

Minutes of the 68th meeting of the General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland. Tuesday 25 June 2019 – Chimney Corner Hotel, Newtownabbey

Present: David Canning (Chair), Áine Andrews (AA), Raymond Beggs (RB), David Cargo (DC), Paul Fitzpatrick (PF), Grainne McAleer (GMcA), Paddy McAllister (PMcA), Eamonn McDowell (EMcD), Siobhan McElhinney (SMcE), Brendan Morgan (BM), Catriona Mullan (CM), Paul O'Doherty (PO'D), Susan Parlour (SP), Rosemary Rainey (RR), Gordon White (GW).

In attendance: Sam Gallaher (CEO), Gerry Devlin (SEO), Majella Matthews (F&CM), Lesley Dickson, Sima Gondhia

Apologies: Delma Boggs, Clive Bowles, Paul Boyle, Carmel McCartan, Sheila Fleming, Cliodhna Scott-Wills, Mary-Lou Winchborne.

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

Action

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and recorded apologies.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest and the Chair reminded members that they may put forward any declarations as the meeting proceeded.

3. Confidential Matters

The Chair advised that the SEO had informed him of a recent legal ruling that potentially impacts on the delegated authority of Officers' and said that as a result a matter needed to be taken "In Committee".

The Council went "In Committee" at 10.40am.

4. Minutes of 65th Council Meeting of 11 December 2018

The Chair indicated that following discussion at the last Council meeting the minutes of meeting of 11th December 2018 had been amended. The Chair asked members to check for accuracy and content.

BM drew members attention to Page 2 of the re-drafted minutes regarding issued raised by SP. He said that while this is a longer set it still remains deficient.

He had concerns over how Council minutes are prepared. He said LD took notes and then drafted minutes and then passed them on to others. He said he had looked at what was written and it did not compare and had to ask for original notes as a ½ hour discussion was summarised in 7 words. Issues raised had been omitted and a different version put in. SP had raised the issue of approval regarding the survey of teachers at the meeting but was told that it had been



passed by the Committee and that no business case was required. There was no mention of this, because a business case was required and the Council had subsequently received limited assurance from the Auditors in this regard. BM expressed the view that the Registrar should not be involved in the preparation of minutes and was concerned how the minutes were being changed so that a certain slant was given. The revised minutes still do not reflect that this matter was passed by Committee.

The CEO said for clarification that when he stated a business case was not required he was referring to the fact that business case approval was not required from DE as the expenditure was within delegated limits

BM said so that was an error?

The CEO said that notes are taken at the meeting often by two people, LD prepares a draft minute which is reviewed by the CEO and subsequently the Chair. The draft is then tabled at the next Council meeting. This process has been followed in GTCNI for some time before his appointment.

BM said that he appreciated that this process had not been changed in recent times but asked why the CEO should be involved in writing up minutes as it should be the job of the Chair to make sure minutes are ratified. At a previous meeting the CEO said his communication was passed by the Committee. This was not accurate.

The CEO advised that regarding his introductory communication to teachers the Chair had been consulted along with PF who subsequently had reviewed the draft communication and that he had mentioned the intention in Committee as well.

RB said that on 11 December recorded in the annotation of the minutes the Registrar indicated that the decision was made by the Committee. BM is entitled to have the question answered. It is now no longer included. This would appear to be manipulation as there is no record of the Committee agreeing to this.

SP said that it was her words being discussed and she was surprised to see it condensed. She did ask about a business case and agreement of this and had looked at the papers and could not see a question. The CEO did say that no business case was required. Where was it agreed? She said that a member had contacted her to say that everything was fine. She advised that she had serious issues the way things are shortened. She indicated that at point 9 regarding the marketing manager she had objected to this and queried the purpose of such a role. "Members were in broad agreement" does not reflect in any way what happened. This is not what happened. She said that the CEO was talking about "the direction of travel". And a level of concern was voiced in terms of staff structure.

