MPTS Committee

Wednesday 7 February 2018
10:00-13:00
Room 4:32
4th Floor St James’s Buildings
79 Oxford Street, Manchester, M1 6FQ

Agenda

1  Chair’s Business
2  Minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2017
3  Chair’s Report (Oral)
4  Executive Manager’s Report
5  MPTS Risk Management
6  Annual Update from the Quality Assurance Group
7  Update on Appeals
8  Cyber Security
9  MPTS Work Programme for 2018
10 Any Other Business

11 Date and Time of Next Meeting: Wednesday 2 May 2018, 10:00-13:00, Room 4:32, SJB
MPTS Committee Action Sheet from the meeting held on 1 November 2017

Current actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date to be actioned by</th>
<th>Staff responsible</th>
<th>Action notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>3. Matters Arising</td>
<td>It was agreed that the Information Systems team would be invited to a future meeting to discuss how the GMC handles data security and cyber attacks.</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Presentation on the agenda for February's MPTS meeting. <strong>Action closed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>3. Matters Arising</td>
<td>In relation to paragraph 17b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that proportionality and references to equality and diversity had been added to the explanatory notes supporting the draft MPTS Vision.</td>
<td>3f</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>Colin Barker</td>
<td>C Barker confirmed that this had been actioned. <strong>Action closed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>3. Matters Arising</td>
<td>During discussion the Committee noted that the Executive Manager would check whether Tribunal documentation could be downloaded to individual devices, which should not be allowed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Update on Data Security to be given at February’s MPTS meeting. <strong>Action closed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>4. Chair’s Report</td>
<td>During discussion, the Committee noted that any MPTS draft response to the <em>Promoting professionalism, reforming regulation</em> consultation would be circulated to the Committee for approval, as the deadline for responses was before the Committee’s next meeting.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Draft response from GMC circulated to the MPTS Committee on 17/01/2018. <strong>Action closed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>5. Executive’s</td>
<td>During discussion, the Committee noted that</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Update on MPTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manager’s Report

where service targets were regularly being met 100%, consideration should be given to making some of them more challenging. Some further work would be carried out on performance data and proposals for internal targets would be brought back to the Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>6. MPTS Committee report to GMC Council</td>
<td>The MPTS Committee requested amendments to the report.</td>
<td>12a-d</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>7. MPTS Business Plan Projects 2018</td>
<td>The MPTS Committee requested amendments to the report.</td>
<td>14a-d</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>8. Update on GMC Appeals</td>
<td>The case where the GMC had not been successful was one relating to restoration to the Register, so the implications of a potential increase in applications for restoration would be discussed with the GMC.</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>07/02/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Plan Projects – Performance and Knowledge on agenda for February’s meeting. To include update on the action. **Action closed.**
Completed actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date to be actioned by</th>
<th>Staff responsible</th>
<th>Action notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>1. Chair’s business</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>2. Minutes of the meeting on 3 May 2017</td>
<td>The MPTS Executive Manager agreed to take up with GMC policy officers how doctors might be encouraged to make the necessary arrangements for indemnity cover, including insurance to defend themselves against fitness to practise proceedings.</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>31/12/2017</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Confirmed at 01/11/2017 MPTS meeting that the action had been completed. Action closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>3. Chair's report</td>
<td>In carrying out diversity research, some work on not just ethnicity but place of qualification and place of origin in the UK should be included.</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>31/12/2017</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Confirmed at 01/11/2017 MPTS meeting that the action had been completed Action closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>4. Assistant Director's report and risk log</td>
<td>The Committee would be informed how quickly the GMC expected to receive determinations after the conclusion of a Tribunal hearing and whether all members of the Committee were receiving the outcome of appeals.</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Confirmed at 01/11/2017 MPTS meeting that the action had been completed Action closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>4. Assistant Director's report and risk log</td>
<td>Risk R16, relating to data security, would also be dependent on GMC data security procedures, so the Executive Manager would raise this in his meetings with the GMC's Information Systems team.</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
<td>Gavin Brown</td>
<td>Action ongoing. See action 3d above dated 01/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>5. Tribunal members resourcing update</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>6. Case management - overview and key developments</td>
<td>Data for different stages of the process would be looked at to see where further time savings could be identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13b 31/12/2017 Gavin Brown Action ongoing. See action 9 above dated 01/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>7. Information security update</td>
<td>Following the recent cases of hacking and ransomware around the world, the Executive Manager would ask the GMC for reassurance about how the MPTS was protected from cyber attacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15a 01/11/2017 Gavin Brown Update on data security scheduled of February’s MPTS Committee meeting. Action closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>8. Update on MPTS vision</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>9. Medical Practitioners Tribunal adjournments</td>
<td>Future updates would make it easier to compare the savings from cases finishing short with the additional costs of adjournments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19a 01/11/2017 Scott Geddes Action ongoing. See action 9 above dated 01/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>10. Any other business</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>11. Code of Conduct and processes for managing concerns with MPTS Associates</td>
<td>References to the Assistant Director MPTS would need to be updated to refer to the Executive Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 31/12/2017 Tamarind Ashcroft T Ashcroft confirmed that the action had been completed. Action closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/09/2017</td>
<td>11. Code of Conduct and processes for managing concerns with MPTS Associates</td>
<td>There had previously been a list of dos and don’ts for Tribunal members which could be looked at again and adapted for use in training sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 31/12/2017 Tamarind Ashcroft T Ashcroft confirmed that the action had been completed. Action closed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of the Meeting on 1 November 2017

Members present

Dame Caroline Swift, Chair
Richard Davies
Jacky Hayden
Patricia Moultrie
Judith Worthington

Others present

Gavin Brown, Executive Manager, MPTS
Tamarind Ashcroft, Head of Tribunal Development, MPTS (item 9)
Colin Barker, MPTS Communications Manager (Items 6 and 11)
Vaishali Fitton, Senior Legal Adviser, MPTS
Dale Langford, Committee Secretary
Guy Wilkinson, Tribunals Manager, MPTS (item 10)

Chair’s business

1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting of the MPTS Committee.

