the long term plan, giving an opportunity for pharmacy professionals to play an integral role in the delivery of new models of care to improve patient outcomes. The objective of the people plan was to provide a workforce able to deliver the long term plan.

2.2 A full people plan would follow, setting out a detailed, costed action plan and implementation plan.

2.3 Although this presentation covered England, there were plans to ensure Council was equally well informed about workforce developments in Wales and Scotland.

**Fees – taking the work forward**

2.4 Mark Voce (Director of Education and Standards) and Jonathan Bennetts (Associate Director of Finance and Procurement) updated the Council on the work being done on fees in light of the responses the previous consultation and subsequent Council feedback. The aim was to triangulate fees, reserves and spending to resource the long-term plans through to 2030 and to provide a longer-term planning horizon for fees, giving more certainty to registrants and the GPhC.

2.5 A longer-term approach required detailed analysis of many factors, while keeping a focus on fairness, proportionality and the potential costs of administering a more complex fee structure.

**Council member recruitment 2019-20 – skills audit**

2.6 Laura McClintock (Chief of Staff) presented a session on developing the ‘desirable criteria’ for the next round of Council member recruitment. Following a recap of the Professional Standards Authority requirements around criteria and competences, and insights from recent reports and inquiries, insights from recent reports and inquiries were discussed.

2.7 The Lord Holmes review ‘Opening up public appointments to disabled people’ noted that only 3% of holders of public appointments were disabled. Simple steps, such as emphasising that applications from disabled candidates were welcome and improving application packs, could make a significant difference and all stages of the Council recruitment process would be reviewed to ensure that they were welcoming and accessible.

2.8 This included revising the criteria. While the essential criteria would not change, the way in which they were expressed would be clarified to make clear that they did not relate solely to qualification or seniority and could be fulfilled through lived experience.
2.9 In order to ensure a continuing and current mix of skills on Council, the desirable criteria were under review. To facilitate this, members would be asked to undertake a skills audit which would include evaluating their skills in a list of areas, considering what skills they could bring to Council, suggesting areas where there may be a knowledge gap and identifying areas for further training. The resulting suggested desirable criteria would be presented to the next meeting for discussion.

Recommendations

3.1 Council is asked to note the discussions from the workshop.

Janet Collins, Governance Manager
General Pharmaceutical Council

janet.collins@pharmacyregulation.org
Tel 020 3713 8139
Initial education and training standards for pharmacists

Meeting paper for Council on 11 July 2019

Public

Purpose

To update Council on emerging findings from the consultation on initial education and training standards for pharmacists; the main decisions that we need to make; and our approach to finalising the standards

Recommendations

That Council notes the proposed approach to finalising and implementing the standards.

1. Introduction

1.1 We published our consultation on initial education and training standards for pharmacists in January. The proposals reflected the changes in pharmacy in recent years with greater use of technology and an increase in the range of services offered to people. The pharmacist’s role as a front-line healthcare professional has continued to develop with more working in GP practices, care homes and people’s homes as well as the more familiar settings of community pharmacy, hospitals, industry and academia. There is also an increasing need for pharmacists to operate in multi-professional teams across health and care settings.

1.2 We received over 600 written responses to the consultation. We also held stakeholder events in London, Cardiff and Edinburgh and a series of focus groups with patients and members of the public. We also attended over 30 meetings and conferences with stakeholders to set out the proposals and obtain further feedback.

1.3 The full consultation analysis will be provided to Council in September and will be published on our website. This will include quantitative and qualitative analysis reflecting the high number of very helpful and detailed free text responses to many of the questions. In advance of that, this paper sets out the very high-level emerging findings and highlights the key decisions that will need to be made together with our approach to finalising the standards

2. Emerging findings from consultation

The learning outcomes of initial education and training

2.1 There was broad support for the learning outcomes set out in the consultation focused on person-centred care; professionalism; professional knowledge and skills; and collaboration.
2.2 Many detailed responses were received including the need to clarify the meaning of certain outcomes; to provide a greater focus on technology and on leadership; and to ensure the importance of underpinning scientific knowledge was emphasised.

2.3 We will therefore take account of these in developing a final set of learning outcomes. In doing so, we will develop a clear statement on what we expect a newly qualified and registered pharmacist to be. This could be along the lines of: *a clinically-focused healthcare professional, ready to begin safely applying a pharmacist’s particular knowledge and understanding of medicines in a multidisciplinary healthcare context and with the knowledge and skills needed to begin training leading to qualification as an independent prescriber*.

2.4 Our intention in developing a summary of this sort is to seek to describe the essence of a newly-qualified and registered pharmacist, in the context of an evolving wider understanding of the lifelong continuum of professional education and development (please see paragraph below on this issue).

*Integration*

2.5 While there was broad support for the principle of integration, many responses focused on the practical issues of how this would be delivered in practice and how it would be funded.

2.6 We therefore expect to recommend confirming that study and practical experience must be more closely integrated, for the reasons set out in our consultation document. This will require universities which wish to have their pharmacy degrees approved for registration to be involved throughout the whole period of initial education and training, so that the award of the degree confirms the graduate’s achievement of learning outcomes and fitness to be assessed for entry to the register. (We did outline in our consultation document the ned for future work on the registration assessment in the light of decisions still to be finalised about the standards).

2.7 We will take forward work with universities, students, employers, commissioners, regulators and funders of education and training to develop a better understanding of what ‘integration’ looks like in practice. This will take account of the practical suggestions and challenges highlighted in the consultation. In particular, we will generate further discussions with a focus on pragmatic solutions and models which meet our standards and deliver the desired outcome.

2.8 In doing so, we do not wish to constrain thinking about how this can be delivered. It is important to remember, however, that all initial education and training programmes we will be approving for registration in the future must be compliant with the relevant EU law, as long as this applies in the UK. This currently means

“training of at least five years' duration, including [emphasis added] at least:

(a) four years of full-time theoretical and practical training at a university or at a higher institute of a level recognised as equivalent, or under the supervision of a university;

(b) six-month traineeship in a pharmacy which is open to the public or in a hospital, under the supervision of that hospital’s pharmaceutical department.”

2.9 So long as the UK is bound by this legal requirement the GPhC does not envisage specifying any further minimum/maximum time periods for a pharmacy degree leading to registration. We expect universities, working with their partners, to bring forward a range of diverse proposals, which must (currently) be compatible with this legal requirement.
**Selection and admission**

2.10 There was broad support for proposals to require universities to assess the professional skills and attributes of prospective students as well as their academic qualifications with interactive elements built into the admissions process. This approach needed to recognise, though, that students would develop over the course of their education and training and there was a need to clarify the standard expected at the admission stage. There were also questions about how this would apply during Clearing and the costs associated with the change.

2.11 There were mixed views about whether the GPhC should be more prescriptive in setting admission standards whereby only those students who achieved the advertised grades should be admitted onto the course and whether unconditional offers should be allowed. Our proposals were that these would be best addressed through our accreditation methodology and we will consider the range of views and responses carefully.

**Equality, diversity and fairness**

2.12 There was broad support for strengthening requirements in this area by providers ensuring that student pharmacists understand and meet legal responsibilities under equality and human rights legislation; respect diversity and cultural differences; and take responsibility for ensuring that person-centred care is not compromised because of personal values and beliefs. There was also broad support for providers carrying out a review of student performance and admissions using the protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act 2010.