Action



The CEO said that matter was taken "In Committee" and his recollection was that a few people expressed concern, that there as a show of hands which indicated broad agreement.

Action

SP said that nothing was agreed and there was no show of hands. There was a powerpoint presentation and this did not reflect the view of the members.

The CEO said it is a question of whatever the Council are happy with in how the minutes are drafted and prepared. At the end of the day what was recorded indicated a consensus concerning possible direction. Nothing was approved as any restructure would be subject to affordability.

SP said we are talking about hiring of staff and this is members money. For the record it did not reflect the view of all the people there.

The Chair said that there was agreement. There is a need to approach the writing of minutes in an agreed and structured way and highlighted the NIAO guidance on minute preparation.

BM said that the Chair should oversee the minutes.

The Chair said this was not the case. He added that the accuracy is determined by the Council and that he had not signed the minutes of 11 December and these will only be signed when they are agreed as accurate by Council. He added that we also need to agree the format for how minutes are written and the NIAO could come along and give some guidance. Otherwise we will get caught up in this again and it is wasteful of time.

BM agreed with this approach and said that the minutes should go out as soon as possible after the meeting. SP was not at the next meeting after the December and you can remember what points you made but not those made by other people. Amendments can be put in beforehand.

RB added that he was not at the meeting but said he did not hear questions being answered. There was a misrepresentation of minutes that would benefit the person editing the minutes and he would like that addressed as this raises the question of risk. Even the second time round it appeared the minutes still were not accurate. He said that issues were not included and he was not getting answers.

SP said that on point 9 there was no way the Chair or the minute taker could judge the feeling of the meeting. There are governance concerns and he was concerned there was a limited response from the auditors.

DC advised that he would not like members to feel that we got a limited assurance because of the minutes.



RB said there were items within the minutes which caused limited assurance.

Action

DC said that a second look at how the minutes are produced would be helpful. The Minutes have not been signed. The way to address this would be to put an amendment to the minutes. If there are underlying issued you will find these being dealt with. He said there had been correspondence from DE at the last audit meeting. He said we could close this down with a proper amendment and asked if BM would like to propose and he would second.

SMcE advised that she was not at the last meeting and was concerned that these are not accurate and for what reason. She said the tone of the conversation is excluded and there are major inaccuracies and asked what else has been missed.

The Chair advised that he had never signed any minutes that the Council did not go through page by page for accuracy. Council agrees minutes, these are proposed and seconded and the Chair signs.

BM proposed that we review the mechanism by which minutes are prepared.

D Cargo seconded.

CEO

Members voted.

RB abstained.

PMcA advised that both himself and Siobhan had attended today due to issues in Council and were still on industrial action.

BM enquired if ARAC members are allowed to vote.

The SEO advised that members of ARAC have some powers of voting.

RB then voted.

The Chair asked for a form of words.

BM reads from LDs hand written notes and indicated that he has asked for these through an FOI request.

CEO said costs were within the delegated limits and he had made the Committee aware of the intent and that was noted on the day.

DC suggested a meeting with the Chair and Registrar to agree a form of words and bring back to the next Council. There is a need to have a form of words.



SP said that she agreed with D Cargo and that looking at number 9 members were not in agreement and she would not feel comfortable with this.

Action

DC indicated that members should agree a form of words to put to Council.

BM said that it should be an impartial form of words.

DC advised that the onus was on the amender to come forward with the approval. The Minutes could be deferred until they came back with amendments.

The Chair said that the minutes would remain in draft and not signed.

The CEO assured members that nothing malicious was going on. The notes are brief as LD and SG take the minutes as much as they can and maybe do not pick up everything. The F&CM sometimes also check these. The current long-standing process is how minutes get produced. The CEO stated he is happy to implement whatever Council is content with but would give assurance that nothing malicious is going on.

He reminded members that the minutes go outside of the organisation and other parties get these to review so it is important for members to consider how the organisation looks.

The Chair said that these were draft minutes and not signed and asked members to go and decide what they wanted put in and review these at the next meeting.

