Approved Public Board meeting minutes
19 November 2025

Present	**In Attendance**
Caroline Corby (CC - Chair)	Jane Carey (JC)
Alan Clamp (AC - Chief Executive)	Amanda Partington-Todd (APT)
Candace Imison (CI)	Melanie Venables (MV)
Juliet Oliver (JO)	Douglas Bilton (DB)
Nick Simkins (NS)	Dinah Godfree
Ali Jarvis (AJ)	Daisy Blench
Geraldine Campbell (GC)	Osama Ammar
Eleanor Marks (EM)	Marija Hume
Ruth Ajayi (RA)	Oyinkan Onile-Ere
	Salma Rahman
	Dan Scott
	Rachael Culverhouse-Wilson
	Akua Dwomoh-Bonsu
	Suzanne Dodds
	Ryan Davidson
	Patrick Murphy
	Lewis Stubbs
	Melanie Hueser (Secretariat)
	Observers
	See below

1. Welcome and Declarations of Interest

1.1. The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the Board meeting. Observers included members of staff and external observers: Anisah Chowdhury (GMC), Aveen Croash (HCPC), Silvia Dominici (NMC) and Carol Haynes (NMC).

2. Apologies

2.1. There were no apologies.

3. Minutes of meeting held on 18 September 2025

3.1. The minutes of the last Board meeting held on 18 September 2025 were accepted as a true and correct record and approved.

4. Actions and matters arising from the meeting on 18 September 2025

4.1. All actions were complete, on the agenda or on track.

5. Chair's report

5.1. The Chair introduced the item, reporting on a meeting with Helen Phillips, the new GDC Chair, and Tom Whiting, CEO. The meeting was productive. There was a focus on the GDC's agenda to reduce fear among registrants about regulation. The Chair found this approach interesting and aligned with the Board's own agenda to refocus regulation towards advice and guidance rather than needing sanctions.

5.2. The Chair convened a biannual meeting of all statutory regulators' chairs, held online for the first time. Feedback on the online format was sought, with plans to alternate between online and in-person meetings. The session was considered useful. There is a growing interest among chairs in discussing AI, specifically what questions Boards should be asking and how to ensure the right people are involved.

5.3. The Chair praised the recent research conference as a triumph, noting high turnout, excellent venue, and strong feedback. The event was seen as valuable by attendees, and the Chair commended the team for their efforts.

5.4. A point was raised about missing sections in the July minutes, which had been included in the Chairs report and was retrospectively approved. An additional check will be implemented to ensure accuracy in future minutes.
Action: MH to update July minutes with the missing actions and CC to sign updated minutes.

5.5. The Chair mentioned a discussion about the appraisal cycle, with some issues to be followed up and feedback to be provided at the next meeting.

5.6. A question was raised about when feedback would be received from the GMC regarding issues reported in the Sunday Times. The Chair indicated this would be covered in the private session as it relates to the unpublished performance review.

6. Executive report and project dashboard

6.1. The Chief Executive introduced the item, providing an update on key priorities, including the Standards review, Regulatory reform, Strategic plan, Business plan, Fees consultation, and the NMC Independent Oversight Group.

6.2. Engagement activities for the Standards review were ongoing in October and November, with a Board meeting scheduled in late February to present final draft standards for approval.

6.3. A detailed discussion on Regulatory reform was planned for the private agenda.

6.4. The Fees consultation was ending soon, with proposals to be submitted to the Privy Council by mid-December. Written feedback from regulators was expected, but no significant issues had been identified so far. Any changes would likely be minor and may not affect the budget.

6.5. The NMC Independent Oversight group met in early November, with the next meeting scheduled for January. A summary was included in the papers.

6.6. The Board asked about the maturity model used to monitor the NMC Culture Transformation Plan. It was explained that it was a standard tool with levels to track progress, and the use of a standard model was seen as advantageous.

6.7. Positive feedback had been received on Right Touch Regulation from conferences, social media, and academic articles. DB was commended for coordinating the effort, and the communications plan for next phases was referenced.
Action: DB to develop a publication on how the PSA uses Right Touch Regulation.

6.8. The Appointments seminar had been very successful, and the team was commended for the effort.

6.9. An increase in cases progressing to initial review at DCR stage was reported, mainly because fewer cases met criteria for administrative closure. The volume of cases reaching further stages remained stable, indicating appropriate filtering. Improvements from the Section 29 pilot included faster, more agile decision-making and better resource use. A session with the Scrutiny Committee was planned for December to discuss benefits and proposals for permanent changes.

