

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
General Dental Council
held at 9:00am on Thursday 5 December 2019
in Public Session
at 1 Colmore Square, Birmingham, B4 6AJ**

Council Members present:

William Moyes	(Chair)
Anne Heal	
Caroline Logan	
Catherine Brady	
Jeyanthi John	
Kirstie Moons	
Margaret Kellett	
Simon Morrow	
Terry Babbs	

Executive in attendance:

Ian Brack	Chief Executive and Registrar
Gurvinder Soomal	Executive Director, Registration and Corporate Resources
Lisa Marie Williams	Executive Director, Legal and Governance
Sarah Keyes	Executive Director, Organisational Development
Stefan Czerniawski	Executive Director, Strategy
Tom Scott	Executive Director, FtP Transition

Staff in attendance:

Colin MacKenzie	Interim Head of Communications and Engagement
John Cullinane	Head of Adjudications (Item 7 only)
Rebecca Cooper	Head of GDC Policy and Research Programme (Item 8)
Tim Wright	Head of Projects, Programmes and Portfolio Delivery (Item 9)
Melissa Sharp	Head of In-House Legal Advisory Service (Item 9)
Samantha Bache	Head of Finance and Procurement (Items 10 and 12)
David Criddle	Head of Performance Reporting & PMO (Item 12)
Katie Spears	Interim Head of Governance (Secretary)
Paula Woodward Pfister	Governance Consultant

In attendance:

Members of the public.

PART ONE – PRELIMINARY ITEMS

1. Opening remarks and apologies for absence

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Stefan Czerniawski, Executive Director, Strategy. Apologies were received from Crispin Passmore, Sheila Kumar and Geraldine Campbell.

2. Declarations of interest

- 2.1. All registrant Council Members declared an interest in Item 8, paying the Annual Retention Fee by instalments.
- 2.2. All Council Members declared an interest in the Items 10, and 14b Council Member Accommodation and Council Member Appraisals Process.
- 2.3. Caroline Logan declared an interest in Item 14a, Council Member re-appointments and noted that she would not participate in the discussion, Item 14c, Review of Education.
- 2.4. All staff declared an interest in Item 15a, the review of financial policies (staff expenses) and on the estates item.
- 2.5. All Council Members and staff declared an interest in Item 14k, the anti-fraud and anti-bribery policy.

3. Questions submitted by members of the public

- 3.1. No questions had been submitted by members of the public.

4. Approval of minutes of the previous meetings

- 4.1. The Council **noted** that the full minutes of the public meeting held on 3 October 2019 had been approved via correspondence and a final version had been circulated to Council members by email on 1 November 2019.

5. Matters arising from the public Council meeting held on 3 October 2019 and rolling actions list

- 5.1. The Council **noted** the actions list and **approved** the completion of actions where they were marked as 'suggested complete'.
- 5.2. In relation to Item 6, all Committee appointment letters had been issued on 29 November 2019 so that action should be treated as complete.
- 5.3. The Council requested that when an action had passed its due date, but was in hand, that the due date for its completion be updated.

Action: Interim Head of Governance to update the due dates in the actions log.

6. Decisions log

- 6.1. The Council **noted** that, beyond the approval of the minutes, there had been no decisions taken in between meetings.

PART TWO – ITEMS FOR DECISION AND DISCUSSION

7. Adjudications Programme

The Head of Adjudications joined the meeting.

- 7.1. The Head of Adjudications introduced the paper and invited questions around the proposal to separate the adjudications function of the organisation from the investigation and presentation functions, as far as was possible within the current legislative constraints.
- 7.2. The proposal was a staging post toward a fuller separation which would necessitate future legislative change. Without such legislative change, the function must remain both in law and in terms of accountability and financial control, a part of the GDC. As part of the programme of work, the Council was invited to discuss the proposals around reshaping the Appointments

Committee (Statutory Panellists Assurance Committee - SPC). This work had been considered extensively by the Chair's Strategy Group and the Council was invited to approve the proposal in principle.