BM agreed to draft this.

BM

GW added that he was very conscious of time and asked if Council could put a time limit on discussion like this. It takes too much time to go through things letter by letter and there is a need to think about future meetings. Members do not have the time to spend.

The Chair said that BMs proposal should help.

Minutes of meeting on 21 March 2019

BM drew members attention to Page 10 7th paragraph. He indicated that GDp had said "Why are we discussing matters already dealt with in Committee and not "In Committee".

The CEO confirmed this and said the Minutes would be amended.

The Chair asked members for accuracy and approval for signing.

Proposed: RR Seconded: GW



Action: Minutes to be corrected and made available at the next meeting.

Action

4. Matters Arising

The Chair indicated that these would be dealt with in the Agenda.

12.40 PMcA left the meeting

5. CEO Update

The CEO advised that most of the report would be picked up in the Agenda but highlighted some points.

He said that the focus was on finalising the accounts for 17/18 and 18/19.

He advised that the GAR meeting had taken place and was a constructive meeting. Issues discussed were the reserves policy, the direction of the organisation which would link into the Corporate plan. He advised that the limited opinion received by the Auditors was driven by the response to addressing recommendations from previous audits.

CEO drew members' attention to an ex-employee who had submitted an Industrial Tribunal complaint. The CEO advised he had attended an initial hearing a few weeks ago and indicated that our insurance providers for cover purposes requested that we transfer the case their legal advisors. In doing this it was his assessment that there would be a greater propensity to settle, but that DSO thinks our case is strong. The hearing is scheduled for November. So the question for Council is to continue to having the case handled by DSO or revert to our insurers with potentially greater chance of settlement.

Remaining with the DSO costs are estimated to be £10-12,000. We are not pushing to settle and are minded to stay with DSO.

RB enquired if the decisions leading to this point were made by officers or Council.

The CEO stated the party had been dismissed in accordance with our policy and where the decisions referred to.

RB said that he did not recall this case being brought to Council.

The Chair said that hearings and appeals are heard by panels of Council.

RB added that he was concerned about the remit of officers.



The CEO confirmed that policies were followed and the employee dismissed.

Action

RB said that he did not recall dismissing anyone.

The CEO advised that this matter was ratified by the F&GP Committee and members of Council heard the appeal.

RB said that if we pay insurers why don't we use them.

EMcD added that we do not know the amount the person is claiming or what our legal costs would be, so how can this can be weighed up.

The CEO advised that legal costs had been estimated at. £10-£12,000 and a budget provision of £20k had been allowed for.

He asked members what they wanted to go with. He said with our insurers we may be forced to settle and members may not want to settle.

DC said that if he had barristers and solicitors who were involved from the start he would stay with them, as they would know the case from the beginning.

Proposed to stay with DSO: DC Seconded: GW

Show of hands: 7

RB proposed to amend the original proposition and use insurers advisors.

BM seconded that.

A vote was taken with 7 for and 7 against.

The Chair had the casting vote and advised that we will stick with the current legal advisor.

The CEO advised that the indication received is that we have a strong case.

RB enquired how much the legal costs would be even if we win.

CEO said about £10,000.

SMcE said it is stated £10,000 to £12,000 in her paper.

RB indicated that a cost of £10k is teachers money compared to £1000 insurance costs.

DC said that the money is GTCNI money.



Action

RB said it is public money.

The Chair said that DE would say it is their money.

SMcE said that teachers have to pay it.

The Chair advised that in England teachers still have to pay fees.

GW said that they do and they also have to pay local authorities where they teach.

BM asked if the Chair was taking the original proposal

The Chair asked if members wanted to stick with their own advisors and asked for a show of hands.

7 for

6 against

1 absent

The CEO discussed the NIPSA agreement and advised that he had offered to have a meeting with the NIPSA representative.

He advised members of booklets and documents enclosed for their information and advised of the British Council launch which he had attended.

BM enquired about the instruction from the Department and asked why this was not included in the report.