3. **Our approach to finalising the standards**

3.1 We will be aiming to finalise new standards following a further round of engagement and discussion about implementation. These discussions will inevitably need to explore funding issues and take account of the wider context of student numbers and workforce planning, although these are not for the independent regulator to lead, still less to resolve. It is our job to specify the standards that must be met, and then to check that they are being met.

3.2 In designing the implementation plan and timetable, we will take a pragmatic and – where appropriate – an incremental approach, so that we enable progress to be made more quickly where this is possible.

3.3 We will do this by leading discussions on practical example of what integration looks like in practice and will bring together universities, employers, students and funding bodies in the Autumn.

3.4 We believe progress can be made more quickly in relation to **selection and admission** and **equality, diversity and inclusion** as these are not dependent on decisions about integration. We plan to finalise the standards in these areas by the end of the December this year so that they can be fully implemented by universities for the academic year beginning in September 2021. We will also take forward work linked to our revised Standard on learning in practice where we want to move to a more structured and rigorous approach including a series of documented progress meetings. We will work with current pre-registration providers to test this within the current pre-registration model.

4. **The continuum of education and training**

4.1 Initial qualification and registration as a pharmacist marks one important milestone in the continuum of education and training in which the new pharmacist will be engaged throughout their whole career. There can be a steep learning curve for newly-qualified pharmacists (as for newly qualified
professionals in any field) and we recognise the importance of pharmacists continuing to learn and develop once they start practising after their initial qualification and registration.

4.2 We are mindful of the shared vision of the four UK Chief Pharmaceutical Officers and the Royal Pharmaceutical Society to work towards post-registration foundation training becoming the norm in the profession. We will therefore continue to work with them and other partners and stakeholders to develop the landscape of quality assured post-registration training and we will take account of these developments as we finalise initial education and training standards and shape the evolution of revalidation.

5. **Equality and diversity implications**

5.1 The consultation asked for views on the impact of the proposals on any individuals or groups and the full analysis will show the responses to this. We will produce a further assessment when bringing forward proposals to Council in due course.

6. **Communications**

6.1 We are committed to continuing to work closely with all key stakeholders to develop the final standards and the plan for implementation. Future engagement will include the stakeholder event in the autumn, as well as a series of meetings and engagement activities.

7. **Resource implications**

7.1 The resources for analysing the consultation and taking the work forward within the GPhC are within the budget provision.

7.2 As noted above, resourcing change in education and training in order to meet the requirements of new standards is not within the GPhC’s role and remit. We will seek to understand the regulatory burden on higher education institutions and employers as part of our next stage of engagement and before standards are finalised.

8. **Recommendations**

8.1 That Council notes the proposed approach to finalising and implementing the standards.

Mark Voce, Director of Education and Standards
General Pharmaceutical Council

05 July 2019
Revising the criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician

Meeting paper for Council on 11 July 2019

Public

Purpose

To revise the criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician to reflect the introduction of integrated knowledge- and competence-based courses

Recommendations

Council is asked to:

• agree revised criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain.

1. Introduction

1.1 The GPhC published revised standards for the initial education and training (IET) of pharmacy technicians in October 2017 and published revised criteria for initial registration in August 2018. The main change to the criteria was to allow pharmacy technicians to sign off a trainee’s two years of relevant work experience, a role that had been previously reserved to pharmacists. The criteria were also amended to remove the option for current or recently registered pharmacists in GB or NI to register automatically as a pharmacy technician.

1.2 One additional amendment to the criteria is now required. The 2017 IET standards emphasised the importance of integrated IET, which would in time take the form of a single course in England and Wales and two linked courses in Scotland. At that time, integrated courses had not been put forward for accreditation/recognition by the GPhC so the registration requirements continued to list separate knowledge- and competence-based qualifications. As providers are now developing and submitting new courses for accreditation/recognition in line with the standards, we need to amend the criteria to reflect this change and Appendix 1 sets out our proposed wording.

1 Courses designed and delivered directly by a provider are ‘accredited’, those which are designed by national awarding bodies (such as the Scottish Qualifications Authority) and delivered through a franchise network of further education colleges and NHS trusts are ‘recognised’. The processes are the same, but they do acknowledge the two different approaches to design and delivery.
2. **Further considerations**

2.1 The criteria currently list all the courses accredited or recognised by the GPhC. As these are contained in the criteria themselves, it means that Council needs to approve any future addition or deletion of courses. We are proposing to change this and simply list the accredited or recognised courses on the GPhC website. This means they are still publicly available for any prospective student or other person to see but enables us to add or delete courses without seeking Council approval each time. This would bring the approach into line with pharmacist education and training where accredited university courses are listed on the website but do not form part of the criteria themselves.

2.2 Courses accredited/recognised to the 2011 IET standards will continue to be taught as part of a transitional teach-out until they expire and expiry dates will be listed on the GPhC’s website (see 1.5 in Appendix 1). Without such transitional provisions, trainees part-way through a course will have to re-register on a new course based on our 2017 standards to be eligible to register. Transitional teach-outs are standard practice and reflect the principle that changes to standards and criteria are not retrospective.

3. **Equality and diversity implications**

3.1 Every accredited/recognised pharmacy technician course in Great Britain must meet a standard dedicated to equality and diversity.

4. **Communications**

4.1 Awareness of the revised criteria will be raised with a wide group of stakeholders through the normal channels and, in addition, will be sent directly to all pharmacy technician training providers and training leads.

5. **Resource implications**

5.1 There are no resource implications for the GPhC in introducing these revised criteria.

5.2 The cost of accrediting/recognising courses based on the 2017 standards has been built in to the Education budget.

6. **Risk implications**

6.1 If these criteria are not agreed, new courses based on the GPhC’s 2017 IET standards will not begin later this year because they will not form part of the criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician and will, therefore, have little value to trainees. This will further delay the introduction of our new standards.

7. **Monitoring and review**

7.1 The criteria will be revised as before alongside the GPhC’s standards for the initial education and training. We plan to do this three years after most courses based on the 2017 standards have been delivered for the first time. On that basis, the revision is likely to be in 2023.

7.2 An earlier revision may be necessary, depending on the outcome of Brexit negotiations.
8. **Recommendations**

Council is asked to:

- agree revised criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain.

Damian Day, Head of Education  
General Pharmaceutical Council

01 July 2019
Criteria for initial registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain

Effective 1\textsuperscript{st} September 2019

About the General Pharmaceutical Council

The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) is the regulator for pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and registered pharmacy premises in England, Scotland and Wales. It is our job to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of members of the public by upholding standards and public trust in pharmacy.

Our main work includes:

- setting standards for the education and training of pharmacists and pharmacy technicians;
- maintaining a register of pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacies;
- setting standards for entry to our register;
- setting the standards that pharmacy professionals have to meet throughout their careers;
- investigating concerns that pharmacy professionals are not meeting our standards, and taking action to restrict their ability to practise when this is necessary to protect patients and the public;
- setting standards for registered pharmacies which require them to provide a safe and effective service to patients; and
- inspecting registered pharmacies to check if they are meeting our standards
About this document

This document sets out the qualifications and work experience requirements for registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain. There are three routes to registration:

• Route 1: Initial registration by UK- and non-EEA trained pharmacy technicians\(^1\);

• Route 2: Initial registration by EEA-trained/registered pharmacy technicians (excluding UK-trained pharmacy technicians)\(^2\); and

• Route 3: Returning to registration as a pharmacy technician.