 These Minutes should be read in conjunction with the MPTS Committee papers for this meeting, which are available on our website at http://www.mpts-uk.org
Minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017

2 The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017 as a true record, subject to the correction of paragraph 9a to refer to how quickly the Professional Standards Authority (PSA), rather than the GMC, expected to receive determinations.

Matters arising

3 The Committee considered the actions arising from the previous meeting of the Committee, including the following points:

a In relation to paragraph 4b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, the Executive Manager had raised with GMC policy colleagues for further consideration, whether more could be done to encourage take-up of indemnity arrangements to cover legal representation at disciplinary hearings.

b In relation to paragraph 6b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that data on place of origin in the UK was not recorded and that there were no justifiable grounds to ask for that information. However, when an enquiry was opened by Fitness to Practise, the location and link organisation where the alleged incident occurred were recorded to enable the identification of potential hot spots. If the allegation was non-work related, FTP recorded where the doctor was working at the time. The GMC’s statistical team would continue to review the data.

c In relation to paragraph 9a of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that the GMC could appeal within 28 days of being served with notice of the decision, whereas the PSA had 28 days from the last date that the doctor or the GMC could exercise the right to appeal.

d In relation to paragraph 9b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that the GMC had recently carried out three audits or assessments in relation to information security, which were available for members of the Committee to see. It was agreed that the Information Systems team would be invited to a future meeting to discuss how the GMC handles data security and cyber attacks. It was also noted that business continuity would be included in the work programme for the Committee’s meeting on 2 May 2018.

e In relation to paragraph 13b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that the new part-time data manager had been tasked with exploring whether there were any stages in the case management process where time savings could be made.
In relation to paragraph 17b of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that proportionality and references to equality and diversity had been added to the explanatory notes supporting the draft MPTS vision.

In relation to paragraph 22 of the minutes of the meeting on 19 September 2017, it was noted that the previously used list of dos and don’ts for Tribunal members was not considered to be appropriate for future use.

During discussion, the Committee noted that the Executive Manager would check whether Tribunal documentation could be downloaded to individual devices, which should not be allowed.

Chair’s report

The Chair provided an update on work and activities that had taken place since the meeting on 19 September 2017, noting that she had:

- Taken part in the annual training of Interim Orders Tribunal (IOT) and Medical Practitioner Tribunal (MPT) members. The training included a session on expert witnesses.
- Had presented a session to 150 doctors at the Royal College of General Practitioners Conference, alongside a GMC Regional Liaison Adviser, on how the GMC deals with complaints and how MPTS hearings are conducted.
- Attended a meeting with the Chair and Chief Executive of the General Dental Council, alongside the Executive Manager, the GMC’s Chief Executive, Chief Operating Officer and Director of Fitness to Practise, to discuss potential collaboration. Some questions have been put to the GDC and a response is awaited. Any firm proposal for collaborative work involving the MPTS would be put to the MPTS Committee for its consideration.
- Had attended meetings with the Doctors’ Support Network, the Patients Association and a six-monthly User Group meeting.
- Had met the Department of Health team working on the recently consultation Promoting professionalism, reforming regulation, and would be considering whether, and if so, how to respond to the consultation.

During discussion, the Committee noted that any MPTS draft response to the Promoting professionalism, reforming regulation consultation would be circulated to the Committee for approval, as the deadline for responses was before the Committee’s next meeting.
Executive Manager’s report and MPTS Risk Register
7 The Committee considered the Executive Manager’s report. The Committee considered:
   a The Executive Manager’s report, along with the performance data at Annex A.
   b The risk log at Annex B.
8 The Committee noted that:
   a As well as a spike in the number of MPT and IOT referrals in August 2017, another spike in referrals was taking place, so the issue was being investigated to understand what factors might cause spikes in referrals.
   b Initial discussions were taking place about potential changes to the 7th floor of St James’s Buildings, with the potential to create a combined reception and waiting area.
   c The policy on the use of Twitter during hearings was being reviewed, with the rules applying in courts being looked as a potential model.
9 During discussion, the Committee noted that where service targets were regularly being met 100%, consideration should be given to making some of them more challenging. Some further work would be carried out on performance data and proposals for internal targets would be brought back to the Committee.

MPTS Committee report to GMC Council
10 The Committee considered the draft MPTS Committee report to the GMC Council as a summary of the MPTS activities since the Chair’s last report to Council on 7 June 2017.
11 Subject to amendments suggested by the Committee, the Committee approved the draft report at Annex A for consideration by GMC/MPTS Liaison Group on 4 December 2017, and GMC Council on 12 December 2017.
12 During discussion, the Committee noted that:
   a The reduction in expenditure planned between 2016 and 2018 of almost £2 million should be included in the report to Council, emphasising the fall in the number of cases during that period.
   b Paragraph 4 of the draft report refers to the MPTS’s priorities for the future, and should briefly mention what those priorities are.
   c Paragraph 6 refers to a ‘recruitment campaign’ for a new lay MPTS Committee member, which should have said ‘appointment campaign’.
d Paragraph 7 of the draft report, on reducing the number of adjournments, should also refer to the reduction in costs.