The CEO advised that it had not happened at the time the report was prepared.

BM said that the instruction had been received before the 18 June.

The CEO asked BM to repeat.

BM said that the CEO had discussed this work at PRRC and it was withdrawn and an email subsequently sent to PRRC members. He then asked why it was not mentioned in the report and why has the Council not been provided with the instruction.

The CEO advised that the instruction had not come through at the time of creating the report and offered to let members see the email. He advised that DE had raised the matter at the GAR meeting and then issued the email.

BM added that this was a fairly serious issue as they were over-riding the Council and asked where the instruction was.

The CEO said he would circulate the email to Council.

CEO



BM advised that he had written on Friday requesting this and still had not received it. The CEO said if he was patient he would receive it.

RB informed members that it was decided at Committees that the CEO would update members at meetings about any matters.

He said it was an order by DE to over-ride the Committee decision and he would like to know how DE knew about this and it was brought up at a GAR meeting. This would have to come from the Perm Secretary.

The CEO advised that at this was brought up at the end of the PRRC meeting under AOB and there was confusion as to how we may deal with this and said he decided to not to progress the matter. He then got communication from DE that they would like us to facilitate this survey by sending our an email and if people don't respond they then don't respond.

BM said that the CEO got instruction from DE and acted on it without discussion with PRRC and did not inform the Council. He said he was shocked that the CEO would go ahead and do this.

The CEO advised that he had been asked to do this by DE and at the PRRC meeting there was ambiguity.

BM said it was not accepted at PRRC.

The CEO advised that he subsequently sent an email to members after an email from DE.

BM noted it was after.

The CEO said that as an NDPB there is also a line of accountability through the CEO to the Perm Secretary.

RB asked what is the point of Council meetings and asked the Chair how many instructions GTCNI had received before.

The Chair advised members that this is the first instruction he has known to be sent and that it had been suggested at PRRC that a protocol was needed for dealing with research requests

BM advised that those minutes have not been agreed.

AA said that she was becoming very concerned at the level of aggression from some members towards the CEO. RR agreed.

RB said there were legitimate questions being asked and no direct answers received. He said he was looking for a simple yes or no. An order from DE to and ALB comes from the Perm Secretary and it is a strange thing for a Perm Secretary to do to ask for an email to be sent. He asked why under FOI does it take so long to receive information.

<u>Action</u>



BM said that a copy had not been sent.

The Chair advised that a reasonable timeframe was needed when making requests to the CEO and the level of aggression did concern him.

BM said that the point was that someone is acting on an instruction and the Council had not been told and there had been no consultation.

EMcD asked for a copy of the email to be read out to them as it would clear the air and the meeting could move on.

The Chair asked if it was possible.

The CEO accessed his laptop and advised that he had only been in post for a year and would caution against, or impress on, members wanting to be involved in what are operational decisions. He said he felt there was not a high degree of trust from some members and that some people don't seem to be working in the best interest of the profession and felt that members don't let us get on and do our job. The danger is that it slows things down. It appears that simpler matters seem become of more important.

BM asked if the meeting could move on and then come back.

RB highlighted a sentence in the enclosed letter to D Baker.

The CEO said h addressed the matter and recognises that may be construed differently.

RB asked if it could be confirmed that the Permanent Secretary has been informed officially that this could be misconstrued.

The CEO stated that Council are aware the legislative basis is weak.

RB asked if this was discussed at the GAR meeting.

The CEO said no but at a separate meeting on 3rd June

The Chair said that minutes could be requested.

The Chair advised that the Perm Secretary had asked for a solution to take regulation forward and Alison Chambers said she had planned a meeting to decide how we could take things forward together.

SMcE advised that when people request information she would be very wary.

DC advised that the CEO writes on behalf of the Council.

RB said that no member of Council was aware of this situation.

<u>Action</u>



The Chair said we were aware of the general context and that we have a weak legislative base.

Action

BM said this was discussed but there were issues that members were not aware of.