7.3. The Council **discussed** the following:

- 7.3.1. The Council was supportive of the proposal and the direction of travel.
- 7.3.2. There were clear benefits in appointing a Chair with judicial qualification and experience of judicial or tribunal decision making including supporting a culture of providing robust directions around case management, and providing advice regarding training and recruitment of panel members.
- 7.3.3. The work would serve as an evidence base to support the organisation's requests for that change, and case management powers would assist with the GDC's ambitions for how hearings could be managed more effectively.
- 7.3.4. There had been some soft engagement with stakeholders about the topic and the approach aligned with the wider regulatory landscape around the separation of these functions.
- 7.3.5. The proposals had been encapsulated in the Costed Corporate Plan (CCP) in relation to delivery and timing in the shell of a project, pending Council approval. If it were approved, the project and associated costings could be crystallized into next year's revision of the CCP, which was designed to allow this sort of flex, and would be overseen by the FPC.
- 7.3.6. The Council discussed the proposed timescales for the work and heard that, on an initial view, it was hoped that the substantive changes proposed could be achieved within 18 months.
- 7.3.7. The work should now move out of the CSG workplan and over to the Executive team to deliver, with scrutiny via the Council. The Chair and Chief Executive would meet with the Chair of the SPC to discuss the issue this month.

7.4. The Council **approved** the proposals set out in the paper around the separation of the adjudication function and asked that the matter be brought back to Council in Q1 of 2020 (March).

Action: The Head of Adjudications to bring a paper, including a programme plan with key milestones, to Council in Q1 of 2020 after EMT consideration at its next monthly session.

The Head of Adjudications left the meeting.

8. ARF Fees: Payment by Instalments

The Head of GDC Policy and Research Programme joined the meeting.

- 8.1. The Head of GDC Policy and Research Programme introduced the paper which invited discussion and approval for the proposal that the GDC commission an external supplier to conduct a feasibility study on the payment of registrants' annual retention fees by instalments.
- 8.2. The topic had been explored extensively by the team, with oversight from the Chair's Strategy Group, and the Council was asked to approve the release of funds to enable the fuller exploration of the topic, with technical and operational analysis, by a third party.
- 8.3. The Council **discussed** the following:
 - 8.3.1. The Council supported the proposal and expressed that it had taken some time for this work to reach the Council, despite there being an appetite expressed for it at an earlier stage. The Council heard that there had been the need for rigour and analysis of the existing data held by the organisation, some benchmarking with fellow regulators and a

careful analysis of the risks attached to the proposal before it could properly be presented to Council for approval. The external work would be necessary to ensure that, with detailed technical analysis, this was a safe proposal for the Council to consider implementing.

- 8.3.2. The financial risk outlined in the paper, of 1.75% of income, did not feel to the Chair as though it would fall outside of the Council's risk appetite if the independent analysis validated the assumptions used in the internal modelling.
- 8.3.3. The Council discussed the assumption of a 20% uptake rate and heard that this was based on benchmarking data from other regulators. The Council discussed that the broad and wide-ranging registrant groups might have an impact on uptake and noted that benchmarking assumptions could only inform the work to a certain extent, given the varied registrant population of the GDC.
- 8.3.4. The Chief Executive, as Accounting Officer, noted that the independent scrutiny of an external party around the planning assumptions and financial risk would be a useful tool for Council to gauge whether these proposals were a secure and safe course to follow.
- 8.3.5. The Council expressed that any independent report should incorporate a recommended approach, with an analysis of the respective benefits and risks attached to that approach.
- 8.3.6. The Council also expressed that there was a clear need for a plan to deal with defaulting parties, with the attendant financial and other risks clearly built in.
- 8.3.7. The Council discussed the timescales of pursuing this work and noted that external work would need to follow an appropriate procurement timetable, but the programme should be pursued at pace. An appropriate communications strategy should accompany the work, and this should include some explanation around the timelines, the fact that the organisation was managing risk to itself and to other registrants who would not participate or default. One element of this work could include a blog from the Chair on the updated position.
- 8.4. The Council **approved** the proposals in principle and the release of funds to enable a full feasibility analysis to be undertaken. The matter should come back to the Council for an update in Q2 of 2020.

Action: The Interim Head of Communications and Engagement to work up a communications strategy around this work and liaise with the Chair of Council around a blog piece on the topic.

Action: The Executive Director, Strategy to bring a paper to the Council in June 2020 with an updated position on the workstream.