**MPTS Business Plan Projects 2018**

13 The Committee considered the paper setting out MPTS Business Plan projects for 2018. The Committee noted that the paper set out to simplify the range of projects being worked on and to move a number of projects into business as usual activity.

14 During discussion, the Committee noted that:

- **a** The overall document would be revised to improve consistency of detail throughout and ensure that objectives and milestones were straightforward to measure.

- **b** The Executive Manager would check what commitments the GMC had made in connection with changes to publication and disclosure policy.

- **c** Paragraph d under ‘Doctor’s Workbook – Phase II’ set out the overall objective for the project and should therefore be listed first.

- **d** Paragraph b under ‘Shared training with the Nursing and Midwifery Council’ should be moved to the following section on ‘Working with other regulators’, as the text did not relate specifically to training.

**Update on GMC appeals**

15 The Committee received a paper setting out details of appeals issued by the GMC since 1 January 2016 and some of the issues arising from the appeals in which judgment had been given. The Committee considered the number and nature of GMC appeals pursuant to section 40A of the Medical Act 1983 (as amended).

16 It was noted that a further four appeals had been heard since the paper had been prepared, with one further appeal where the GMC had been successful and one where it had not – judgment was awaited for the other appeals.

17 During discussion, the Committee noted that:

- **a** The case where the GMC had not been successful was one relating to restoration to the Register, so the implications of a potential increase in applications for restoration would be discussed with the GMC.

- **b** Following the Supreme Court’s ruling on Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords [2017], the two-stage test for dishonesty established by R v Ghosh [1982] should no longer be applied, which would have implications for hearings related to dishonesty and for training of Tribunal members.
c The outcome of the appeals should provide a good basis for training and improve consistency of hearing outcomes.

18 It was noted that the annex would be reformatted before publication.

Training update

19 The Committee received a paper setting out details of MPTS training delivered in 2017. The Committee noted the current position with regard to training tribunals and the plans for 2018.

20 It was noted that:

a This year’s annual training of IOT and MPT Tribunal members was due to be completed during November 2017 and included a session on referring to experts and how to explain in determinations the consideration of expert evidence.

b In May 2018, some joint training with the Nursing and Midwifery Council was being arranged, to cover generic skills such as chairing.

c Other channels to cascade information in a more responsive way were being considered, such as e-learning and webinars.

21 During discussion, the Committee noted that:

a Courses should if possible be bespoke and relevant, and involve a limited number of participants.

b Consideration should be given to measuring the success of a course by seeking feedback six months afterwards.

Doctor Contact Service

22 The Committee received a presentation giving an overview of the work undertaken in developing a Doctor Contact Service.

23 During discussion, the Committee noted that:

a Consideration could be given to rotating involvement with the Doctor Contact Service, to give more staff exposure to the useful work that it does.

b Although there are wellbeing champions to support staff, some other professional support could be offered to staff involved in the Doctor Contact Service.

c Additional ways of getting qualitative data and feedback would be looked at.
Operational update: MPTS media relations

24 The Committee received an update on the work of the MPTS media relations team. It was noted that the media relations team could provide speaking notes about MPTS to members of the Committee for speaking engagements.

25 The Committee noted the paper.

Any other business

26 The Committee noted that the Department of Health (England) had announced plans to develop a state-backed indemnity scheme for general practitioners, with the aim of protecting them from the costs of clinical negligence claims, but not fitness to practise proceedings. The risk that the proposed scheme could result in an increase in unrepresented doctors was noted.

27 As it was Richard Davies’ final meeting as a member of the Committee, the Chair thanked him on behalf of the Committee for his contribution to the Committee’s work.

28 The Committee noted that the following papers would be reserved from publication:

   a Annex B to the Executive Manager’s report – the MPTS Risk Register.

   b Item 6, MPTS Committee report to GMC Council (as the final version would be published on the GMC Council agenda).

   c Item 7, Business Plan projects 2018.

   d Item 9, Training update.

29 The Committee noted that its next meeting would be on Wednesday 7 February 2018.

Confirmed

Dame Caroline Swift, Chair                               Date: 7 February 2018
Referrals to MPTS interim order hearings made in 2017 by quarter

Number of referrals

Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4

100% of IOT hearings commenced within the 3 week target
Non Compliance referrals to MPTS made in 2017

Number of referrals

Q1  Q2  Q3  Q4

4  6  4  5
Referrals to MPTS made in 2017 by FtP Investigation Type

- **Regional Inv (to commence in 9 months)**
- **National Inv (to commence in 6 months)***
- **Criminal Conviction Inv (to commence in 9 months)**

*Internal service target
MPTS Room utilisation rate per month

Target 80%

% Utilisation

Jan  Feb  Mar  Apr  May  Jun  Jul  Aug  Sep  Oct  Nov  Dec

0%  10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%
MPT Hearings commencing 2017 by months from decision to refer

Service Target: to commence 90% of MPT hearings within 9 months of referral (met every month in 2017)
Note:

1. All hearings were provisionally listed to take place within service target.

2. Doctor/Defence actions do not affect the service target.
Number of defence/doctor applications to postpone an IOT hearing in 2017