RB advised he had requested the legal advice before the CEO letter was issued and that the advice concerned him. He said anyone could get this letter through FOI and question the CEO about it.

BM said that RB was making a fair point.

The Chair emphasised for the need to move on.

7. Regulation - update report

GTC/19/68/2

The SEO advised that paper 2 had dealt with this.

8. ITE Accreditation of PGCE Programmes

GTC/19/68/3

The Chair advised that all PGCE programmes are to be accredited to 2023.

Proposed: PO'D Seconded: RR

The SEO advised that we intend to provide the HEIs with access to our brand in case they want to publicise this and showed members a draft of the certificate intended to be presented to each HEI.

AA requested that it be put on record that she had some reservations as she had encountered a particular problem at a review meeting.

9. 17/18 Annual Report & Accounts

GTC/19/68/4

The F&CM took members through this paper.

She advised that it was agreed that finalisation and certification of the Accounts would be delayed pending the HMRC's advices regarding our taxation status after CCNI's decision to decline charitable status.

HMRC's advices were received advising that our fee income is not taxable and this has been reflected in the Annual Report and notes to the Accounts. The only other change to these accounts is to update the GS and other relevant sections to reflect the limited IA assurance received in respect of 2018-19.

The F&CM asked members approval for this report to go to NIAO for certification and thereafter for laying at the NI Assembly at the earliest date and publication on our website.



The Chair asked if our sponsor body are satisfied.

Action

The F&CM answered that they were.

DC advised that this report had gone through the ARAC and congratulated staff on their work and said he was happy to endorse.

Proposed: DC Seconded: RR

10. NIAO 17/18 Report for Those Charged with Governance GTC/19/68/05

The F&CM took members through this report highlighting the key messages:

Their proposed certification of the 2017-18 Accounts with an unqualified audit opinion without modification.

That they did not identify any priority 1 recommendations.

Two lesser recommendations were made and these have been implemented and are included in the Report.

She directed members to a copy of the Letter of Representation to the C&AG that will be signed by the CEO and accompany these accounts.

She advised this report was for members information.

The Chair said he was pleased with this position.

11. Audit and Risk Assurance Annual Report

GTC/19/68/06

And

12. Internal Audit Annual Report

GTC/19/68/07

DC advised members that the Council is required to produce and ARAC Report. He thanked the F&CM for has assistance. He said it was a very full report of the activities of the ARAC and that the format complies with best practice. He said the report was being brought to Council for noting and approval.

He highlighted one issue that as a result of activities had received a limited opinion and that considering the Annual Opinion and Report for 18/19 there was still a way to go to for GTCNI to be an efficient corporate body. He advised that there were a number of issues highlighted in the Audit Opinion and would encourage members to take note of the Annual Report and Opinion and focus on what action is required in order to obtain a satisfactory opinion. He said he had spoken to the Head of Internal Audit and as we do not have a



corporate plan this also contributes to a limited opinion. It is important to note that opinion and galvanise ourselves to get a satisfactory opinion next year.

Action

The Chair thanked DC.

DC asked for a proposer.

Proposer: RR Seconded: BM

GMcA left the meeting at 1.30pm

13. 2019-2022 Corporate Plan, 19/20 Business Plan, Budget 19/20 GTC/19/68/08

CEO

The CEO spoke regarding the draft Corporate Plan received at Committees reiterating that this was the Council's plan. He advised he had received some favourable comment but not comments from everyone. He said the overall intent was to fulfil our statutory functions and use the reserves over the period to support operations and cover contingent liabilities. Our 3 statutory functions are Registration, Regulation and to Promote Teacher Professionalism.

He said that in the context of the plan the allocated budget (DE) is likely to continue to be the same as the past two years. He advised that regulation will bring additional cost pressures and the dynamics of this can change from year to year. We will need to bid for additional finance cover which is essentially requesting access to our reserves.