As well as education and training requirements, the registration process also includes the following checks:

• health;

• character;

• knowledge of English language; and

• identity.

Further information about how to apply to join our register can be found in application forms and guidance notes on how to apply for registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain (at https://www.pharmacyregulation.org/registration/registering-pharmacy-technician).

---


Routes to registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain

Route 1: Criteria for initial registration for UK- and non-EEA-trained pharmacy technicians

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This route applies to applicants who trained in the United Kingdom (UK) or outside the European Economic Area (EEA) and are making their initial application for registration as a pharmacy technician in Great Britain (GB) on or after the 1st September 2019. Such applicants must have completed:

- the integrated, or linked, knowledge and competence qualification(s) as set out on the GPhC website; and
- a minimum of two years’ work-based experience in the UK set out in section 1.3 or by meeting the alternative requirements set out in section 1.4.

1.1.2 Applicants must apply for registration as a pharmacy technician within five calendar years of commencement on a recognised course, or within two years of completing the last recognised course, whichever is sooner. Extenuating circumstances will be considered where there are legitimate, documented grounds for exceeding these timeframes.

1.2 Qualifications

1.2.1 A list of all eligible qualifications can be found on the GPhC’s website.

1.2.2 There are no exceptions to the qualification requirement for registration as a pharmacy technician. All UK and non-EEA applicants must have completed both competency-based and knowledge-based qualifications whilst completing work-based experience in the UK.
1.3 Work-based experience

1.3.1 Applicants must provide evidence they have completed a minimum of two years’ relevant work-based experience in the UK under the supervision, direction or guidance of a pharmacist or pharmacy technician to whom the applicant was directly accountable for not less than 14 hours per week. A pre-registration trainee pharmacy technician must commence or register for the required qualifications in Annex A within three months of commencing contracted, relevant work experience.

1.3.2 Within the two-year period of training and work experience a minimum of 1260 hours of work experience must be undertaken under the supervision, direction or guidance of a pharmacist or pharmacy technician to whom the applicant is directly accountable, excluding sickness absence, maternity/paternity leave and holidays. A minimum of 315 hours of work experience under the supervision, direction or guidance of a pharmacist or pharmacy technician to whom the applicant is directly accountable must be undertaken in each of the two years.

1.3.3 In certain circumstances (for example, prolonged serious ill health or maternity/paternity leave) an extension of the two-year qualifying period of work experience may be granted on application to the Registrar if supported by cogent and sufficient evidence. The Registrar has the discretion to grant such an extension up to a maximum of one year.

1.4 Exceptions related to the work-based experience requirement

Non-EEA applicants

1.4.1 The two years’ relevant work-based experience requirement described in section 1.3 may be reduced in the case of applicants wishing to register as a pharmacy technician who already hold non-EEA pharmacist or pharmacy technician qualifications.

1.4.2 These applicants must have completed relevant qualifications whilst working in the UK under the supervision, direction or guidance of a pharmacist or pharmacy technician to whom the applicant was directly accountable for no less than 14 hours per week.

1.4.3 In addition to the relevant qualification(s), applicants must provide evidence of:

- their non-EEA pharmacist or pharmacy technician qualification which entitles them to practise as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician in their original country of qualification; and

- being registered or otherwise eligible to practise as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician in their country of qualification.
Pharmacist pre-registration training

1.4.4 A period of pharmacist preregistration training in the UK, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man that can be validated by the GPhC and has been completed within two years of commencing a recognised pharmacy technician training course may be offset against the work experience requirements for registration.

1.4.5 The time limits for completing registration still apply. Applicants must apply for registration as a pharmacy technician within five calendar years of commencement of the validated period of pre-registration training or within 2 years of completing the last recognised qualification whichever is sooner. This may only be included if it is within five calendar years of the date of application for registration.

1.5 Transitional provisions

1.5.1 Qualifications leading to registration as a pharmacy technician accredited/recognised prior to 1st September 2019 remain accredited/recognised until the listed expiry date and students registered on them currently can continue to study on them until the listed expiry date and, on successful completion can use them as part of an application for initial registration as a pharmacy technician.

1.5.2 These qualifications can be found at:

https://www.pharmacyregulation.org/education/pharmacy-technician/accredited-courses

Route 2: Criteria for initial registration for EEA-trained pharmacy technicians (excluding UK-trained pharmacy technicians)

2.1 Applicants will have rights under Directive 2005/36/EC (as amended by Directive 2013/55/EU) or EC Treaty rights if:

- they hold a pharmacy qualification gained outside an EEA member state that entitled them to practise as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician in their country of qualification, and
subsequently that qualification has been recognised by an EEA member state and they have been permitted to work as a pharmacy technician in that EEA member state; or

- they hold a pharmacy technician qualification from another EEA member state. The EEA member state of qualification may either regulate the profession of pharmacy technician or if the profession of pharmacy technician is not regulated in that Member State, the education and training to obtain the qualification is regulated.

- if neither the profession of pharmacy technician nor the education and training is regulated in the EEA member state of qualification then in addition to the pharmacy technician qualification they must also have one-year of full-time professional experience as a pharmacy technician, or for an equivalent period on a part-time basis, during the previous 10 years.

2.1 An application for registration under Route 2 (EEA) will be subject to scrutiny and evaluation. This is a comparative assessment of the applicant’s qualification and work experience against the GB requirements for registration. The applicant may be required to complete an adaptation period not exceeding three years or pass an aptitude test where either:

- the training the applicant has received covers substantially different matters from those covered by the GPhC-recognised pharmacy technician qualification(s); or

- the pharmacy technician profession in GB comprises one or more professional activities which are not part of the pharmacy technician profession in the applicant’s home Member State, and those professional activities require specific training which the applicant has not covered in their home Member State.

**Route 3: Criteria for returning to registration as a pharmacy technician**

3.1 This applies to applicants who had been previously registered with the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain or the GPhC.

3.2 Applicants wishing to return to registration must submit a portfolio of evidence demonstrating their professional competence against the scope of practice they propose to practise within once
registered. Applications will be evaluated and assessed to determine their professional competence.

3.3 Paragraph 3.2 will apply to persons applying to return to registration on any date after 26\textsuperscript{th} September 2012. It will apply to persons who were previously registered as pharmacy technicians with formerly approved grand-parented pharmacy technician qualifications, accredited pharmacist qualifications and persons previously registered as pharmacy technicians with non-UK pharmacy qualifications irrespective of their initial route to registration.
Meeting paper

Council meeting on Thursday, 11 July 2019

Public Business

Council member appointments 2020

Purpose
To consider further recommendations on the process for filling Council member vacancies arising in March 2020

Recommendations
The Council is asked to:

I. note the progress update on the recruitment of Council members through an open competition process
II. approve the updated selection criteria and competencies (Appendix 1)
III. note the Diversity Action Plan, designed to support the process of recommending appointments in 2020 (Appendix 2)
IV. agree the process for filling the remaining vacancies through reappointments

1. Introduction

1.1. On 31 March 2020, one lay and two registrant Council members will complete their second terms of office. To maintain the balance of Council as required by statute, this recruitment round must include one member who lives or works wholly or mainly in Scotland.

1.2. At its meeting on 16 May 2019, the Council agreed the process for filling these vacancies via open competition. This paper provides an update on the appointments process for 2020, including proposed changes to the selection criteria and competencies, and sets out arrangements for filling the remaining vacancies through a reappointments process.