Note: The GMC made no applications in 2017
Number of defence/doctor applications to postpone a MPT hearing in 2017

- **Q4**: Includes one joint application with the GMC
- **Q3**: Applications granted: 4, Applications refused: 5
- **Q2**: Applications granted: 6, Applications refused: 9
- **Q1**: Applications granted: 5, Applications refused: 6

Legend:
- ♻ Applications granted
- 🟢 Applications refused
Number of GMC applications to postpone a MPT hearing in 2017

- Q4: Includes one joint application with the Defence/Doctor
  - Applications granted: 3
  - Applications refused: 3

- Q3: No applications were granted in Q3 & no applications made in Q2

- Q1: No applications granted
  - Applications granted: 0
  - Applications refused: 1
Non Compliance Hearings concluded in 2017 by outcome

- **Suspension**: 8
- **Non Compliance not found**: 1

Number of hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MPT Hearings concluded in 2017 by outcome

- Erasure: 62
- Suspension: 76
- Conditions: 13
- Impairment - No Action: 4
- No Impairment - Warning: 13
- No Impairment: 27
Outcomes of No Impairment in 2017 - facts found proved & not proved

- Facts found proved: 10
- Facts not found proved: 17

Number of hearings with an outcome of no impairment
Number of GMC/PSA Appeals lodged in 2017 (& outcome)

- **GMC Appeals**: 19
- **GMC Successful Appeals**: 9
- **GMC Unsuccessful Appeals**: 2
- **GMC Withdrawn Appeals**: 4
- **GMC Appeals Awaiting Hearing / Outcome**: 4
- **PSA Appeals**: 1
- **PSA Successful Appeals**: 1
Number of doctor Appeals lodged in 2017 (& outcome)

- Doctor Appeals: 25
- Successful Appeals: 4
- Dismissed: 5
- Withdrawn: 4
- Awaiting Outcome: 12
4 – Staff Network terms of reference

Our MPTS Staff Network

Background

1 Front line employees often have the most experience with, and information about, company policies and systems. Therefore our views and opinions need to be captured for MPTS to evolve and improve.

Round Table Model

2 It is important that the group has a round table ethos, where people can bring the topics of concern or suggestions without worrying about any personal consequences.

3 We will respect the views of others. Respect will be demonstrated by courtesy, good communication and taking time to understand the points of view of MPTS staff.

Aims

- Enable staff views, interests and feedback to be expressed more effectively
- Share information and seek the views of staff on current topics
- Promote open and timely communication
- Recognise staff importance in the development of the MPTS
- Provide advice and a steer on equality and diversity and dignity at work
- Track actions and provide feedback on the issues brought to the Staff Network
Membership

- Membership should include 6, 5, 4 staff. The Executive Manager should be present and in his absence an appropriate senior manager. Senior managers to be invited to the Staff Network to discuss issues raised and to provide updates on actions where needed. Guest speakers will also be invited to the Staff Network where needed to provide updates on topics of interest to the group.

Meetings

- Will run monthly, if possible on the third week of the month, rotating the day however not including Mondays.

- Actions will be shared with the group and accessible via the intranet.

- If you can’t attend the meeting you can post suggestions for discussion in the boxes in kitchens on level 4 & 7, SJB. Or send an email to the Office or the MPTS Chair at MPTSChair@mpts-uk.org, or email the Governance Officer at Bernadette.beisty@mpts-uk.org

Approval date: January 2018

Review date: January 2019
Executive summary

This report provides an update on the operational performance of the MPTS.

Annex A is the MPTS performance data for 2017.

Annex B is the Terms of Reference of the MPTS Staff Network.

Recommendations

The Committee is asked to consider the report, along with the performance data at Annex A and note the MPTS Staff Network Terms of Reference at Annex B.
Performance

1. The Executive Manager, Head of Operations, Case Manager and Data Manager have been working on improvements in respect of the visualisation of the MPTS performance data.

2. At Annex A you will find our initial work. This is very much work in progress therefore we would welcome the Committee’s views.

3. In terms of performance, service targets continue to be met consistently with no areas for concern.

4. Additionally the Data Manager has been working with the MPTS Operations Team to increase the data that we capture about the work of the MPTS and how we best utilise it to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our operations.

MPTS Update - 21 December 2017

5. On the 21st December 2017 Dame Caroline Swift emailed MPTS Committee Members an update. This update included;
   - An introduction to Joy Hamilton (new MPTS Committee Member) and Bernadette Beisty (new MPTS Governance Officer)
   - Background and the detail concerning the forthcoming Publication & Disclosure changes that we discussed at November’s MPTS Committee meeting
   - The GMC response to the medical associate professions consultation
   - The final MPTS Committee report to the GMC Council – a draft of which the Committee commented upon at November’s meeting
   - The presentation given by the Executive Manager to the MPTS All Staff Meeting in early December

6. If appropriate, we will send an update like this, via email, in between each Committee meeting.

Finance

7. The 2017 MPTS budget was £9,393,764 (a reduction of £1,180,000 against 2016).

8. The actual spend is expected to be £8,639,373 a variance of £754,391 or 8%.

9. There are a number of reasons for this including:
£366k of underspend relates to overachieving against efficiency target. This is mostly due to success of recruitment programme for LQCs earlier in the year resulting in 75% of hearing days in Q4 operating without the need for a Legal Assessor.

The number of hearing days has been lower than budgeted (predicted 2429 days, actual 2294 days).

Higher than usual staff turnover in the first half of the year.