The CEO advised that the plan has not gone to the Department as yet and it is for the Council to set direction. There is no guarantee regarding the budget and said that the new Council can consider financial sustainability for the long term. Given time pressure in the meeting he advised that he would write to everyone to give them a final chance for comment. He advised that the Business Plan reflected the corporate objectives and alignment of staffing would flow from the corporate plan. He said he was happy to take comments.

This matter did not go to ARAC.

SMcE said that she was concerned about an increase in fees.

The CEO said he would re-draft that line but that Council needs to think of the longer term.

SMcE asked that on page 8 would the table be inserted.



The CEO said it will show DE intent that we are a well-run organisation and also for teachers to reflect that we promote professionalism as well as staff.

Action

SP asked about supplementing income from other sources.

The CEO referred to partnership working and the option of sponsorship.

SMcE suggested a business case to the Department of Finance.

The CEO said that there are other things we could do that the Department may possibly fund us for. Council needs to be open to other possible sources of funding which could ease pressure on need to amend registration fees.

SP added that we will need a substantial amount of money and that we need to be clear regarding our direction.

The CEO said that the plan as drafted affords time to plan for the longer term while fulfilling our statutory functions. Reserves will need to be used in a measured way. The CEO cited that the Council had an asset in workforce information that it was not using fully.

SP asked for an explanation.

The CEO advised that the Council had a database of 27,000 records. As far as he could see we do not use this information effectively to inform our work.

EMcD said that he did not want this information given to anyone.

The CEO explained that was not what he meant.

EMcD said we are not doing what we should be and need to focus on regulation.

DC said that the Council needs a corporate plan. If there are things we do not want in it or to do we need to say. We are at risk with no corporate plan. If there issues of concern, this is only a framework. If we are asked for extra work from DE we could ask for payment. There is no intention to sell teacher information.

The CEO said that we want the best for teachers and the profession and Council has a role in advising on and approving the business plan that sets out planned activities. He advised that at some point income will have to be looked at. This plan allows us to fulfil our statutory functions.

SMcE said she was nervous about being asked to trust the leadership. She highlighted the reference to a Code of Professional Practice and said we should be careful about this.



The CEO advised that it is not uncommon for a professional body set standards of practice

Action

The SEO said that we do have a Code of Values and Professional Practice and it would be up to the next Council to decide if it needs to be updated.

CEO

RB asked if Committees have seen this document.

The CEO said they had.

RB asked the Chair of ARAC had seen it as he had the Cttee minutes and it was not shown in it. He said it should have been submitted to ARAC where DE, IA and NIAO were present so that they could have gone through this line by line and this could have been presented to the Council as final. He said he objected as a member of this Committee that this was not presented.

The CEO said it was unfair to ask the Chair.

The CEO advised that this plan is the Council's plan and said that its members responsibility to give direction. The plan as it stands is internal and has to be submitted to DE in due course. Half of the ARAC members are from outside of the organisation. The purpose is to agree internally and then present the plan to the Department. We need to show that it aligns with their agenda. It should be agreed by members first and that it had been on the agenda for several meetings. He said a copy had been emailed to GTCNI ARAC members for comment.

RB said that this is a governance matter and should have been given to ARAC. The decision should be made by the Chair and he did not accept that we should not share our thinking with the people who guide us and he would welcome their views.

The CEO said he would take the view that this is not being adversarial but more about considering presentation.

DC said that Council does not have a corporate plan and it is incumbent to have one in place. He asked if Council could agree. This is only the start as DE will go through the report with a fine tooth comb.

The CEO said this will affect our operational decisions throughout the year and will its workings out will go through Committees. He said he was happy to circulate again and take comments.

<u>CEO</u>

DC advised that if members are uncomfortable about funding the line could be taken out.



SMcE asked if the piece about fees could be taken out and on page 2 the issue about school trends as this depends on who you are talking to.

Action

The CEO said these were NISRA statistics.

The Chair asked members to send in comments to the CEO.

The CEO said he would send an email to all Council Members.

SMcE asked if we were ratifying this or was it for the new Council.