1.3. As Council is aware, our role in the recruitment of new members is to assist the Privy Council to make the appointments. As usual, the process will be carried out in accordance with the Professional Standards Authority’s (PSA) ‘Good Practice in Making Council Appointments’ guidance and the principles of merit, fairness, transparency and openness and inspiring confidence. Ultimately, the Council is responsible for ensuring that the appointments process is undertaken appropriately and in a timely manner, and for allocating sufficient resources to it.
2. **Key considerations**

(a) **Update on the open competition process**

2.1. At its meeting in May, Council agreed the process for filling Council member vacancies in 2020, including the use of an executive search agency to manage the recruitment campaign and process. In the 2018/19 round, the use of an external agency helped to increase the diversity and calibre of candidates and meant that staff and candidate selection panel members considered only redacted documentation until the point of final interviews, which further reduced the risk of any bias, or perception of bias, in the process. The tender process closed on 2 July 2019 and the tender selection panel is now in the process of assessing the bids.

(b) **The candidate selection panel**

2.2. The role of the candidate selection panel is to assess candidates against the published criteria, in accordance with the published process, and decide which candidates to recommend to the Privy Council for appointment.

2.3. For the 2020 appointments round, we have convened a new panel, taking into account early advice from the PSA and our own commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion more widely. We have increased BAME representation on the panel and we have appointed a new registrant member as well as a new female panel Chair. The panel also includes the Chair of the Council (as is usual process) and an independent member, who is responsible for providing assurance to the PSA that the principles of a good appointments process have been followed.

(c) **Skills audit (including review of selection criteria and competencies)**

2.4. This year, we carried out a more in-depth skills audit with our Council (including the five new members who joined in April 2019). Our aim is to ensure that the Council collectively has the skills, knowledge and experience to lead the organisation effectively, in line with our long-term vision. The audit was also designed to ensure that selection criteria and competencies used to select Council members reflect the current and expected future needs of the Council, and do not create unnecessary barriers from an equality and diversity perspective.

2.5. On 13 June 2019, Council members participated in a practical workshop exercise, as part of the skills audit. During this session, members heard a presentation outlining current good practice guidance from the PSA; insights, learnings and themes from recent public reports, and how we will incorporate these into our own process for 2019/20; reports on equality, diversity and inclusion themes, including recent statistics and learnings from the external context (as well as our own diversity monitoring reports from the 2018/19 recruitment round) and reflections on the existing criteria and competencies.

2.6. Following the workshop, Council members were asked to complete a bespoke self-assessment form as part of the second phase of the skills audit. Members were asked to rate their skills and experience across a range of different areas, using three levels of grading: ‘highly skilled/experienced’, ‘competent’, and ‘not skilled/experienced’. Members were provided with definitions to help them decide which rating to apply to each area.
Results of the skills audit

2.7. The self-assessment exercise achieved a completion rate of 100%. Overall, the results indicate that there is a good spread of skills and experience (at both ‘highly skilled/experienced’ and ‘competent’ levels) across all core categories identified. The skills and experience were also assessed under three key sections – pharmacy, patients and governance – and the results under each section are as follows:

(a) Patients - while a number of members have experience working with or caring for patients outside the role of a healthcare professional, there is currently less experience in representing the views of patients or advocating specifically for patients in a broader sense. On that basis, we suggest that experience of representing the patient voice or patient advocacy should be included in the desirable criteria for 2020.

(b) Pharmacy – there is currently a good spread of experience among the registrant members across most of the featured areas of pharmacy, with particular strengths in leadership, community and hospital. We also identified some additional experience among the current members, including prison pharmacy as well as the design and implementation of new models of supply. The only exception was in technology relating to pharmacy or healthcare more widely. While a number of members had some experience in this area there, no members described themselves as being ‘highly skilled/experienced’ or having had comprehensive training in this area. We suggest that experience of healthcare technology should remain in the desirable criteria for 2020.

(c) Governance - the final section of the audit looked at broader governance and regulatory areas such as financial management, corporate compliance and risk management, and equality, diversity and inclusion. Again, we found a good spread of skills across this section, with most members rating themselves as ‘highly experienced’ or ‘competent’ in most areas. Particular strengths were identified in areas such as regulatory environments, governance experience beyond the GPhC, and providing external representation at Council or Board level.

Other existing areas of skills / experience

2.8. Members were asked to identify any additional skills/experience which they could bring to Council business beyond the core categories specified in the self-assessment form. The results included:

- System leadership across different boundaries;
- Educational governance;
- Audit committee experience;
- Team leadership;
- People skills, including change management within complex projects, cultural transformation, and bullying and harassment;
- Specific knowledge of the NHS and pharmacy in Scotland, including engagement with key stakeholder;
- Oversight and operation of fitness to practise processes;
- Experience of investigations and enforcement;
- Articulation and promotion of standards of professional education and conduct; and
- Experience of project management and change management.
**Specific areas which could be supplemented**

2.9. Members were asked about any specific areas of skill, experience or expertise that could be supplemented on the Council in order to sustain or increase impact and effectiveness. Some areas identified, such as experience of inspection and networking, are those in which other members already have skills. The additional areas we identified as needing to be supplemented through desirable criteria are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of skill or experience identified</th>
<th>Resulting desirable criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent prescribers and professionals working in care home and GP practice settings</td>
<td>Experience of using clinical and/or prescribing skills in one setting or a range of different settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrant members with day-to-day experience of working in a community setting and/or in a new role as a prescriber.</td>
<td>Experience of using clinical and/or prescribing skills in one setting or a range of settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works in and/or has recent experience of working in healthcare IT and related developments</td>
<td>An understanding of technology developments in healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience and/or understanding of education and training (x2)</td>
<td>An understanding of academic and vocational education and training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed changes to the selection criteria for 2020**

2.10. We have updated the essential criteria and competencies to take account of the feedback from the Council and from the last recruitment round, as well as relevant insights from the external context. Although we have not substantially changed the criteria, we have added some clear, explanatory guidance to help candidates understand what the criteria mean and how they can meet these. We also have sought to ensure that the criteria strike the right balance and focus on skills and abilities, enabling diverse candidates to give broad examples.

2.11. We have also updated the desirable criteria to reflect the results of the skills audit, which includes taking account of the skills / experience of departing members as well as the longer-term vision of the GPhC. Separately, we are satisfied that the current skills mix enables us to ensure adequate succession planning for the relevant committees on which those members serve.

2.12. Taking all of this into account, we propose to include the following desirable criteria for the 2020 appointments:

- Experience of representing the patient voice or patient advocacy (Lay)
- Experience of using clinical and/or prescribing skills in one setting or a range of different settings (Registrant)
- An understanding of technology developments in healthcare (Lay or Registrant)
- An understanding of academic and vocational education and training (Lay or Registrant)
- Lives or works primarily in Scotland (Lay or Registrant)
2.13. Council is asked to approve the revised criteria and competencies attached at Appendix 1.

3. Equality and diversity implications

3.1. This year, we have produced a Diversity Action Plan, to support the process of recommending Council appointments in 2020 and to demonstrate how we meet our equality obligations, as well as our broader commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion at all stages of the planning and implementation of the appointments process.

3.2. This is also designed to help us identify the practical steps and actions that we can take, to attract a broad, diverse range of suitably qualified candidates, and reflects learnings, insights and feedback from the previous appointments round as well as recent reports in the external context that are relevant to our work. A copy of the Diversity Action Plan is attached at Appendix 2.