At the MPTS Committee meeting in November it was reported that the proposed MPTS budget for 2018 was £8,685,681.

Due to a change in churn calculation and GMC wide pension changes the final budget for MPTS in 2018 is now £8,462,261.

**Tribunal Diversity 2017**

As of January 2018, the MPTS has 308 tribunal members of whom 46% are female and 19% identify as BME.

This compares favourably with the most recently published figures for courts in England and Wales (28% female and 7% BME) and tribunals in England and Wales (46% female and 14% BME). (Source: www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications/judicial-statistics-2017)

For each hearing, we try to achieve diversity among the three tribunal members. The availability of tribunal members within the pool determines how often we can do this.

In 2017, our medical practitioners tribunals had both ethnicity and gender diversity on 46% of hearing days.

On 47% of hearing days our medical practitioners tribunals had gender diversity only, while on 2% of hearing days our tribunals had ethnicity diversity only.

A non-BME, single sex tribunal only sat on 5% of hearing days.

**Staffing**

We are in the process of recruiting a number of MPTS roles;

- Two opportunities for Level 4 staff to spend 50% of their time on the Doctor Contact Service.
- Level 4 Tribunal Clerk secondment opportunities.
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- Level 4 Project Officer secondment opportunity.
- Level 5 Personal Assistant to the MPTS Chair and Executive Manager.

The first MPTS Staff Network meeting was held on the 16 January 2018; the agreed Terms of Reference can be found at Annex B.

Facilities

19 We continue to discuss moving the MPTS Reception at SJB, consolidating operations on the 7th floor and the associated option of reducing the MPTS footprint on the 4th floor. A final decision will be taken in March.

General Dental Council

20 A meeting was held on the 10 January 2018 with the GDC; attendees included the Chairs and Chief Executives of the GMC and GDC and the Chair and Executive Manager of the MPTS.

21 The meeting was a follow up to one on the 12 October 2017 at which the GMC set out its interest in working collaboratively with the GDC on potential options for its adjudication function.

22 At the 10 January meeting the GMC again reiterated its enthusiasm for working collaboratively with other professional regulators.

23 The meeting agreed that further clarity was required concerning what it was proposed that the MPTS do on behalf of the GDC and the associated legal and financial implications.

24 The GMC expressed enthusiasm for undertaking this substantial piece of work jointly with the GDC.

25 However, due to their own timetable, the GDC concluded that this was not something they wished to pursue at this stage.

26 It was agreed that the Executive Manager, MPTS would be the GMC link to the GDC with regards to adjudication.
Executive summary
The MPTS risk register has been reviewed and updated by the MPTS Executive Manager – the revised risk register is at Annex A.

MPTS aim to take a more dynamic approach to focus on risks resulting from projects and shorter term threats.

In January 2018, MPTS staff received training on tools and processes for identifying and managing risk.

Recommendation/s
a The MPTS Committee is asked to consider the report and the revised risk register at Annex A.
The current MPTS risk register

1. The revised risk register, at annex A, was reviewed and updated by the MPTS Executive Manager in November 2017. The previous risk register, as considered by the MPTS Committee on 19 September 2017, is at Annex B, for reference.

2. The revised risk register represents a first attempt at creating a more dynamic risk register and has involved the simplification and consolidation of the risks previously reported upon.

3. At the MPTS Committee meeting 03 May 2017 a request was noted that a risk be added to articulate the potential impact of GMC revalidation requirements on the number of medical members on the tribunals now and in the longer term.

4. A deep dive analysis was conducted to ascertain the extent of this risk, the analysis of this risk was reported at the meeting on 19 September 2017.

5. The MPTS Committee concluded that the impact of revalidation requirements on the number of medical members of tribunals was not a risk that needed to be reported on or mitigated, therefore the risk was closed.

Changing our approach to risk

6. The majority of the risks identified in the previous MPTS directorate-level risk register are ongoing issues that are mitigated as part of ongoing processes. The risk status of these issues is unlikely to change at any time.

7. We are keen to make the risk register more dynamic by identifying and managing risks resulting from projects and shorter term threats and opportunities, as well as capturing general and ongoing risks to the MPTS.

8. This paper sets out the revised approach we have adopted to risk management.

New approach

9. We have established a formal structure for project and programme risk management for the MPTS, including corporate level escalation, see annex C.

10. Staff, especially project managers and project leads, are now clear on their roles and responsibilities with regards to risk.

11. Staff have received training on risk management processes and tools to use for risk identification.
How we will work

12 Each month, the MPTS senior management team will review status reports on the progress of all programmes. Risks will be considered as part of those status updates, including programme level risk registers. Risks with the highest rating will be scrutinised.

13 As part of the new approach all projects will have risk registers in place, this process has been developed to ensure a consistent approach and staff members’ understanding of identification and mitigation.

14 We have established the following roles and responsibilities for risk management in MPTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPTS project managers</td>
<td>Responsible for maintaining individual project risk registers in terms of identification, mitigation and considering escalation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Business Support Adviser</td>
<td>Governance of programme risk register, review of project risk registers, providing healthy challenge to project managers, identifying programme-wide risks which have multiple impacts, producing risk updates for SMT meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Business Planning Manager</td>
<td>Co-ordination and governance of MPTS entries on the Corporate Risk register, ensuring they are up to date and relevant; maintaining escalation options with the Business Support Advisor to ensure that any high profile risks are managed appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPTS Executive Manager</td>
<td>Sponsor with sign off authority on new process, ultimately responsible for MPTS and corporate risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 The Corporate Business Planning Manager and Graduate Business Support Adviser have successfully delivered training to MPTS staff on the risk management process (from individual project risks to programme reporting and escalation methods) as well as sharing tools and techniques on how to identify risks and how to get to the root cause of the risks.
## Agenda item: 6

**Report title:** Quality Assurance Group 2017 overview and criteria review  
**Report by:** Tamarind Ashcroft, Head of Tribunal Development  
**Action:** To note

### Executive summary

This paper details an overview of the 2017 QAG outputs, highlighting any themes emerging.