The Head of GDC Policy and Research Programme left the meeting.

9. Regulations: Registration Application Fees

The Head of Projects, Programmes and Portfolio Delivery and Head of In-House Legal Advisory Service joined the meeting.

- 9.1. The Head of Projects, Programmes and Portfolio Delivery and Head of In-House Legal Advisory Service presented the paper which sought approval for the final registration application fee levels, in line with the fees model approved by the Council in its October meeting. These fees were proposed to cover the costs associated with first registration applications, which were currently being met by existing registrants. The Council was also asked to make, and seal, amended fees regulations to bring these changes into effect. If approved, the registration application fees would be chargeable from 2 January 2020.
- 9.2. There had been minor amendments made to the draft regulations circulated to Council members via their papers; including some minor typographical errors, adding the definition of a retention fee to both sets of regulations and the clarification in Regulation 9 of the DCP

regulations that the fee of £9.67 was due for each month or part thereof, rather than being a stand alone fee.

- 9.3. The Council discussed the impact of the fees on the different registrant groups, in particular those applying for multiple titles at different times, and also emphasised the importance of a clear communications strategy around this work. The Council heard that the GDC would offer a reduced processing time and paper application option for any potential applicants impacted by the very small window wherein the online application option would be closed whilst technical updates were made to the system to facilitate this new approach to fees collection.
- 9.4. The fees levels would be as set out below:

Band descriptor (percentages are the proportion of applications from this band in 2018)	Processing fee	Assessment fee	Total fee
Registration as a UK-qualified dentist, dental care professionals (DCP) or additional DCP title(s) (65%)	£22.95	-	£22.95
Registration as a dentist with an EEA qualification, has passed the Overseas Registration Exam (ORE), or a recognised overseas qualification (9%)	£22.95	£65.65	£88.60
Registration (requiring individual assessment) as a DCP with a European Economic Area (EEA) qualification, or an overseas qualification (4%)	£22.95	£506.25	£529.20
Registration as a dentist with a qualification requiring an individual assessment (2%)	£22.95	£662.40	£685.35
Registration (requiring individual assessment) of additional DCP title(s) with an EEA qualification, or an overseas qualification (1%)	£22.95	£453.40	£476.35
Registration as a temporary dentist (<1%)	£22.95	£79.30	£102.25

- 9.5. The Council **approved** the specified fee levels (at page 6 of the cover paper and in the table above) and, accordingly, **made and sealed the fees regulations** (which will replace those made by Council in October 2019). These regulations should be cited as below and will come into force on 1 January 2020:

- 9.5.1. The General Dental Council (Dentists) (Fees) (No.2) Regulations 2019; and
- 9.5.2. The General Dental Council (Professions Complementary to Dentistry) (Fees)(No.2) Regulations 2019.

The Head of Projects, Programmes and Portfolio Delivery and Head of In-House Legal Advisory Service left the meeting.

10. Council Member Accommodation

The Head of Finance and Procurement joined the meeting.

- 10.1. The Head of Finance and Procurement presented the paper which set out a review of Council Member expenses and accommodation and a proposal that the GDC purchase a corporate membership to the Royal Society of Medicine (RSM) for 11-20 members for 2020.

The paper had been subject to scrutiny by the Remuneration Committee (Remco), who had recommended the proposal to the Council.

10.2. The Council **discussed** the following:

- 10.2.1. The Council were broadly supportive of the proposals, and the proposal that the usage of the membership be monitored and reviewed by the Remco before coming back to Council for approval in advance of any proposed extension of the membership in 2020 for 2021.
- 10.2.2. The Council discussed the impact of attending Council meetings remotely and noted the importance of a physical presence in the room for Members themselves. The Council noted that the headquarters of Council were London and the bulk of the Council meetings would be required to take place there.
- 10.2.3. The composition of Council was due to change in the coming year, and the needs of those new members might differ to the current composition (although recruits from Northern Ireland and Wales would form part of this recruitment exercise). The need to keep the membership under review was emphasized.
- 10.2.4. The Council noted that this was an organisational membership, as opposed to a Council membership, and there were a range of ancillary activities that would benefit from this arrangement. The Chief Executive had chaired several recent meetings of the Quality Assurance Group in the meeting space at the RSM and having a free or reduced price space to hold stakeholder events or semi-formal functions, which the organisation currently had to source from the market, would be greatly useful and would save significant administrative time.
- 10.2.5. The Council were informed that the ongoing work by the Finance team to review accommodation options in Birmingham and other cities.
- 10.2.6. The Council noted that, if the proposals were approved, the Governance team would provide a list of the current dates of meetings in 2020 and, if advised promptly after this list was provided, would (by exception) book accommodation for London Council meetings. If Council members required changes to this accommodation on later dates, this would be undertaken by those members. For non-London meetings, Council members would continue to book their own accommodation within the expenses policy.

