

**Minutes of the Regulatory and Professional Policy Committee Meeting held online via Microsoft Teams on 16 November 2023 at 10.30am**

**Agenda Item A - Apologies**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Present (Yes/No)</b>
Mr Rory O'Donnell	Chair	Yes
Ms Gráinne Power		No – apologies
Ms Marie Louisa Power		Yes
Mr Peter Dennehy		Yes
Ms Dorothy Donovan		Yes
Mr Mark Jordan		No – apologies
Ms Geraldine Crowley		Yes
Dr Laura Sahm		Yes
<b><i>Members of PSI staff in attendance for part or all of the meeting included:</i></b>		
<i>Ms Damhnait Gaughan</i>	<i>Head of Practitioner Assurance</i>	
<i>Mr Dan Burns</i>	<i>Head of Strategic Policy, Research and Communication</i>	
<i>Ms Cora O'Connell</i>	<i>Professional Standards Manager</i>	
<i>Ms Therese Anglim</i>	<i>Communication Project Executive</i>	

**Colour code: Red—for decision; Green—for discussion; Blue—for information**

### Agenda Item B – Declaration of Interests

#### Issue

Declaration of interests by members of the Committee.

#### Information

The Chair invited members of the Committee to declare any conflicts of interest regarding any of the items scheduled for discussion at the meeting before it commenced.

#### Decision Approved and/or Action Requested

The members of the Committee declared no conflicts of interest.

### Agenda Item C – Approval of meeting agenda

#### Issue

The Committee was asked if they were content to proceed with the meeting as per the agenda.

#### Information

The meeting agenda had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

#### Decision Approved and/or Action Requested

The Committee approved the agenda of the meeting on the proposal of Mr Peter Dennehy and seconded it by Ms Dorothy Donovan.

### Agenda Item D – Approval of Minutes – 25 September 2023 meeting

#### Issue

Approval of the Minutes of the Regulatory and Professional Policy Committee meeting held on 21 September 2023.

#### Information

The Chair noted that the draft minutes of the Regulatory and Professional Policy Committee Meeting held on 21 September had been circulated to Committee members in advance of the meeting.

#### Decision Approved and/or Action Requested

**Decision Approved:** The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2023 on the proposal of Ms Dorothy Donovan and seconded by Ms Marie Louisa Power.

## Agenda Item E - CPD Model for Pharmacists - Draft Report for Review of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Model for Pharmacists in Ireland (2023)

### Issue

The Committee was provided with an update via a memo and a draft report of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Model for Pharmacists.

### Information

The Committee was provided with an update by Damhnait Gaughan.

The Committee was provided with an overview of the project to date, which is a multi-annual project running across 2022–2023, reviewing the current model of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for pharmacists to ensure it supports future pharmacist practice in all settings, that it is agile, adaptive, and sustainable, and that it delivers value for money.

Following the successful completion of a competitive tender process, Mazars was appointed in December 2022 as the external contractor to assist PSI with this project. A presentation of the work conducted to date, emergent findings, and next steps was delivered by Mazars to the Committee at its meeting on 13 April 2023. The finalised draft report by Mazars sets out the outcomes and recommendations arising from the review. The Committee will be asked at the 30 November meeting to sign off on the report and to recommend the report for approval at the 14 December Council meeting.

The Committee was requested to provide their feedback under the following headings:

- i. Are recommendations grounded in evidence and rational?
- ii. Can any observations or evidence be further developed into recommendations or the report?
- iii. Were the key deliverables of the review met?

Under the first heading, the Committee focused their discussion on each individual recommendation.

#### **Recommendation 1: Investigate opportunities to incorporate intra and inter-profession collaboration into the CPD Model**

The Committee discussed the first recommendation and broadly accepted and supported it. There were no further remarks.

