**(PRRC/Min/20/15)**

**Minutes of the 15th Policy, Registration and Regulation Committee**

**Monday 15th June 2020, Albany House, Great Victoria Street, Belfast**

**Present:** Brendan Morgan,Lisa Magennis, Julian Morgan, Mary Lou Winchborne, Gordon White, Siobhan McElhinney, Dr Martin Hagan, Maria Mullally, (Raymond Beggs – Observer)

**Apologies**: Maria Thommason

**In Attendance:** Sam Gallaher (CEO), Gerry Devlin (SEO), Alison Chambers (DE), Lesley Dickson (PA).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **Welcome, Introduction and Apologies**   Members were welcomed to the meeting.  No apologies had been received.     1. **Declarations of Interest**   There were no declarations of interest.  The CEO informed members that Raymond Beggs would be joining the Committee for the meeting as an observer.   1. **Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair**   The CEO asked members for nominations for the post of Chair and BM indicated that he had just received a message from JM to say she had difficulty in joining the meeting. AB advised there could be a technical problem. It was decided to defer this item to later in the meeting when JM was able to join.   1. **Minutes of 12 September 2019 and 6 February 2020**   The CEO asked members if they were content with the minutes of the 12 September 2019.  Proposed: GW  Seconder: MLW  The CEO presented the draft minutes of 6 February to members for amendment and adoption.  BM highlighted Matters Arising and said he had made the point that legislation will be reviewed. The CEO said he was looking at the legislation pertaining to regulation and not looking at the whole legislation. BM highlighted the unsound ground relating to sub teachers who pay the full fee but do not have the full services of GTC and said this should be looked at. The CEO added that there needed to be a strategic review of income and this provided the opportunity to look at structural issues. It is a matter for the Council at some stage to go to the Department to get them to look at this.  MLW indicated on page 3 the section on shadow members and explained the context. At Section 7 MLW advised she had gone back to the SEO with amendment regarding past members entitlement and involvement on the Leadership Competences Advisory Group.  The SEO updated members that the work of the Advisory Group had come to a halt and the final meeting was on 28 February. New members attended this meeting and one past Council member, Carmel McCartan, attended as she had been closely involved in the competences and the handover was now complete. Work, if required, will now be taken forward by new members.  The SEO explained the advisory role of previous members. BM stated that the caveat should state that previous members could continue on in an advisory role. MLW added that she was unsure if the Council had the authority to state this and some level of analysis would need to be undertaken. She said it would be worth putting down how these things work and the paragraph needs to reflect clarity. She also advised that a thank you letter should go out to members. The SEO said a letter had already been sent out.  The SEO suggested a redraft of the sentence and MLW advised that she had already sent an amendment on to him. MLW read out the paragraph and members concurred. BM indicated that previous members should be written to thanking them for their work.  Proposed: BM  Seconded: MLW  **3. Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair of Committee (deferred from earlier in the meeting)**  The CEO asked for nominations and MLW nominated GW for the post of Chair. This was seconded by MH.  GW advised he would be happy to continue in the post of Chair of PRRC. BM raised that there could be a conflict of interest as GW was a friend of the CEO. MLW questioned how this would be a conflict. GW advised he had always declared that interest. BM advised that GW had disclosed this at the CEO interview and GW advised that he did not know that SG had applied for the post and GW had stopped the procedure and put his interest on record as he wanted to follow procedures. BM indicated that GW had felt at that point there was a conflict but when the Council had a vote in June GW did not declare a conflict. The CEO said he had raised the matter at the recruitment stage and the people on the panel did not think there was an issue and GW has always acted professionally. MLW highlighted her concerns about getting into an irrelevant debate and that GW declared a conflict of interest in June.  The CEO put the nomination to the Committee and SMcE asked if anyone else wanted to take the role to avoid controversy and said that maybe some of the new people would want to be upskilled. LM proposed JM for Chair and this was seconded by BM. The CEO said there were now two proposals for Chair and asked members if they wanted to vote or defer. LM said this should not be deferred again and that a vote should be taken.  SMcE said she would propose that GW be Vice Chair but GW said he did not want to be Vice Chair. MLW said that the Vice Chair could come in and be supported by the Chair and then move up afterwards. The CEO advised that the tenure of the position is two years. BM indicated that he was sure that GW would be willing to help out and GW agreed.  A vote was taken:  Chair – GW – 3 votes  Chair – JM – 4 votes  JM was elected as Chair.  The CEO asked for nominations for Vice Chair.  JM nominated LM for Vice Chair and SMcE asked GW to assist in an advisory role.  