10.3. The Council **approved** the purchase of a corporate membership of the RSM (for 11-20 members) for 2020 and **requested** that a review of this membership be placed on the workplans for Council and Remco for 2020, in advance of any renewal date.

Action: Head of Finance and Procurement to procure the approved membership.

Action: Interim Head of Governance to provide Council members with a current list of meeting dates, locations, and confirmation against which dates the RSM membership would apply.

Action: Interim Head of Governance to place a review of the corporate membership of the RSM on the annual workplan of the Remco (September) and the Council (October).

The Head of Finance and Procurement left the meeting.

11. Moving Upstream 2020

- 11.1. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper in relation to the proposed publication of the Moving Upstream document. The Council had undertaken a workshop session the previous day, wherein there was discussion around the annual publications of the organisation and the strategy attached to them. The Council was asked to consider whether the publication of a look-back report on 2019, in the form of Moving Upstream, was still within

its appetite and whether it was envisaged that there would be a change of approach in the next iteration of this publication, if it were still needed.

11.2. The Council **discussed** the following:

11.2.1. Given the changes in the landscape of the organisation, now that a three-year Corporate Strategy and Costed Corporate Plan (CCP) had been published, it was likely that the future iterations of this report would be reporting against the progress achieved on the activities contained within the CCP.

11.2.2. The Council noted that there was merit in bringing the work done around Shifting the Balance to a close and using the Moving Upstream publication as a stepping-stone to future strategic approach of the organisation.

11.2.3. There was still appetite for the publication of a document in early 2020, accompanied by a later event in support of it, as this had been well received in 2019. However, this was likely to be the last iteration of Moving Upstream as a publication. Thought should be given to future titles of a publication reporting performance against the CCP.

11.2.4. The Council noted the benefit of including some content that spoke to the themes captured in the workshop from the preceding day, namely, the more existential themes or scene-setting messages about the organisation as a whole, and that thought should be given to making this content easily digestible to its varied audiences.

11.3. The Council **noted** broad support for having a publication, underpinning a later event, that was structured so that publication could move into a digital space without much difficulty.

Action: The Executive Director, Strategy to bring a paper and final draft of the Moving Upstream report to Council in January 2020, seeking approval for publication.

12. Organisational Performance – Q3

The Head of Finance and Procurement and the Head of Performance Reporting and PMO joined the meeting.

Part A: Finance Review and Forecast

12.1. The Head of Finance and Procurement presented the paper outlining the financial review and results of an updated financial forecast from September 2019.

12.2. The Council heard that, at the end of September 2019, the GDC's operating surplus was £3.5m higher than budgeted at £20.1m. Income was £0.7m higher than budgeted due to a mix of unbudgeted income received from investments, from additional registrants renewing their registration in December 2018 than had been forecast and some additional income from DCPs, due to a timing difference in budgeting. Expenditure was £2.7m lower than budgeted and the key drivers for the underspend against budget were outlined.

12.3. Based on the Q3 out-turn, a detailed review of income and expenditure for the remainder of 2019 indicated that the budgeted operating surplus of £4.4m could increase to a forecast surplus of £7.8m by the end of the financial year. This was due to: an additional £0.5m investment income that had not been included in the 2019 budget, due to the timing of the decision to invest, vacant staff posts (£1.3m underspend) and staff being recruited under market rate (£0.6m underspend) and lost and wasted days in hearings. These were expected to run through to impact on Q1 of 2020.