6.10. Accredited Registers Programme performance against KPIs was maintained or improved, with no new accreditation decisions. Consideration was being given to using unrestricted reserves to develop a single search tool, with a separate paper to be discussed later.

6.11. Positive feedback from Standards Review workshops, with regulators and Accredited Registers feeling informed and engaged. The timeline for Board approval of final standards was delayed to February to allow for the NMC lessons learned exercise.

6.12. Momentum and urgency around AI among regulators was noted, with plans for a joint paper and engagement with MHRA leads. Work was underway to develop a data and intelligence strategy to better identify and act on concerns, including risk of harm. Areas of concern relating to under-regulation included non-surgical cosmetics, audiology, and sonography, with evidence to be presented to relevant commissions.
Action: MV to share slides from Dr Helen Smith and enquire whether she would give a presentation to the Board.

6.13. There was a query regarding a post-implementation review of the website, which was planned for 12 months after launch, with accessibility testing to be included. It was explained that web stats were being monitored, but direct comparisons were difficult due to changes in site structure.
Action: OOE and MV to bring a post-implementation website report to the Board meeting in March 2026.

7. Finance report

7.1. The Director of Corporate Services introduced the item. The Finance report was noted as straightforward, with no significant issues or concerns raised.

7.2. The Board indicated general satisfaction with the financial position as presented.

8. Committee updates

8.1. **Audit and Risk Committee:** The Board **noted** the report.

8.2. **Reserves policy:** The Board was asked to approve the Reserves policy. There were no objections or concerns raised, and the Board **approved** the policy.

9. Draft 2026-29 Communications and Engagement Strategy

9.1. The Director of Policy and Communications introduced the strategy, emphasising its role in supporting the 2026-29 strategic plan through communications and engagement work. The strategy aims to expand awareness, impact, and influence, with a focus on prevention and amplifying oversight functions.

9.2. The strategy is anchored in using oversight functions more effectively, especially with upcoming changes like new standards and their implementation.

9.3. The strategy is structured around the three main strategic aims:
- Oversight and Standards: Embedding new standards, raising awareness (especially with parliamentarians), and leveraging Right Touch Regulation.
- Enhancing Oversight: Convening, promoting good practice, and focusing on thought leadership areas (e.g., AI, non-surgical cosmetics).
- Enablers and Barriers: Launching a framework to identify over/under-regulation, articulating areas of concern, and setting out processes for decision-making.

9.4. The strategy will be underpinned by detailed plans for each area.

9.5. The Board raised concerns about resource pinch points and suggested a Gantt chart to identify when demands might peak. They also asked how success would be measured, emphasising the need for stakeholder perception metrics.

9.6. The Board questioned the cost implications, asking for clarity on current and future team size and budget, and requested that future business plans specify resource needs.

9.7. The importance of integrating communications across all teams was emphasised and aligning the strategy with statutory and discretionary priorities.

9.8. The need for prioritisation and flexibility to respond to emerging issues was emphasised.

9.9. The need to address Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) was highlighted and the team was asked to consider engagement with social care regulators.

9.10. The Board agreed that developing concrete partnerships would be useful, such as with patient safety commissioners, to share resources and demonstrate new ways of working.

9.11. The Board commended the patient focus in the strategy but asked how the team would prioritise which patient, carer, or public groups to engage, given limited resources.

9.12. It was clarified that prioritisation would be based on understanding which groups are most affected by different regulators and planning accordingly, with PR colleagues and assessment teams involved.

9.13. The need for more explicit communications work on non-surgical cosmetic interventions was acknowledged, confirming that it is a significant part of current comms work, including targeted social media campaigns.

9.14. The Board **approved** the strategy in terms of direction of travel, with the understanding that no additional resources were being committed at this stage. Any future resource requests would be brought as business cases during business planning.

10. Accredited Registers Programme reserves

10.1. The Head of Accreditation presented a proposal to use unrestricted reserves from the Accredited Registers Programme to invest in developing a single search tool for the public. The Board was asked to approve a £20,000 allocation for this purpose.

10.2. The proposal was described as clear and strong.

10.3. The Board queried whether the scoping exercise for the search tool could consider incorporating disclosure/barring/safeguarding information, even if only by including relevant links, and it was confirmed that the design would keep options open for future growth and adaptation.

10.4. The Board **approved** the £20,000 investment from AR reserves for the scoping, with no objections raised.

10.5. The Board agreed to revisit the reserves policy and investment proposal as needed, with the understanding that the platform should be adaptable for future enhancements.