The CEO advised that it would be this Council and passed to the new Council.

DC advised that the Council needs a cautious 3 year plan and needs a timescale for comments.

The CEO suggested aiming for the end of July.

DC advised that there is a time pressure on a corporate body and that we don't wish to slip back towards special measures. If the Department require us to have a Corporate Plan then the aim should be to show our compliance.

The CEO said this would most likely be reviewed by the next Council.

The Chair asked if members were content.

14. Election Update

GTC/19/68/09

The SEO advised he had to make some changes. The Department wrote the scheme and approval is a matter of routine.

15. Schedule of meetings 2019 & 2020 and transition to new Council GTC/19/68/10

The CEO advised that this would be completed over the summer holidays and that there would be a new Council in October. He said he was proposing to have Committee meetings and a Council meeting in September. LD to work on dates.

16. Minutes of Committees (Chairs)

a) ARAC Minutes (draft)

GTC/19/68/11

DC advised that matters within the ARAC minutes had already been covered during the meeting.

b) F&GP Minutes (Draft)

GTC/19/68/12



All matters had been discussed in the meeting. The ROW fees had been agreed.

Action

c) Human Resources Committee (Draft) GTC/19/68/13

The Chair informed members that he had sent the Committee minutes to members.

d) Policy, Registration and Regulation Committee (Draft)

GTC/19/68/14

BM took members through this paper advising that most of the issues had already been discussed. He advised that Eugene O'Loan had attended and there had been a lively discussion. Noted that regulation would not be going ahead this year. Issues raised by AA had been discussed. He advised that the budget options had been put to the Committee and that ROW fees had also been discussed along with the use of data.

At this point in the meeting the CEO read the email regarding the instruction from the Department.

BM requested that this be forwarded to members of the PRRC.

RB added that he was concerned regarding the Analysis of Budget Options paper. He advised that he had attended as an observer and that other Committees got a different Options paper.

The Chair advised that the F&GP committee had been provided with 5 options.

The CEO said that demonstrative budgets had been put forward to feed into Corporate Planning

RB said that reporting this in the ARAC minutes is to keep everyone safe. How can the Committee scrutinise the paper if the documents are not the same.

DC said that this paper was not discussed at the ARAC meeting and that the Audit Office had commended them on this as best practice.

RB said he was concerned about the different reports.

BM asked what the reason was that Committees were not presented with the same report.

RB also raised this point and asked why different Committees were presented with different papers.

The CEO said that it relates to the corporate plan and was he was being circumspect for ARAC and the information was for illustrative purposes only.



RB then asked if the CEO was saying that different Committees were

not issued with different options. He also asked this question from the Chair.

The CEO explained the reason why ARAC had a different options paper.

DC said that he had not been asked if this was an item on the Agenda as it should not have been on the Agenda as it was a matter for the other Committees. With the support of the Audit Office discussion was prevented.

RB added that he appreciated the comments and asked if ARAC was presented with 3 options when the others had 5.

The CEO replied that the other Committees had more substantial papers.

BM asked if that was a yes. Did they get 3 or 5?

Chair said all other Committees got 5.

The CEO advised that what ARAC received regarding budget options was pertinent to this year i.e.19/20.

RB said this only became an issue because of his attendance at 2 Committees.

DC said that there needed to be a root and branch review of the minutes, role of Chairs and Agendas and that he would prefer to wait until such a review to discuss this.

17. Risk Register

GTC/19/68/15)

DC took members through this paper, advising it was a dynamic document and was accurate at the point of production. It is the Council's Risk Register and has their corporate ownership. It is part of the governance structure and members have a responsibility for it and not just the ARAC. He advised that it may change before the next meeting.

18. AOB

The SEO said that there would be 3 Reviews of Decision coming up soon and he required members for the panel. He said he would email members to check availability.

19. Date of Next meeting

TBA



	Action
Signed Daril annun Dated 14/10/19	
) Signed Line () Lin	
9	



General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland

2	**************************************	Action