12.4. The Chair of FPC noted that the FPC had scrutinised the material before Council and were satisfied with it and able to recommend it to the Council.

12.5. The Council **noted** the update.

Part B: Balanced Scorecard

- 12.6. The Head of Performance Reporting and PMO presented the paper on the performance of the organisation in Q3 of 2019. The Council heard that UK DCP active processing time had remained green throughout the period, despite receiving 70% more applications than in Q2. There had been further reductions in the Rule 4 casework at the Case Examiner stage and no major ICO impacts had required reporting to the ICO. There had been two data security incidents in Q3; one relating to data being disclosed to an incorrect recipient and one relating to data integrity being compromised.
- 12.7. Certain performance indicators (on Slide 10 of the appendix) had been removed on 5 November 2019 and new Information Governance performance indicators had been added. EMT Actions had been amended and updated.
- 12.8. The Chair of FPC noted that Balanced Scorecard had been considered and scrutinised by the FPC and the Committee was satisfied with this examination and the proposed next steps. FtP timeliness was scrutinised in depth and an action plan was being devised by the Executive Director, FtP Transition, to improve performance in this area. This was going to be considered by the SLT and then the FPC in February. The Chief Executive noted that the financial report on the underspend clearly interlinked with the impacts of the timeliness issues. Money was not being spent to plan because work was not happening to plan – and impacting on activity in the later, more expensive elements of the FtP process. Positive steps had been taken to improve timeliness in the earlier stages of the process, but these had been disrupted by changes related, directly and indirectly, to the move to Birmingham. He noted that the individual productivity of the new team was impressive, and adjustments were being made where assumptions around experience of the previous team had not been borne out with a newer workforce. Improvements in this area were an EMT priority action.
- 12.9. The Council heard that there had been a sustained upturn in the number of incoming cases that was also skewing performance and that the FPC were seeking assurance, via the action plan, that existing ways of working were being recalibrated to take account of learnings. If the upturn was sustained, the Council would be sighted on it, not least because resource requests would likely need to be made. The FtP timeliness action plan would come back to Council in March 2020.

Action: Executive Director, FtP Transition to bring paper to Council in March 2020, following SLT and FPC, on the action plan around FtP timeliness.

- 12.10. The Council discussed the possibility of outsourcing some FtP work where appropriate and noted that, whilst it might be feasible for small discrete areas of work, the strong view of the Chief Executive was that this was unlikely to present a long-term solution to the issues that consistently arose in this area. The team were working to retain access to those staff members who held the deepest expertise, in order to provide continued support for the newer team members.
- 12.11. The Council heard that stakeholder engagement in this area was good and that anecdotal evidence of the experience of defence providers was positive, running contrary to the statistical performance of the organisation in this area.
- 12.12. The Council discussed staff turnover in FtP and heard that part of this turnover was expected and other parts of it related to staff members taking on promotion opportunities or leaving the organisation within their probation.
- 12.13. The Council also discussed the engagement performance on the Scorecard, particularly in relation to DCPs, and noted the value in engaging proactively with this audience.
- 12.14. The Council requested further information on the categorisation of 'other' within the Information Governance performance indicators.

Action: Executive Director, Legal & Governance to provide Council members further information on the 'other' categorisation on the Information Governance performance information by correspondence.

- 12.15. The Council **noted** the update.

The Head of Finance and Procurement and Head of Performance Reporting and PMO left the meeting.

13. Dental Complaints Service – Performance Report Q3

- 13.1. The Executive Director, FtP Transition presented the paper providing an update on the performance of the Dental Complaints Service for Q3 of 2019. The updates requested by the Council in its October meeting had been actioned and were awaiting IT implementation. The updated presentation of the information would be available in Q1 of 2020.
- 13.2. The Council **discussed** the following:
 - 13.2.1. The work being conducted on alternative dispute models and social return on investment was interesting and a useful opportunity to pilot a process that might inform wider work across the organisation.
 - 13.2.2. There was appetite for some organisational follow up to those complaints passed to the NHS in relation to fitness to practise referrals, but the Council recognised that this would not be possible or appropriate in relation to DCS signposting to other complaints handlers.
 - 13.2.3. The Council requested information as to whether there was any geographical significance in the time taken for complaints to be resolved.
- 13.3. The Council **noted** the update.