It was agreed that LM should be Vice Chair.   1. **Matters Arising**   The CEO discussed the paper from the ARA Committee and advised that a matter had been raised by PO’D. Two resolutions had been discussed and proposed and accepted by the Committee. The CEO had been asked to bring these to the other Committees.  GW highlighted the letter he had written to members of PRRC which had been blocked by the Chair of GTC. He said he felt the contents of the letter was relevant. BM advised he would give the background to this and asked who had drafted this paper. The CEO queried how he had a conflict of interest. BM said that the CEO drafted the paper and he believed there was a conflict of interest. The paper is presented to members for information only. He said GW made the claim that BM had blocked his letter. BM advised that we cannot have a situation where people can use the secretariat to communicate anything like that. We cannot have a situation where people can write potentially libellous matters to be sent out. The Chair and Vice Chair of Council have looked at how these should be treated. The first one was a letter PO’D had wanted circulated but would not share his own email address. The Chair is the main conduit to members. He highlighted that he had asked LD to circulate emails to members who were content to share their email contact details. The CEO advised that he was only acting on a request from ARAC to draw this to the attention of members.  BM said that the Chair of HR did not give his permission for this to go on the Agenda. GW indicated he wanted to make it clear that the CEO did not know about this letter. He said the profession is in crisis and that letter was a genuine paper. BM enquired if the letter had been sent now that GW had got all the email addresses of members. GW stated that the letter was of its time which was 16 April and was to kickstart a conversation. BM indicated that we all want to move forward and the CEO said this was not the forum to discuss. He highlighted the communication problems and advised that members need to sort this out.  Members discussed the sharing with emails within the Committee and said that if this was agreed then members could set ground rules. The SEO asked members if they were content to have their emails shared and MLW said she would like some standards applied to all Committees. The CEO said that Chair had guidance documents to be discussed by Council and highlighted the Governance Framework and changes within the Code of Conduct. An agenda item needs to be discussed with Council. GW said these rules should be across all Committees and would like a Council decision on this. Members discussed how ARAC communicated between each other. The CEO said that ARAC had expressed a view and have put forward resolutions to go to Council.  Members discussed the use of a GTC email which would keep work separate from their own emails. BM said the use of emails would be a long discussion at Council. The Vice Chair said that it was a personal choice and in full committee everyone’s permission may not be given. She recommended that it be brought to Council.  **8. Draft Leadership Lens and Competences (PRRC/20/15/03)**  The SEO introduced this paper and MH took members through the detail. He added there was a tremendous merit in the existing competences. He highlighted who these were for and how they could be used and added that this model breaks boundaries. He advised that the general feedback from those who have seen it is favourable and it allows teachers to develop their own professional learning and careers. He said that members of the Advisory Group supported the Leadership Lens and Competences. He indicated that at the moment the work had been parked and embargoed by DE but the group would really like to take this forward. The group had taken it as far as they could and it was now in DE‘s hands.  BM commended MH on a superb paper and said it was very succinct and very easy to understand. The Chair added that it was very concise and covers everything. The SEO added that there was a lot of input into this work and it was very creative. He highlighted the use of the word ‘Lens’ and said the feedback from stakeholders was very favourable.  SMcE asked about timescale for roll out? MH indicated that because of the Covid situation all working groups work has been parked.  Members praised the document saying it was very positive from GTCNI. MH said this was an opportunity to make the work of GTCNI visible and it would be a good and positive benefit to Council.  The CEO said it was a good piece of work for teachers but it was a big stretch to say this should replace the 27 competences. He asked if the 27 have been mapped into the 12 proposed competences and could we say that clearly that these replace the 27. MH emphasised that the 27 existing competences could be mapped to the 12 new leadership competences and that the Advisory Group and Writing Group had considered this matter at some length and felt the Leadership Lens and Competences were a significant development and could replace the 27 Teacher Competences.  