### Recommendation

The MPTS Committee is asked to note the outputs of the QAG for 2017 and to confirm that the current selection criteria for QAG remains appropriate.
**Volumes**

1. During the period 1 January - 31 December 2017 there were 1746 MPTS hearings. Of these, 527 were selected for QAG review which covers hearings between 1 January and 30 November 2016. A further 48 Rule 29 Case Manager decisions were also reviewed during 2017, making a total of 575 decisions reviewed.

2. The data below is based on hearings that took place between 1 January and 30 November 2017 as the QAG only reviews decisions once the appeal period has passed.

**MPT Decisions**

3. During this period the QAG reviewed 32% of MPT decisions (included within this number are restoration hearings). This is a slightly lower percentage than intended to be reviewed as within the number of hearings each month, only completed hearings were used for the selection criteria. Due to the level of adjournments impacting the review selection volume, for 2018 we will be basing the selection on total hearing numbers but still only reviewing those that had completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan-Nov 2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hearings</strong></td>
<td><strong>MPT (New- (N))</strong> 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MPT (Review- (R))</strong> 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>509</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases selected for QAG</strong></td>
<td><strong>MPT (N) inc restoration</strong> 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MPT (R)</strong> 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The main themes for learning points for MPT related to clarifying legal tests and case law correctly and reminders about procedures. The need to provide more detailed reasons in some cases continued as an ongoing learning point. This year work commenced to introduce a determination framework to provide a structure for drafting which was piloted in the last quarter of the year. This provides a minimum level of drafting which should assist to ensure that tests frequently referred to are done so in a standard manner.

5. Training during 2017 included all QAG learning points raised prior to September and tailored updates for latter sessions as judgments were issued eg Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Ltd [2017] UKSC 67.

**IOT Decisions**

6. During this period the QAG reviewed 28% of IOT decisions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan-Nov 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of hearings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOT (N)</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOT (R)</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases selected for QAG</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOT (N)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOT (R)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7  100% of the 16 Non-compliance Hearings were reviewed during 2017.

8  Areas for learning points, in addition to the requirement for more detailed reasons, included consideration of the overall risks and how to approach variation of orders.

9  Again training in 2017 included all learning points identified prior to September 2017. Additionally case law emerging from MPT appeals which could impact on IOT decisions was also discussed.

**Rule 29 Postponement decisions**

10 43% of Rule 29 Postponement decisions were reviewed during 2017. Towards the end of 2017 additional staff case management support was recruited and as a result of this a decision was made to end the contracts for services for those associate individuals carrying out this work to take effect early 2018. From March 2018 we will devise a new system for ensuring the quality of decision making by those employed by the MPTS which will sit outside of the standard processes for the Quality Assurance Group.

**Feedback**

**PSA Feedback**

11 Between 1 January and 31 December, we were notified that 16 cases had been considered by the PSA, 7 of which have resulted in learning points to date and 1 of which was appealed. This is a slight reduction to the volume considered by them in 2016.

**GMC Feedback**

12 During 2017 the GMC’s Decision Review Group sent the QAG 8 letters covering 26 cases. They have exercised their power to appeal in a number of cases- the analysis of these appeals is the subject of a separate paper.
2017 revised selection criteria for QAG

13 In 2017, the committee noted the revision of the selection criteria and that the approach to providing direct feedback to tribunals was to end.

14 The overall volume of MPT decisions reviewed reduced by 17% between 2016 and 2017. The overall volume of IOT decisions reviewed increased by 9%, however a decision was made to further reduce the selection criteria for IOT review decisions from August 2017 and we therefore anticipate that this would offset the increase for a full year at the revised criteria.

15 In 2016 we provided direct feedback to tribunals in 16% of decisions reviewed. If we had continued to provide direct feedback in 2017 we anticipate that this would have accounted for 15% of decisions reviewed. This is due to an increased level of feedback for MPT decisions but a significant decline for IOT decisions.

16 The committee is asked to note these changes and confirm that the quality assurance of decisions continues to meet the necessary scrutiny levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item:</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report title:</td>
<td>Update on Appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report by:</td>
<td>Vaishali Fitton, Senior Legal Adviser, MPTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered by:</td>
<td>MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action:</td>
<td>To note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive summary**

To consider the learning points arising from GMC, PSA and doctor appeals of/challenges to decisions of Tribunals.
Appeals and challenges to Tribunals’ decisions: General

1 Appeals and challenges to decisions of Tribunals can (generally) be brought in the following ways:

1.1 doctors’ appeals of a Medical Practitioners Tribunal’s (‘MPT’s) decision, under section 40 of the Medical Act 1983 (‘the Act’);

1.2 doctors’ challenges to an MPT’s decision not to restore him/her to the register (following erasure as a result of fitness to practise proceedings) or to issue a warning, by way of application for judicial review of that decision;

1.3 doctors’ challenges to an Interim Order Tribunal’s (‘IOT’s) decision, by way of a claim brought under Part 8 of the Civil Procedure Rules;

1.4 GMC’s appeals of an MPT’s decision (including decisions to restore a doctor to the register) or a Non-compliance Tribunal’s (‘NCT’s) decision, under section 40A of the Act;

1.5 PSA appeals of an MPT’s decision under section 29 of the National Health Service Reform and Health Care Professions Act 2002.