Action: The next iteration of the DCS quarterly performance report should contain an update as to whether there was any geographical significance attached to time taken to resolve complaints.

14. Items for Approval

a. Appointment and Reappointment of Council Members – Process

- 14.1. The Executive Director, Legal and Governance presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The Council heard that the Remco had discussed and suggested amendments to the proposed process which had been incorporated. The Council noted the importance of advertising the new roles to a wide registrant base.
- 14.2. The Council **approved** the proposed process.

b. Process for Annual Appraisals of Chair of Council, Council Member and the Chief Executive.

- 14.3. The Executive Director, Organisational Development presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The process had been scrutinised at the Remco and the suggestions of the Committee had been incorporated into this iteration.
- 14.4. The Council **discussed** the following:
 - 14.4.1. The Chair raised concerns about the proposed approach to external input in relation to the assessment of the performance of the Chair of Council. The Chair welcomed constructive comment from the Professional Standards Authority, the Privy Council via the four Departments of Health, or the four Chief Dental Officers, and stressed the need to be clear about the questions to be asked, in order to gain maximum value from this exercise. This feedback should be sought by the Senior Independent Council Member, as opposed to the Communications team. These concerns were echoed in relation to the proposed approach to external input on the performance of the Chief Executive.

- 14.4.2. Members of the Remco noted that there was an appetite to obtain appropriate external feedback but noted concerns about from whom, and how, it was obtained.
- 14.4.3. The Council discussed that it was sensible that the proposed draft objectives for the Chair and the Chief Executive remain in draft until they had been discussed at their respective appraisal meetings, at which point they could be re-presented to Council for final approval.
- 14.4.4. The Council discussed the value of peer feedback and noted that it was only useful within the appraisal process when Members were able to provide clear, honest and robust feedback and the Council agreed that, with that in mind, peer feedback should remain within this iteration of the process with the questions to be addressed provided by the Executive Director, Organisational Development.
- 14.5. Subject to the above amendments, the Council **approved** the proposed process and encouraged the Executive Director, Organisational Development to look afresh at the process for next year.

Action: Finalised objectives for the Chair and Chief Executive to be re-presented to the Council following the appraisal meetings (either via correspondence or at the March meeting).

Action: Chair of Council to feed back to the Chair of the Remco the discussions from Council on the concerns about the external feedback portion of the appraisal process recommended by the Committee.

Action: Executive Director, Organisational Development to formulate questions to be addressed in the peer review process and circulate to Council members.

c. Review of Education – For Publication

- 14.6. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The Council received a regular report, every two years, the format of which had been endorsed by the Policy and Research Board. All material relating to individual institutions contained within the report was already in the public domain and had been shared and agreed with the relevant institution. The Council discussed the potential impact of publication of less than positive feedback about certain institutions on public confidence in those institutions but noted the importance of transparent reporting on the Quality Assurance function carried out by the organisation for public safety, in line with its key purpose. The Council also noted that the report now felt somewhat out of date and asked that the planning for the next iteration of the report be expedited.
- 14.7. The Council also noted that the FPC had requested that the in-depth review into Education Quality Assurance be set aside. In its place the the February meeting of the Committee would receive a wider deep dive on Education, and the outcomes of this would be presented to Council in March 2020.
- 14.8. The Council requested that, within the publication, some context be provided about the applicable requirements for each institution to set the scene for the report.
- 14.9. Subject to those amendments, the Council **approved** the document for publication.

d. Consultation on the Specialist Lists – Response for Publication

- 14.10. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The organisation had consulted on the specialist lists from January to April 2019 and received a wide range of responses around what should, in the longer term, be the meaning of a specialty listing and how could the GDC ensure that the significance of a specialism remained current through a registrant's lifecycle on the register. The Council discussed the item and **approved** the summary report of consultation responses for publication.

e. Revision Process for Speciality Curricula

- 14.11. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The specialty curricula were due for review and the team had been working jointly with the JCPD to develop an appropriate approach to this. The Council were asked to approve the process for review of the curricula to enable the organisation to provide the assurance that the appropriate standards were being met throughout the process. The Council discussed the proposed timelines and noted the importance of landing the work in time for the new academic cycle for 2021-2022. The Council asked that it be made clear that this process was not intended to close off any mediated entry routes and that the headings of the annexed document have the question marks removed.
- 14.12. The Council asked that an update be provided on the work in Q3 of 2020.
- 14.13. Subject to the amendments outlined above, the Council **approved** the proposed process.