3.3. We will continue to consider these themes at all stages of the process through to the appointments being made in March 2020.

4. Communications

4.1. The PSA requires vacancies, via open competition, to be advertised for at least four weeks, to give potential candidates sufficient opportunity to see the advertisement and apply. We propose to advertise for longer than the required four weeks as the advertising period will run over the summer. Our advertising strategy has been designed to attract a strong and diverse field of suitable candidates (see the Diversity Action Plan for more information).

4.2. We have also developed a communications plan, to underpin the appointments campaign. This will include engagement activities during the planning phase, and consideration of advertising and engagement with key interests to help publicise the vacancies and encourage applications. This year, we will also host a new webinar, to help de-mystify the recruitment process and to encourage a wider pool of candidates to apply.

4.3. Finally, we have updated the Privy Council and the Professional Standards Authority about our plans and the timetable for this work, and have submitted our formal ‘Advance Notice of intent to recommend appointment’ bundle to the PSA. The estimated timeline for the campaign is approximately nine months from initial advertisement to members taking office in April 2020. We will continue to keep the Privy Council and PSA updated as we finalise the arrangements and move towards formal recommendations in due course.

5. Resource implications

5.1. Provision has been made for the recruitment campaign, including the use of an external agency, in the budget for 2019-20.

6. Risk implications
6.1. An appropriate and robust process for recruiting and selecting Council members is an essential step in ensuring good governance within the GPhC.

6.2. It is essential that our procedures meet the requirements of the PSA’s Section 25c scrutiny process. Failure to ensure that our appointment process meets the four principles of merit, fairness, transparency and openness, and inspiring confidence in regulation means that the PSA may not have confidence in our process. This would result in the Privy Council not making the appointments we recommend.

7. Confirmation of reappointments 2020

7.1. Council is also asked to approve the process for filling the remaining vacancies that arise in 2020 through a reappointments process. There are currently two Council members who are eligible for reappointment in April 2020.

7.2. When considering whether to use reappointments, the Council should assess and consider the current and future needs of the Council for particular skills and expertise (see results of the skills audit exercise); consider the balance between continuity and refreshment of the Council’s membership; consider the diversity of backgrounds within the Council’s membership; and take account of any relevant external factors.

7.3. Taking all of this into account, there appears to be no reason why Council cannot proceed with its general principle of using a mixture of open competition and reappointments for 2020.

7.4. Should Council approve the use of reappointments for the relevant vacancies, this process would run concurrently with the open recruitment process. It will then be necessary to consult the Privy Council on the planned timing of the reappointment recommendation. In line with PSA guidelines, this should not normally be more than six months before the members’ current terms end (October 2019 to March 2020).

7.5. We are not required to submit formal Advance Notice of the reappointments process to the PSA in the same way as the process for open competition. However, once candidates have been recommended, the scrutiny and recommendation processes are the same as those for open competition.

8. Monitoring and review

8.1. Council will be kept updated and informed on the 2020 appointments process as this moves forward.

8.2. Looking forward, there are no Council vacancies arising in 2021. However, we will be reporting to Council in due course about future arrangements for staggering appointments in the longer-term.

Recommendations
The Council is asked to:

I. note the progress update on the recruitment of Council members through an open competition process
II. approve the updated selection criteria and competencies (Appendix 1)
III. note the Diversity Action Plan, designed to support the process of recommending appointments in 2020 (Appendix 2)
IV. agree the process for filling the remaining vacancies through reappointments

Laura McClintock, Chief of Staff
laura.mcclintock@pharmacyregulation.org
Tel 020 3713 8079

Janet Collins, Governance Manager
janet.collins@pharmacyregulation.org
Tel. 020 3713 8139
The experience and knowledge Council members need to have

To help you decide if you want to apply for a role as a Council member, we have set out the criteria we will use when assessing applicants. You will see that these are ‘essential criteria’. This means that only candidates who show, throughout the course of their applications, that they meet the essential criteria to an acceptable level will be recommended for appointment by the panel. The panel may not fill all the vacancies if it does not have enough suitable candidates and could recommend that some positions be left empty. Your application form must show that you have the experience and knowledge needed for the role.

**Essential criteria**

All candidates must show that they have the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>How you can demonstrate this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E1</strong> Working within a framework</td>
<td>An appreciation of and commitment to protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of patients and the public. Experience of working within, either professionally or in other ways, a set of rules, guidance, policies or other boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2</strong> Analytical and decision-making skills</td>
<td>The ability to identify problems, options and solutions, considering risks, consequences and impact. Ability for forward thinking and to see the bigger picture. Knowledge/experience of analysing and understanding different types of information and situations and contributing constructively to the collective decision-making process. A willingness to change your thinking in the light of new information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E3</strong> Collaborative and professional communication skills Working collaboratively and communicating professionally with others</td>
<td>The ability to work with others, to challenge, listen and question constructively. Good communication skills and an ability to put views across clearly, persuasively and sensitively. Influencing and persuading others using well-reasoned arguments, experience of participating in group discussions and working effectively in a team of people. Understanding and being open to different points of view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desirable criteria

On this occasion, we are seeking candidates with knowledge or experience of one or more of the following areas:

- representing the patient voice or patient advocacy (Lay)
- using clinical and/or prescribing skills in one or a range of settings (Registrant)
- an understanding of technology developments in healthcare (Lay or Registrant)
- an understanding of academic and vocational education and training (Lay or Registrant)

In addition, we are seeking one candidate who lives or works primarily in Scotland (Lay or Registrant).

The competencies Council members need to have

You will need to be able to show at interview that you have the following competencies and qualities, which are needed in this demanding role. Successful candidates will need to be able to apply these competencies to the Council’s responsibility to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of members of the public by upholding standards and public trust in pharmacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>How you can demonstrate this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E4</strong> Integrity and respect</td>
<td>Gains trust of others, principled and values-based actions. An understanding of and commitment to good governance and to the Nolan principles of public life. Taking an ethical approach to your work and being open and honest, including when things go wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E5</strong> Pharmacy professional practice</td>
<td>Up to date knowledge and understanding of the practice of pharmacists and/or pharmacy technicians and an awareness of the factors and issues that influence it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **C1** Personal qualities  | • Willing to accept and uphold their own accountability and also willing and able to hold others to account for their performance of their own delegated responsibilities  
• A high level of honesty, integrity, objectivity and fairness  
• A commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion  
• The ability to maintain confidentiality  
• A high level of motivation and a willingness to constantly review and improve performance  
• The ability to display credibility across and beyond the registered pharmacy professions |
| **C2** Intellectual flexibility | • Thinks clearly and creatively  
• Is able to analyse complex information – considering the bigger picture as well as the detail – and to arrive at sound judgements  
• Is able to understand who the GPhC’s key interest groups are, and their motivations and priorities  
• Is willing to modify their thinking in light of new information and dialogue |
| **C3** Effective influencing and communication | • Can influence and persuade others using evidence and well-reasoned arguments  
• Is able to give and take advice  
• Is able to test and probe constructively and effectively to get the best outcomes for the GPhC and its statutory functions |
| **C4** Effective team working | • Builds constructive relationships and works effectively in a team  
• Understands and maintains the separation between non-executive and executive roles (for example, Council members set the direction for the organisation rather than getting immersed in the detail of operational delivery)  
• Promotes and supports the corporate decisions of the Council  
• Actively looks for the different views of others and respects those views |
Council member appointments 2019/20

Diversity Action Plan

“Good governance has to be accomplished through superior quality decision making at board level. It is therefore important that board members are drawn from the widest possible talent pools. It is critical that boards reflect and represent their customers and stakeholders. It’s also vital that different life experiences and perspectives inform board discussions and decisions. A diversity of ideas and perspectives leads to superior decision making and therefore outcomes”1

We have produced this Diversity Action Plan, to support the process of recommending Council appointments in 2019/20 and to demonstrate how we meet our equality obligations, as well as our broader commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion at all stages of the planning and implementation of the appointments process. This Diversity Action Plan is also designed to help us identify the practical steps and actions that we can take, to attract a broad, diverse range of suitably qualified candidates, and reflects learnings, insights and feedback from the previous appointments round as well as recent reports in the external context that are relevant to our work.