2 Although any appeal of/challenge to an MPT’s, NCT’s or IOT’s decision is usually some form of challenge to the decision making of that tribunal, neither the tribunal itself nor the MPTS are a party to the appeal/challenge; the GMC and doctor (and PSA, where appropriate) are the relevant parties.

3 The In House Legal Team of the GMC conducts all of the appeals/challenges mentioned above and the MPTS does not actively participate in the ongoing appeals/challenges. However, the MPTS takes a keen interest in the outcome of any such appeal/challenge so that any learning points can be identified.

Using and applying any Learning Points

4 The MPTS communicates the learning points arising from appeals/challenges to tribunal members:

4.1 in Appeal Circulars, which summarise the key information from the judgment and identify any learning points or good practice;

4.2 at the annual training for tribunal members, which is due to commence in September 2018;
4.3 by way of updates on the outcomes of appeals direct to tribunal members involved in the appealed hearing (and of the outcome of any remitted hearing following the appeal);

4.4 by providing direct feedback to individual tribunal members, if necessary, as part of their annual appraisal and continuous professional development.

Learning Points: 1 October – 31 December 2017

5 Since the last update to the MPTS Committee, the relevant learning points arising from the judgments given in appeals/challenges are:

5.1 Tribunals should consider all three limbs of the tripartite public interest test in the over-arching objective (public safety, public confidence in and upholding proper standards of the profession) considering the purpose as a whole and not give excessive weight to any one limb (in particular the first) or to the doctor’s evidence of remediation;

5.2 if a Tribunal departs from the Sanctions Guidance, the relevant paragraph should be referenced and clear reasons given for doing so;

5.3 Tribunals should make clear that the seriousness of a doctor’s misconduct has been balanced against any mitigating factors and to explain how the mitigation in the case justifies imposing a lesser sanction, where the Sanctions Guidance indicates that a more serious sanction is likely to be the appropriate one;

5.4 in Restoration cases (where the doctor was erased following disciplinary actions as a result of allegations of dishonesty or sexual motivation):

5.4.1 the legal test to be used by Tribunals in restoration cases is not one of ‘exceptional circumstances’ in matters relating to sexual misconduct and/or dishonesty;

5.4.2 section 41 of the Medical Act 1983 provides a broad discretion to a Tribunal (subject to having regard to the overarch ing objective) and the GMC’s own guidance on restoration makes no reference to ‘exceptional circumstances’;

5.4.3 greater weight should not be placed on the need to maintain public confidence and uphold professional standards, over the remediation undertaken by the individual;

5.4.4 Tribunals considering restoration applications are not entitled to go behind the previous Tribunal’s findings. However, they are carrying out a different
exercise to that of the previous Tribunal and it is appropriate for them to consider where on the spectrum of seriousness the conduct which led to the erasure falls;

5.4.5 Tribunals considering restoration applications can appropriately consider how long the erasure has been imposed for, when considering the over-arching objective and in particular, what is necessary to maintain public confidence and/or proper professional standards and conduct;

5.5 in dishonesty cases:

5.5.1 the test for dishonesty (in civil and criminal proceedings, including regulatory ones) is as set out in the Supreme Court judgment in Ivey v Genting Casinos UK Ltd (t/a Crockfords Club) [2017] UKSC 67:

5.5.1.1 the fact finding Tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual’s knowledge or belief as to the facts;

5.5.1.2 once his/her actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his/her conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people.

There is no requirement that the individual must appreciate that what s/he has done is, by those standards, dishonest;

5.5.2 the second limb of the former test for establishing dishonesty, as set out in R v Ghosh [1982] Q.B. 1053,* should no longer be used;

5.5.3 the first (objective) limb of the Ghosh test was not the same as the second (objective) limb of the Ivey test.

* Did the [defendant] realise that ordinary honest people would regard his/her behaviour as dishonest. The answer to that second question must also be yes.
Annex 1. MPTS Work Programme 2018

1 Agenda items have been matched to the MPTS Committee’s key responsibilities (see Table 1.) to provide assurance that the Committee is compliant with its Statement of Purpose and is reviewing all aspects of the MPTS Committee’s key responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 February 2018</td>
<td>MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Chair’s Report (Oral)
- Executive Manager’s Report including MPTS Risk Register and performance data (a-k)
- Annual Update from the Quality Assurance Group (f,g)
- Update on Appeals
- MPTS Work Programme for 2018

Additional items added to the agenda:
- Update on Data Security (requested at the MPTS meeting in November 2017)
- Update on MPTS Business Plan Projects – Performance and Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 May 2018</td>
<td>MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Chair’s Report (Oral)
- Executive Manager’s Report including MPTS Risk Register and performance data (a-k)
- Report of the Chair of the MPTS to GMC Council (a-l)
MPTS Annual Report to Parliament (l)