Action: Executive Director, Strategy to bring an update paper back to Council in October 2020.

f. Patient and Public Survey Results and Action Plan – For Publication

- 14.14. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper and invited any comments or questions. The latest Patient and Public Survey was the result of a joint design with the GDC and Ipsos Mori and the Council were asked to approve the report from them for publication. The Council discussed the actions that might follow on from this publication and asked the team to bring back an action plan to tackle the themes that arose from it.
- 14.15. The Council **approved** the documents for publication.

Action: The Executive Director, Strategy to bring back an action plan around tackling the themes that had arisen from the patient and public survey to Council in Q1 of 2020.

g. Quality Assurance Decisions

- 14.16. The Executive Director, Strategy presented the paper and invited any comments or questions on the publication of the Education Quality Assurance activity and sought approval of the proposed reporting process annually to the Council and to the Privy Council. The Council discussed the report and requested clarification as to whether any providers were missing from it (potentially Leeds, Nottingham and Lambeth).
- 14.17. The Council **approved** the proposed reporting process to Council and the Privy Council and **noted** the report on the publication of the Education Quality Assurance activity.

Action: The Executive Director, Strategy to confirm whether any providers were missing from the report and report back to Council via circulation.

h. Review of Financial Policies and Procedures

- 14.18. The Council heard that each of the financial policies that were tabled at Council had been scrutinised by the FPC and were recommended to Council by the Committee. The Council **approved** the proposed revisions to the staff expenses policy and other financial policies.

i. 2020 Reserves Policy

- 14.19. The Council heard that each of the financial policies that were tabled at Council had been scrutinised by the FPC and were recommended to Council by the Committee. The Council **approved** the updated policy.

j. Investment principles and strategy review

- 14.20. The Council heard that each of the financial policies that were tabled at Council had been scrutinised by the FPC and were recommended to Council by the Committee. The Council **approved** the investment principles and investment strategy.

k. Anti-fraud and anti-bribery policy

- 14.21. The Council heard that each of the financial policies that were tabled at Council had been scrutinised by the FPC and were recommended to Council by the Committee. The Council **approved** the updated policy.

15. Items for Noting

a. Estates Strategy Programme Update

- 15.1. The Council **noted** the update and noted that the close out report on the Estates programme was due to be discussed at the FPC in early 2020.

b. Joint Whistleblowing Report

- 15.2. The Council **noted** the report.

c. Horizon Scanning and Stakeholder Engagement Reports

- 15.3. The Council **noted** the reports and that a further update on remote orthodontics would be provided at Council in January 2020.

16. Update Reports from the Council's Committees

- 16.1. The Chair of Council provided an oral update on the work of the Chair's Strategy Group (CSG) since the last Council meeting. The CSG had discussed and recommended to Council the work in relation to the separation of the Adjudications function and the work on paying the annual retention fee by instalments. The CSG also heard an early exploratory paper on the presentational approach of the GDC and the Group expressed that it would like to see research to inform its understanding of the expectations of patients of the regulator. An update on this work would be brought back to the Group in Q2 of 2020.

PART FOUR - CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS

17. Any other Business

- 17.1. The Council **noted** that a workshop with Deloitte was scheduled for the Council in January in relation to the Board Development programme and this would focus on the role of the Council, its Committees and the Accounting Officer. This would be accompanied by proposals to implement the Board Development programme, arising out of the Deloitte report.

Action: The Executive Director, Legal and Governance to circulate the draft Board Development programme proposals to the Council.

18. Review of the meeting

- 18.1. The Council noted that there had been a significant amount of papers for this meeting and some of the timings had been ambitious. The level of challenge was improved, and the Council were pleased with the balance of business in the public session.

19. Close of the meeting

19.1. There being no further business, the meeting ended at 12:30pm.

Date of next meeting: 15-16 January 2020

Name of Chair: William Moyes