Table 1: List of actions and next steps under each stage in the appointments process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details</th>
<th>Status update / next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial planning and development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the equality impacts at all stages of the recruitment process, from planning through to implementation and beyond</td>
<td>We have considered equality, diversity and inclusion themes as part of our initial planning for this recruitment round, leading to the development of this Diversity Action Plan. We will continue to consider these themes at all stages of the process through to the appointments being made in March 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider and review insights and learnings from recent and relevant reports, inquiries or publications relating to diversity in public appointments</td>
<td>An initial review has been carried out and relevant learnings have been fed into the development of this Diversity Action Plan and our ongoing assessment of equality, diversity and inclusion considerations throughout the process. As part of this work, we have considered reports and information from sources such as the Centre for Public Appointments (CPA) in the Cabinet Office, which supports Government in the appointment of individuals to the boards of the public bodies as well as information from the Ethical Standards Commissioner and the Scottish Government. We have also reviewed diversity strategies from other organisations, to take account of good practice and other innovative ideas on appointments processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Christian Brodie, Chair of the Public Chairs’ Forum, referenced in the Centre for Public Appointments, Public Appointments Diversity Action Plan
Additionally, at its workshop on 13 June 2019, Council members received a presentation that highlighted some of the diversity statistics relating to external public appointments across other sectors and jurisdictions. This included information about the Government’s aspirations for 2020 that 50% of its own public appointees should be female and 14% from ethnic minorities.

Review the findings from the Lord Holmes Review ‘Opening up public appointments to disabled people’, to ensure that insights and learnings are incorporated into our process for 2019/20

Although the recommendations in the Lord Holmes Review are primarily for the government, we have nevertheless reviewed this carefully as the learnings and themes are still relevant to our own work. We also considered the Review’s case studies demonstrating how organisations such as Social Care Wales, the Social Mobility Commission and the Honours Committee have run more open selection processes. And, we have summarised the key insights and learnings at Annex A and explained how we have incorporated relevant aspects into our own processes through this Diversity Action Plan.

Review and follow the updated PSA Good Practice in Making Council Appointments guidance (revised March 2019)

We are required to follow the PSA guidance at all stages of the recruitment and appointments process. We have reviewed the revised guidance published by the PSA. Our Council policies and procedures have been updated to reflect the current guidance and these were approved by Council at its meeting on 16 May 2019. Additionally, Council members received a presentation on the current PSA requirements at its workshop on 13 June 2019, specifically focussing on good practice requirements on selection criteria and competencies, including equality and diversity considerations.

Review of selection criteria and competencies

Ensure that our core competencies and selection criteria have been reviewed and, where appropriate, any changes identified from the 2018/19 process, to increase accessibility and to ‘widen the net’ to attract more applicants.

All Council members have taken part in a skills audit, to develop revised competencies and criteria for the 2019/20 recruitment round. This included participating in a workshop exercise on 13 June 2019 and completing a bespoke self-assessment form. The results will be discussed at the Council meeting on 11 July 2019 and Council will approve the revised criteria and competencies for 2019/20.

As part of the review of the criteria and competencies, Council members considered equality and diversity aspects, primarily to ensure that the criteria and competencies do not create unnecessary barriers and allow the Council to progress towards achieving greater board diversity generally (including but not limited to BAME, gender, disability, LGBTQ+, age, socio-economic). See Annex A below for additional considerations relating to disabled candidates, as highlighted through the Lord Holmes Review.

Candidate packs and application forms

Review candidate pack and application forms and produce an accessible application form (available in different formats on request), including clear guidance for all potential candidates.

We have worked with our Communication team to review the content and formatting of advert and application pack, to make sure they are accessible, clear and inclusive. Additionally, we are in the process of seeking feedback from patient and public representatives on the pack, to ‘test’ this with real life readers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details</th>
<th>Status update / next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We have also added stronger and clearer messages about our commitment to equality and diversity in the candidate pack and supporting materials.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following feedback from some of last year’s candidates via our executive search agency, we have also made the wording around the desirable criteria even clearer. And, we have amended the application forms, to make it expressly clear that candidates do not have to complete each box relating to the desirable criteria, to avoid any potential confusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The selection panel</strong></td>
<td>The selection panel has been reconstituted this year, with a new Chair and a new registrant member. We have discussed what is expected from selection panel members with each new panel member and we will continue this liaison throughout the process. The Council Chair will also continue to raise awareness of our commitment to EDI with all new selection panel members in advance of the recruitment starting and outline what is expected from them as panel members throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the newly formed candidate selection panel understands and demonstrates a commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the diversity of our selection panel, specifically by appointing a BAME member to the panel</td>
<td>We have successfully increased BAME representation on the selection panel for the 2019/20 appointments round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive search agency</strong></td>
<td>Council agreed the overall process for appointments at its meeting in May 2019, which included the use of an external agency. The tender process concluded on 2 July 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an external search agency to avoid any direct, associative, perceptive or indirect discrimination and to increase the diversity of the candidate talent pool</td>
<td>The tender document has been published and this includes clear and express requirements around equality, diversity and inclusion and what is expected from the search agency. This will also be explored through the assessment and evaluation of the bids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and strengthen the wording of the tender document, to ensure that bidders are required to demonstrate through the tender process how they will attract the broadest and most diverse range of candidates, and work in line with our commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion more widely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attracting talent: advertising strategies</strong></td>
<td>The 2018/19 recruitment closed with 224 applications, including a good diversity of application by declared characteristics (33 did not provide a diversity form). We want to encourage this diverse mix of candidates for the 2019/20 round. We have worked closely with our Communications Team to design a bespoke Communications Plan. This is designed to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Design and launch our communications and advertising campaign to ensure broad appeal and to identify a diverse field | - Support the development of recruitment materials that are accessible, clear and inclusive  
- Encourage applications from a diverse range of applicants, including people with certain protected characteristics or with certain experience and skills which may be underrepresented on Council, and candidates from Scotland*  
- Emphasise our commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion at all stages of the process |