MH indicated that the 27 competences were not future proofed for the current era. Issues such as transgender are not mentioned in the 27 competences. MH advised that this was an educative process and teachers were looking at their own professional development. The SEO said it was designed for stakeholders to own this and the group were reluctant to move into prescriptive areas. LM added that not all prescription is bad and if these are replacing the 27 competences we would want to see development continuum. The Chair said she understood there would be a website for support for teachers. MH said there was and highlighted the links. BM said these would have to be endorsed and the CEO noted that this paper should be brought to Council with a recommendation to endorse the Leadership Lens and Leadership Competences as developed by the Advisory Group.  Proposed: BM  Seconded: LM  MH left the meeting at 12.09 and members had a 5 minute break.   1. **Invoicing Options paper in light of Covid 19 (PRRC/20/15/02)**   The SEO advised that he had asked the SRO’s to develop a paper regarding concerns arising from sub-teacher employment come September. He outlined how the registration fees are collected and how the invoicing process takes place. He advised the options paper was provided for Members’ information. He gave members the 3 Options available and recommended Option 2 which postpones the invoicing process until September rather than July/August, with the deregistration letter going out at the end of October. This should enable Council to recoup its total income.  Members discussed how this would work and how it compared with previous years and lead to a reduction in income. The CEO said income may go down but this remains to be seen but indicated that we have got the bulk of fees in as usual.  The CEO said we were sensitive to the needs of temporary teachers and explained to members how the registration year was calculated but said that if teachers were de-registered they could re-register at any time. He said we were not de-registering unless the fee is not received.  Members discussed Option 2.  Proposed: BM (that this had been noted)  Seconded: SMcE  **9. Accreditation Update (PRRC/20/15/04)**  The SEO took members through this paper, advising that accreditation is proceeding with adaptations to current circumstances. He outlined the accreditation process indicating that the accreditation committee had received the accreditations submitted by Stranmillis and St Mary’s and said the next stage was a meeting with the ETI to receive feedback on the inspection process then an accreditation meeting with Stranmillis and St Mary’s is to take place. This meeting may take well take place at the Accreditation Sub Committee but may not be ratified until September/October. LM said that she appreciated the SEO’s work and indicated the need for time to collate notes.  The SEO said he would be sending out questions to the HEI’s. LM asked was it within our remit to make recommendations.The SEO said we accredit and ETI inspects the programmes.  **10. Regulation Update (PRRC/20/15/05)**  Members were informed that discussions were taking place with DSO on a new resource assigned to work for the Department and they are doing preliminary work on redrafting legislation. They were advised that matters would be picked up at the next meeting. All our records have been updated and there were 37 cases where the employer process is now closed. Members were advised that officers do not make the decisions. The CEO advised that he makes final screening the decisions. At present, the CEO is liaising with DSO on the red files and the possibility of internal screening process on the current caseload.  BM asked if Registration Officers and DSO look at the 37 cases to see if any can be closed off. The CEO said we do not have the power to pursue any of the others. BM enquired if the persons involved are notified of a case going forward and the CEO said there is to be some form of communication and we would need to think carefully on the lines of communications. He advised that a set of procedures had been agreed and there was a need to make decisions and follow process.  SMcE asked of the repercussions of holding the red files.  MM said that holding this information would have been fine in the past but now it is different. The CEO said that we are dealing with DSO on the logistics of the red files and will get this done as quickly as we possibly can.  SMcE said she was concerned that this matter had been raised in June 2019 and it still has not been actioned.  MM added that it could be a human rights issue.  Members discussed the destruction of the red files and MM said that if dealt with in the correct way it would not be challenged. BM asked if someone made a challenge now would the Council be wrong under human rights and MM advised that we are already in the process of rectifying the situation.  The CEO said he had spoken to DSO and they are following up.  Members agreed the paper.  The Chair said she was happy to move on.  **AOB**  MLW raised the matter of staff returning to the office environment in the current circumstances.JM noted that it would be necessary to carry out a risk assessment. MLW suggested an independent risk assessment in readiness for a return to the office. BM asked if any DE or Government advice had been issued. MLW and BM stated that shared toilets would be a risk area. AC said she felt that DE staff would not be office based until the end of the year. SMcE suggested that the return of GTCNI staff to the office should be aligned with the return of DE staff to Rathgael House, if this was feasible. AC agreed to keep the Council up-to-date about any proposal or advice on return to office working arrangements.  **Date of next meeting** : 14 September 2020  Signed …………………………………….. Dated ……………………………. | Action |