11. PSA communications on hate crime, hate speech and discrimination

11.1. The Director of Policy and Communications introduced the item, explaining that the PSA published a statement on hate speech, hate crime, and discrimination at the end of September, prompted by current geopolitical events and polarised views. The statement aimed to clarify expectations for regulators and Accredited Registers, especially regarding the distinction between free speech and hate speech, and the professional responsibilities of registrants.

11.2. The statement also reminded regulators to consider the context in which professionals work and to support registrants and staff affected by these issues. The PSA's EDI working group provides an ongoing forum for related concerns.

11.3. The Board asked whether the issue had been discussed with the chairs of other regulators and what actions they were taking. It was explained that while it had come up in previous meetings (e.g., regarding the Meade case about gender-critical beliefs at Social Work England), it was not discussed at the most recent chairs' meeting.

11.4. The Board emphasised the importance of regulators providing clear guidance to their communities about boundaries and acceptable behaviour and ensuring transparency and consistency.

11.5. The Board supported the PSA's leadership on the issue but cautioned against the weaponisation of regulation, referencing the police experience with non-crime hate incidents and the need for clarity about the PSA's role. The importance of balance, transparency, and not overstepping legal boundaries was emphasised.

11.6. The statement had been well received by regulators, who are aware of the challenges and the need to communicate clear messages to registrants. The responses from regulators were thoughtful, but thresholds for action remain a grey area.

11.7. The statement had also been sent to the Accredited Registers, who provided positive feedback but raised questions about legal definitions and cross-border complexities, especially for organisations operating across the four nations.

12. Board effectiveness review

12.1. The Director of Corporate Services introduced the board effectiveness review proposal, explaining it is conducted every three years by an external provider, typically an internal audit firm. The process involves inviting bids, with the aim to start work immediately after Christmas and deliver a final report to the Board in March. The previous review was positive, but the same consultants cannot be used as they are no longer on the supplier framework.

12.2. The review will observe Committee and Board meetings early next year as part of its assessment.
Action: JC to involve interested Board members in the Board effectiveness review process.

12.3. The Board raised a point about clarifying the scope of 'Board engagement', suggesting it should specify whether it refers to engagement with internal stakeholders, external stakeholders, or among Board members. It was agreed to be all three.

12.4. The Board agreed that the scope should be clarified before bids are being invited.

12.5. No objections or concerns were raised about the process or timing, and the Board **noted** the plan for the review.

13. Board workplan 2025/26

13.1. The Director of Corporate Services introduced the item.

13.2. There was discussion about the pattern of holding meetings outside London, referencing the previous meeting in Sheffield as an example of a non-London, England-based meeting.

13.3. The possibility of holding a meeting in Manchester was raised, with the GMC offering to host and provide opportunities to observe doctor tribunals. Manchester was described as an interesting health community.

13.4. It was noted that the Welsh government expressed concerns about holding the Board meeting there in July due to uncertainty around the shape of the government and the possibility of being in recess, suggesting September as a better alternative. The Board agreed to revisit the schedule and determine the best timing and location for future meetings, emphasizing the need to get dates in diaries.
Action: AC and CC to review timing of the Board meeting planned for Wales.

13.5. The Board **noted** the workplan.

14. Any other business

14.1. There was no other business discussed.

15. Questions from Members of the Public

15.1. There were no questions.

15.2. The Chair thanked the observers for their interest in the PSA.

Signed by Chair   **Date 14 January 2026**

professional
standards
authority
for Health and Social Care

Action Log
On track (including not started) Delayed (or medium risk of delay for projects) Overdue (or high risk of delay for projects) Complete

Mtg. Date	Item No.	Action point	Owner	Date required	Action progress	Status
19 March 2025	5.2	Invite all Board members to attend the next Staff day.	MH	March 2026		
18 September 2025	7.3	Meet with the Finance team to discuss Section 29 forecasting and decide whether a Board discussion on the issue should be scheduled for the meeting in January 2026.	NS	January 2026		
19 November 2025	5.4	Update July minutes with the missing actions and CC to sign updated minutes.	MH		Complete	
19 November 2025	6.7	Develop a publication on how the PSA uses Right Touch Regulation.	DB	March 2026		
19 November 2025	6.12	Share slides from Dr Helen Smith and enquire whether she would give a presentation to the Board.	MV	November 2025	In progress. Slides circulated and presentation being arranged.	
19 November 2025	6.14	Bring a post-implementation website report to the Board meeting in March 2026.	OOE/MV	March 2026	On track.	
19 November 2025	12.2	Involve interested Board members in the Board effectiveness review process.	JC	November 2025	Complete	

| 19 November 2025 | 13.4 | Review timing of the Board meeting planned for Wales. | AC/CC | Complete - This will be in September or November 2026. | |