*Scotland*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action details</th>
<th>Status update / next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demystify the role and process and provide information to support candidates to understand what is required at each stage</td>
<td>Our Communications Plan covers important aspects including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Initial promotion and awareness raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Press releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholder engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Blog posts or podcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Webinar (see below for more information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will also raise awareness of the benefits of being a Council member among those who have the potential and the aspiration, but may not be aware of the opportunities available, for example, by sending information about the role to organisations and charities that we have linked with previously. Some new examples have been identified in the recent reports and we will include these in our stakeholder lists.</td>
<td>*Whilst we wish to encourage candidates from a wide geographical spread (and across all three countries that we regulate), we must recommend a candidate this year who lives or works wholly or mainly in Scotland in order to maintain the balance required by the Pharmacy Order 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the executive search agency, to promote the opportunities through a range of different channels and networks</td>
<td>The next phase is to work in conjunction with the search agency, drawing on our insights and learning from last year’s process (including our advertising report and equality monitoring report) to finalise our campaign. We will use existing data to identify whether further steps need to be taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of the appointments and ensure the recruitment process does not act as a barrier to talented candidates from a wide range of backgrounds applying for public appointments</td>
<td>We have applied the insights from external reports, to help us to encourage applications from a diverse range of applicants. This will be done through enhanced awareness raising and through the planned review of our core competencies and selection criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the visibility of appointees who share certain protected characteristics through outreach, events and social media</td>
<td>Last year, we published experiences from existing Council members. We will include more ‘real life’ experiences in this year’s campaign, primarily through our webinar and Q&amp;A (see below for more information). We have also identified some new networks and organisations this year that may reach/engage with potential candidates, such as the NHS Confed BME Leadership Network, BAPIO and Women in the City, to ask them to help promote the opportunity through their networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host a webinar to de-mystify the recruitment process and to encourage a wider pool of candidates to apply</td>
<td>This year (in a change from last year’s process) we will run a new style webinar, to garner interest from potential candidates and try to dispel some of the myths about the process and the role, and to try to encourage a more diverse range of candidates to come forward to apply. Our webinar will also give candidates an opportunity to ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action details</td>
<td>Status update / next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce some ‘top tips’ on how to succeed at competency-based interviews, to help support candidates who may not feel that these roles are for them, or have not been successful in the past.</td>
<td>Last year, our executive search agency provided ongoing guidance and support to candidates throughout the process, in order to help them feel prepared for the interview stages. We will work with the agency this year, to consider what more we can do to provide appropriate support and encouragement to help candidates understand and feel more prepared for the application and interview process. We will also include some high-level guidance in the webinar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update our social media and other online pages to ensure that those who want to understand more about the opportunities available.</td>
<td>Last year, we directed enquiries about the role to our external search agency. We will make sure that our campaign materials make it clear that people can easily ask for advice or information about the role and the process for making an application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the networks through which we raise awareness of public appointments and provide support for candidates.</td>
<td>As above, through recent reports and publications, we have identified some new sources and networks within which we will be able to share the information about the role. We have particular country needs for our 2019/20 round, in order to maintain the constitution of our Council, as required by statute. This year, our communications campaign includes steps to attract candidates from Scotland in order to maintain this balance. We will also try to encourage others from a wide social and geographical spread to apply, using our communications and advertising campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use diversity-focused jobs board to source candidates.</td>
<td>We will reflect on the equality monitoring statistics from last year, in order to identify any new or alternative ways to reach out to people who share certain characteristics, and to support / encourage them to apply via our webinar and communications materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build on our existing pool of potential talent.</td>
<td>Where possible, we will ask our recruiters to approach applicants from previous campaigns whom panels identified as having excellent potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support potential candidates to have a ‘look and feel’ of the organisation before going through the process.</td>
<td>We will encourage people to attend a Council meeting before submitting their application to give them an idea of what was involved and to help them feel more prepared for the application and interview stages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accessibility and adjustments**

Offering adjustments to meet the needs of individual candidates and reminding candidates about this at different points in the process. Our executive search agency reported that they received positive feedback from candidates in the 2018/19 round, indicating that the adjustments were managed well and that the GPhC was very accommodating of these different needs. See Annex A below for...
### Action details

**Interview process**

- **Ensuring that all application forms are redacted to remove the names of candidates and any other information by which they may be identifiable.**
  
  In line with our usual procedures, and PSA guidance, all candidates will remain anonymous to the panel until the final interview stage. We will ensure that the search agency is well-briefed on the requirements around removing identifiable information from application forms.

- **Ensuring the selection and decision-making processes are objective, fair and unbiased with robust independent quality assurance established.**
  
  We will follow external guidance on making Council appointments. We will continue to have an independent panel member on the selection panel, who is responsible for providing assurance to the PSA that the principles of a good appointments process have been followed, namely merit, fairness, transparency and openness, and inspiring confidence.

- **Declaring and recording where a candidate is known by a member of the panel (in a professional and/or personal sense).**
  
  We will ensure that the panel Chair reminds panel members to make declarations at all stages of the process and we will record these in the notes of the meetings.

**EDI monitoring**

- **Continue to collect, monitor and report on diversity data.**
  
  Our recruiters will collect this data and produce a diversity statistics report at the conclusion of the process.

- **Keeping equality and diversity monitoring data separate from the main application forms and ensuring that these are not used in the selection process.**
  
  We have reviewed the wording of our candidate pack to ensure that it is clear and explains fully how the information will be used. Equality and diversity data will not be used in the selection process.

- **Providing equality and diversity monitoring data to the PSA as part of their assurance of the process.**
  
  We will provide a full report to the PSA as part of our Notice of Recommendation submission.

### Annex A: Applying the insights and learnings from the Lord Holmes Review on ‘Opening up public appointments to disabled people’

"Opening up public appointments to disabled talent is not looking to give anyone an unfair advantage. An equitable, inclusive, fully accessible and positive process puts everyone on the same start line. It allows everyone to run whatever race they choose with fairness, dignity and respect throughout…"

The recommendations in the report are focussed on increasing the number of disabled applicants, interviewees and appointees. However, I believe that they could have general applicability and benefits in many situations, across public appointments and to all talent acquisition and recruitment practices"²

---

² Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE, Lord Holmes Review: ‘Opening up public appointments to disabled people’
Table B: Summary of key insights and recommendations from the Lord Holmes Review

The independent Lord Holmes Review explores how to open-up public appointments to disabled people. Although the recommendations in the report are primarily for the Government, we have nevertheless summarised some of the key insights and considered how these might apply to our own work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights from the Lord Holmes Report</th>
<th>How we will apply the recommendations to our work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attracting and nurturing talent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Public appointments over rely on the Centre for Public Appointments website, appealing to a self-selecting group. The review considers options to look further and harder for disabled talent, and combat the perception that public appointments are “not for people like them” | We use different mechanisms and channels to promote opportunities to a wide range of candidates. We have also drawn up specific stakeholder plans focused on sector-specific groups and professional networks of disabled people.  

We will also share our advert and candidate pack with the Disability Charity Consortium and ask them to share this through their networks. We will also discuss with the executive search agency how they will help us to identify disabled candidates, for example, through the Disability Network. |
| **Application packs and job descriptions** |                                                   |
| Most applications are submitted via email, or sometimes less accessible third party online portals | We promote our candidate packs and supporting materials in a variety of formats. We will also work with our executive search agency to make sure that candidates are able to access the website and supporting materials easily, and that this does not put candidates off from applying.  

The report highlights the use of online tools and toolkits to ensure packs are accessible, and suggests that departments should test packs against existing free-to-use tools on GOV.UK related to WC3 standards, openness to neurodiverse candidates and free online guidance on making applications accessible. As discussed above, we have taken a number of steps this year, to test the accessibility of our candidate packs and materials.  

We continue to offer candidate packs in multiple alternative formats. |
| Not all packs offer alternative application methods | We offer a point of contact and advice for candidates who may require an alternative form of submission, to ensure that we are not excluding potential candidates at the first hurdle.  

We will continue to offer preliminary interviews for candidates, including arrangements for Skype interviews where this is better for the candidate (and we have updated our candidate pack to make it explicit that this will not disadvantage those candidates).  