#### **Recommendation 2: Consider reducing the CPD cycle period and/or the CPD review eligibility period for newly qualified pharmacists and/or the introduction of mandatory CPD submissions before the end of the cycle period (with a view to sustaining engagement in the medium to long term)**

The second recommendation was discussed by the Committee. There was some debate concerning the exact meaning of the recommendation. The Committee suggested that the recommendation's wording be revised to make it easier to understand. The Committee commented that they view the reduction in the CPD cycle period as a positive and useful recommendation.

**Recommendation 3: Remove the Practice Review element from the CPD Model**

The Committee discussed this recommendation and concluded that it would be a welcome and useful recommendation based on the evidence in the report. There were no further comments.

**Recommendation 4: Redefine the precise scope of the CPD model desired, based on the information in this report & related reports and, when that is complete, identify the mechanism by which that scope is best delivered**

The Committee discussed this recommendation. A discussion was held to determine whether the recommendation's wording was overly vague. The Committee requested that the wording in this recommendation be clarified. Following that, the Committee considered the reference to 'perceived conflict of interest' in relation to accreditation and procurement processes, as described in the report. The Committee heard about the history of procurement, the circumstances that gave rise to the perceived 'conflict' and how this is managed through accreditation processes. The Committee noted the difficulties, and PSI agreed to feedback the observations to Mazars.

**Recommendation 5: Incorporate enhanced risk-based approaches to the sampling of practitioners for CPD review processes**

The Committee discussed this recommendation and found it to be generally acceptable and beneficial. There were no further comments.

**Recommendation 6: Develop a flexible, administrative process to couple annual registration with satisfactory CPD compliance.**

The Committee discussed this recommendation and found it to be acceptable and useful. The Committee suggested that there might be potential for satisfactory compliance with CPD certification to have validity for a year or longer. It was noted that satisfactory compliance with CPD, for other healthcare professionals' registration, is demonstrated in the report, as typically being an annual requirement.

**Recommendation 7: Incorporate peer feedback – or discussion – into the self-reflection process.**

The Committee discussed the last recommendation. The Committee supported peer-to-peer feedback, noting that it has been successfully implemented in other healthcare CPD models. The Committee also stated that receiving peer-to-peer feedback should not be

made complicated or time-consuming, or need not be a requirement for every CPD cycle undertaken by pharmacists.

Under the second heading, the Committee focused their discussion on whether there was any other evidence that could be further developed into recommendations or reports.

The Committee commented that it was great to have comparisons from different countries in the tables provided in the report's body, however, Ireland was missing from some comparison tables, and they would like to see Ireland included. The Committee also noted that the methodology was robust, well-researched, and utilised a non-English-speaking region. A Committee member noted that it would be useful to see greater detail on the composition of focus groups for example, the number of pharmacists who participated in the focus groups.

The Committee inquired whether the appointment of a pharmacy leadership body is consistent with PSI's current corporate strategy. The Committee was informed that the Workforce Intelligence Report recommended that this action and a feasibility study would need to be carried out.

The Committee then discussed the use of mobile devices to access the ePortfilo. The Committee noted that being able to access the IOP's portal via mobile phone and receive push notifications would be beneficial, as this is now a more current and common means to receive information and updates.

Under the third heading, the Committee focused their discussion on whether the key deliverables of the review were met.

The Committee reviewed each of the key deliverables and came to an agreement that they had all been met. The Committee highlighted that the report did not include any projected expenses. The Committee noted that this was difficult to achieve in the absence of a clear scope for the model, as noted by Mazars.

The Committee next asked whether legislation would need to be changed. The Committee heard that the legislation in question is secondary legislation, therefore the process would be straightforward because the PSI has ownership of the Rules, within a broad scope.

#### **Decision Approved and/or Action Requested**

The Committee noted the update.

Agenda Item F – Any Other Business

**Issue**

The Committee was asked if there was any other business to discuss.

**Information**

None was raised.

**Decision Approved, and/or Action Requested**

None.

**The meeting concluded at 11.35 am.**

**Signed by:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**