Additional item requested at the MPTS meeting in November 2017

Business Continuity Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 11 September 2018</td>
<td>MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair’s Report (Oral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Manager’s Report including MPTS Risk Register and performance data (a-k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribunal Members’ Resourcing Updates (last reviewed in September 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Review of MPTS Vision (m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 15 November 2018</td>
<td>MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair’s Report (Oral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Manager’s Report including MPTS Risk Register and performance data (a-k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Chair of the MPTS to GMC Council (a-l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Review of the MPTS Business Plan (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPTS Work Programme and Annual Report of the MPTS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update from the Quality Assurance Group (f,g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional items last reviewed by the MPTS Committee in November 2017:

- Training Update (b,c,)
Key Groups and Policies/ Guidance related to MPTS Committee Business:

- Quality Assurance Group – annual update scheduled
- Adjournments Working Group – to be reviewed as part of the Executive Manager’s Report at each meeting
- Code of Conduct for Managing Concerns with MPTS Associates – noted at the meeting in September 2017; review date September 2022
Table 1. MPTS Committee’s key responsibilities for 2018 (as set out in the Committee’s Statement of Purpose and additional items from the MPTS Vision and MPTS Business Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPTS Committee’s Responsibilities</th>
<th>Assurance Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a</strong> The delivery of a hearings service that demonstrates efficiency and effectiveness.</td>
<td>Executive Manager’s Report and updates from the Quality Assurance Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b</strong> The appointment of Medical Practitioners and Interim Orders Tribunal members (including chairs) and that appropriate systems for the appointment, training, assessment and, where required, the removal of case managers in place.</td>
<td>Papers on recruitment campaigns, training and appraisal as required. Training Update scheduled for November 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c</strong> The appointment of legal assessors and case managers and that appropriate systems for the appointment, training, assessment and, where required, the removal of case managers in place.</td>
<td>Papers on recruitment campaigns, training and appraisal as required. Training Update scheduled for November 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d</strong> Maintenance of a system for declaration and registration and publication of Committee members’ private interests.</td>
<td>Declaration of interests of Committee members’ private interests available on the MPTS website and updated by the GMC Governance team on a 6 monthly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e</strong> Consideration of matters by a Medical Practitioners Tribunal and Interim Orders Tribunals are maintained.</td>
<td>Executive Manager’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f</strong> High quality standards of decision making by Medical Practitioners Tribunal</td>
<td>Included in the Quality Assurance Group updates to the Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>High quality standards of case management by case managers are maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>The setting and maintenance of guidance for the MPTS tribunals, case managers and legal assessors, as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>That the MPTS applies the equality and diversity strategies and policies of the GMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Notification of Medical Practitioners Tribunal and Interim Orders Tribunal decisions as required by the Medical Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Effective liaison with all users of the hearings service provided by the MPTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| m | From the MPTS Vision:  
- Make high quality well-reasoned, independent decisions to protect the public  
- Runs hearings efficiently and effectively, using resources appropriately  
- Treats all tribunal service users with respect and fairness  
- Has a distinct voice, clearly articulating our role | Annual report on the MPTS Vision scheduled on the work programme for 2018. |
| n | From the Business Plan 2018 priorities: | Annual review of the Business Plan |
| performance and knowledge, corporate, hearings engagement, improved technology and closer working with other regulators. | scheduled on the work programme for 2018. |
Report title: MPTS Committee Work Programme for 2018
Report by: Bernadette Beisty, Governance Officer, MPTS
Considered by: MPTS Committee
Action: To note

Executive summary
The MPTS Committee’s work programme for 2018 sets out the business for review during 2018. The work programme covers the key responsibilities of the MPTS Committee as outlined in the Committee’s Statement of Purpose. The work programme also contains key items for review from the MPTS Vision and the MPTS Business Plan priorities.

Recommendation
The MPTS Committee is asked to note its forward work programme for 2018
Work programme for 2018

1. The MPTS Committee’s work programme for 2018 at Annex 1. contains the schedule of reports for review during the meetings to be held in 2018. The Committee’s work programme for 2018 was derived from the Committee’s duties and activities outlined in the MPTS Committee’s Statement of Purpose and ongoing and new work arising from the MPTS Vision and the MPTS Business Plan.

2. In 2018 the key priorities identified in the MPTS Vision document are as follows:
   - Makes high quality, well-reasoned, independent decisions to protect the public
   - Runs hearings efficiently and effectively, using resources appropriately
   - Treats all tribunal service users with respect and fairness
   - Has a distinct voice, clearly articulating our role


4. Annex 1. sets out the key responsibilities of the Committee for 2018 and provides assurance that all elements of the MPTS Committee’s role and function will be reviewed as part of the MPTS work programme.

5. The work programme will be regularly reviewed by the Chair of the MPTS Committee and the Committee will be informed of any substantive changes as part of the Executive Manager’s report.

Standing agenda items

6. In addition to the items contained in Table 1. (MPTS Committee’s key responsibilities for 2018) the Committee will review the following standing items at each meeting:
   - Chair’s Report (Oral)
   - Executive Manager’s Report: including the MPTS Risk Register and performance data
Equality and Diversity

7 In making its decisions the Committee will at all time pay due regard to equality and diversity. The MPTS Committee will receive regular updates on equality and diversity as part of the Executive Manager’s report.

Meeting Schedule

8 Below are the scheduled meeting dates for 2018

- Wednesday 7 February 2018, 10:00-13:00
- Wednesday 2 May 2018, 10:00-13:00
- Tuesday 11 September 2018, 10:00-13:00
- Thursday 15 November 2018, 10:00-13:00

9 All meetings will take place in St James’s Buildings, Manchester