The report indicates that appointing departments should be open to alternative means of application and assessment, and that the Government should commission, analyse and publicise pilot recruitments innovations such as video or audio submissions, short pre-interview phone discussions, free-form submission in any text format. We will follow the outcome of any Government work in this area and feed this into future campaigns. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights from the Lord Holmes Report</th>
<th>How we will apply the recommendations to our work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all packs expressed openness to disabled applicants</td>
<td>The report indicates that simple statements can have a positive impact such as “say applications from disabled people welcome”, “disabled applicants will be equally considered” and “demonstrate a genuine welcome to candidates with disabilities”. We have updated our candidate pack to reinforce these positive messages and ensure that the language is purposeful, positive and welcoming about disabled candidates, inclusion and adjustments. We have also checked to ensure that the language used in packs continues to be appropriate and we will avoid outmoded or overly legalistic text concerning disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All offered adjustments, but the language and approaches were inconsistent</td>
<td>Our candidate packs already ask potential candidates to let us know if they need any adjustments at any stage of the appointments process and that we will provide ongoing support / adjustments for candidates who are successful. We will also: - Ask in advance if any adjustments are needed for people to participate fully - Be clear on how candidates can make requests, who would consider them and what information is needed - Be positive and supportive about honouring adjustments (the report found that a lack of clarity about whether (and if so, which) costs would be met and whether adjustment requests would be honoured played on the minds of some people: “It’s tiresome to apply not knowing if you’re going to get the adjustments you need”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria favour experience, sector and seniority, with less emphasis on skills, output and lived experience. This counts against many disabled peoples’ nonstandard CVs</td>
<td>On a positive note, our existing criteria and core competencies do not include academic qualifications, particular degrees, or specified lengths of service in a particular sector, which the report indicates candidates can often perceive as being required. We have also received feedback from our executive search agency that compared to some organisations they worked with, our criteria and competencies are very open and focus on skills and abilities, which enables candidates to give broad examples. We have also considered this feedback as part of our skills audit and revision of our criteria and core competencies, to see if these can be pared back any further. We have asked Council members to think about how the criteria might be perceived by people are more likely to have “non-standard CVs and education histories” and whether improvements could be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews and beyond</td>
<td>The report suggested that appointing departments should consider more open and innovative selection processes than one-off panel interviews and has asked the Government to commission, analyse and publicise pilot selection processes. Proposed alternative methods could include: • job trials • mock board meetings • extended shadowing of the board or the whole organisation • board paper exercises (shared in accessible formats in advance) • multiple two-person interviews • considering applications with equal weight to interview • offering phone or online video calls as standard. Prior to answering competency-based questions, we already ask candidates to do a board paper exercise and to give their perspectives / reflections on what they have seen (with advance thinking and reading time). This enables candidates to settle into the interview and bring their own broader, perspectives and ideas to the discussion. We also inform candidates about the structure and format of the interview at the very outset, including in the initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights from the Lord Holmes Report</td>
<td>How we will apply the recommendations to our work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidate pack. We also prepare the materials in other formats to support candidates who need adjustments. We will follow the outcome of any Government work to ensure that this is fed into future campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience-focused, competency-based panel interview</td>
<td>The report indicates that allowing disabled candidates space in the process to show what skills they have developed and impact they can have is crucial. The reports also suggests that a rigid panel format can stymie this: “I remember one interview for a public appointment, I wanted to tell them about my lived experience ... but there was no opportunity to do this” We will ensure that our selection panel understand how to allow candidates the space to show their skills and experiences and consider this feedback as we review our interview questions for the 2019/20 round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report recommended that all public bodies should be Disability Confident by summer 2019. All should have a Disability Confident level and display this on their websites and application packs and have a clear pathway to progress up the levels.</td>
<td>The report found that people felt it was better for an organisation to have a Disability Confident rating prominent in job packs than not. It shows that the employer has engaged with the issue on some level and wants to display this to potential candidates. We are working with the BDF to build a business case for disability confidence and means that we can access specialist advice on how disability affects our stakeholders. Although we cannot yet display the logo on candidate packs, we can still provide messages about the support we can offer to candidates in the candidate packs and in our communications campaigns. We have also provided disability awareness training for staff about how to support people who need adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of poor adjustments, interview etiquette and feedback suggest low disability awareness and lack of disabled representation on panels</td>
<td>Throughout the appointments process in 2019/20, we will follow the good practice suggestions recommended in the report, including: • Be proactive – if adjustments have been requested, contact the interviewee in advance to plan ahead (e.g. find out how best to meet a candidate’s needs as soon as they are shortlisted and not just in the week of the interview) • Be guided by the individual – do not make assumptions about what adjustments they need. • Consider that access is more than physical – is the room or alternative facility appropriate and giving the candidate the same opportunity as everyone else? • Costs – plan and budget for the potential costs. Evidence received by the review suggests that the common thread between poor adjustments and poor interview etiquette is a lack of basic disability awareness. We will consider these insights as part of our process to constitute our new selection panel and identify any additional training needs. We will also seek advice and guidance during the process, if this is needed to support any candidates with particular needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection and transparency**

| Issues in reporting rates remain: appointees are | Existing disability data is collected at application through a diversity monitoring form. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insights from the Lord Holmes Report</th>
<th>How we will apply the recommendations to our work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seldom asked again, the form is inconsistently used, there is no mandation and there is imperfect accessibility.</td>
<td>We explain clearly in our candidate pack that data is not used in the selection process and will only be used for statistical purposes, and for us to review our performance in relation to our equality, diversity and inclusion responsibilities. We also encourage candidates to complete the form and make it clear this does no prejudice their application in any way, and that the data will be treated carefully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For our 2018/19 recruitment round we had a total of 224 applicants with 33 not providing a complete diversity form. Over 94% of all respondents, registrants and lay indicated they had no disability. 11 applicants indicated they did have a disability and one candidate preferred not to answer. And, we provided adjustments for candidates, including at the final interview stages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have shared our Diversity Action Plan with the EDI team at the GPhC and highlighted the findings from the Lord Holmes report in relation to data and transparency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retention**

While beyond scope of the review, contributors shared concerns about retention of disabled public appointees

Concerns identified in the review were based on: a lack of adjustments to accommodate new disabled members, access issues, unconscious bias, and pressure to represent ‘the disabled’ on their committee. The review urges Government to examine retention statistics and consider if further work is needed to render board culture and practice more disability friendly.

We will follow the outcomes of any future Government review in this area and consider how to apply any insights or learning to our own work.

While out of scope of the Lord Holmes review, contributors shared consistent messages about expenses and remuneration

The report indicated that a lack of expenses or funding for adjustments adversely affected applicants and appointees, and unremunerated posts were more likely to exclude disabled applicants. The review urges Government to examine the outcome of GEO’s Access to Public Office scheme.

Council members posts continue to be remunerated and the rates are reviewed on an annual basis, taking into account benchmarking from across the wider sector and other relevant considerations such as how the remuneration might impact on attracting new or more diverse candidates the role.

We sought advice on this issue from our executive search team last year. We were advised that raising remuneration has an impact in terms of increased general interest, including, but not specifically, from candidates from diverse backgrounds. More money makes these roles more attractive for everyone, not disproportionately more interesting for people from diverse backgrounds. Additionally, we received no negative feedback, either directly or through the search agency, that the remuneration had put candidates off from applying in last year’s round.