

**Governance review – update and national issues**

**The purpose of this paper** is to highlight and invite comment on issues affecting members on a national basis as the result of Council’s preference for a new Council of about 12 elected members and a small number of committees to support it.

The Governance Working Group is meeting with members from country boards and the English Regional Networks in late February. This meeting, plus any other feedback on this paper, will inform Council’s decision at its meeting on 22 March.

**The CSP governance review and work to date**

Governance is about having *robust structures and processes to manage the overall direction, effectiveness, supervision and accountability of the CSP to achieve our vision*. Good governance is essential if the CSP is to remain a significant influencer, campaigner and strong membership body. The CSP Council initiated a governance review in December 2015 in response to weaknesses identified through member and staff feedback, benchmarking with others and against best practice.

More information about the review and its progress is summarised in a ‘Members’ update’ paper at the end of this document.

**Council composition and ensuring diversity**

The CSP Council’s strongly preferred governance model features *a small Council of about 12 members*. Council members will be elected to represent all CSP members and work in the best interests of the physiotherapy profession as a whole. For this reason, there was a general agreement at the December Council meeting that there would be no need to segment the Council, so no ‘protected’ seats for particular groups of CSP members such as associate or student members.

The Council must provide credible and relevant leadership to the physiotherapy profession, representing all aspects of the CSP’s diverse membership. This means accessing particular member expertise or perspectives as appropriate to inform Council policies and decisions. There are existing ways of doing this, for examples using the Professional Networks, Student Executive, Country Boards and English Regional Networks and members are encouraged to suggest other ways of tapping into members’ views.

**National and regional perspectives and input**

The CSP is made up of members from across the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands and Isle of Man. This diversity gives the Society considerable knowledge and strength to promote the physiotherapy profession and promote the rights of our members. This ‘coming together’ of members for a common purpose is a powerful concept and needs to be reflected in the CSP Council. Any Council proposals should not feed into any wider sense of disenfranchisement in UK institutions members may have.

Council must continue to tap into different country experiences and perspectives to provide *credible and relevant leadership to members wherever they live and work*. This is not about bringing in particular knowledge or expertise as the Country Boards, ERNs and our staff will continue to be responsible for ensuring that the advice they give reflects country or region specific issues and views.

The function of Country Boards is unaffected by the Governance Review. It is their role to inform policy formulated by Council and to offer country-specific views on policy and practice. This will continue regardless of the composition of the Council. The function of the English regional Networks is not covered by the review. They will continue to be a means for members to identify region-specific issues.

CSP staff have the expertise and responsibility to ensure that country and regional issues and perspectives, including tapping into members’ views, are reflected in the CSP’s work. Political, industrial and professional differences are built into structures, with staff based in Edinburgh, Belfast and Cardiff working closely with the country boards and country networks. Professional advisers have been added to the Welsh and Scottish offices to strengthen engagement with members in both countries over professional issues. Additional staffing has also been deployed to support regional engagement and member input in England.

**How does the Council ensure it is credible with its members across all of the United Kingdom and Crown Dependencies?**

Several options are described below, along with pros and cons. This list is not comprehensive and does not represent the views of Council. It aims to provide a starting point for further thought and discussion ahead of the March Council meeting.

1. One option would be to assign *portfolios* to individual Council members, for example, a member could take a lead responsibility for liaising with members in Northern Ireland. This could involve attending NI Board meetings but wouldn’t be restricted to existing formal structures and there may be inventive and high tech ways of engaging with members in NI.

Pro - provides contact point for country board, ERNs and members more generally, with direct link to Council

Con – could feel tokenistic, danger that other Council members do not engage and rely on portfolio holder to think about national issues

1. Whereas the majority of Council seats will be open all members to vote on, another option would be to provide for members in each of the four countries to vote for one specific Council member. This would provide some element of geographical diversity although these Council members would represent all members and not be bound by directions from country boards or ERNs.

Pro – provides a figurehead for each country

Con – encourages ‘national’ Council member to focus on specific country rather than needs of all CSP members, potentially limiting their contribution to Council

1. A variation on the above option is to structure elections so that that candidates with the highest number of votes from each nation are counted first, then the remaining seats are allocated on a ‘first past the post’ basis.

Pro – aims to ensure ‘national’ members have credibility through voting process.

Con – relies on members from all countries standing for election.

1. One option is to make no special provision for member nations on Council’s membership. Existing structures, notably the country boards and the English Regional Networks, already recognise the diversity of the CSP membership and ensure that all members’ needs are represented.

Pro – reinforces principle that all Council members will consider all members’ needs, making particular interests or groups less marginalised. This is in line with approach taken for others with particular needs or interests e.g. students and associates.

Con – concerned members may feel this approach doesn’t give sufficient guarantees that national and regional views will inform Council’s work

There may be other options to address concerns around ensuring Council is diverse and credible with members across the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. Members are encouraged to think about this and offer further suggestions and ideas.

**The Governance Working Group want to hear from you**

Members are invited to comment on this paper, in particular:

* How can the proposed new CSP Council have the confidence and support of all members wherever they work and live?
* Without protected seats Council could be elected without members from each country serving as Council members. What practical and presentational issues would this create?
* What are the ways of ensuring the ‘voice’ of members are fed into CSP Council work and decisions?
* What other suggestions and advice do you have to offer the group ahead of it making further recommendations to the Council in March 2017?

Comments should be sent to the GWG at [Governancereview@CSP.org.uk](mailto:Governancereview@CSP.org.uk) by Tuesday 21 February 2017.

Feedback from this exercise will be discussed when the GWG meets with members of the English Regional Networks and the Northern Ireland, Scottish and Welsh Boards on 24 February 2107.

There will be a fringe meeting at the Annual Representative Conference on Monday 6 March 2017 on the governance review. The CSP Council will update members on the review and answer questions.

**Alex MacKenzie (Chair), Sharon Greensill, Beverley Harden**

**CSP Governance Working Group**

**7 February 2107**

**Governance review – members update**

**20 January 2017**

*Purpose of paper*

This paper provides members with a summary of Council decisions taken on governance and identifies what work is planned for the future.

*What is the governance review?*

Governance is about having robust structures and processes to manage the overall direction, effectiveness, supervision and accountability of the CSP to achieve our vision. Good governance is essential if the CSP is to remain a significant influencer, campaigner and strong membership body. The CSP Council initiated a governance review in December 2015 in response to weaknesses identified through member and staff feedback, benchmarking with others and against best practice.

*Modernisation of governance*

Improvements to governance processes are being made alongside the review. Council work is more focussed on strategic decision making and the quality and timeliness of meeting paperwork has improved. Definitions about the roles and responsibilities of Council members and the purpose of Council (‘to provide leadership of the physiotherapy profession and governance of the CSP’) have been agreed to make expectations clearer and improve accountability.

*Current governance arrangements*

The Council is the governing body of the CSP and provides leadership to the physiotherapy profession and governance of the CSP. This means it is responsible for determining the strategic direction of the Society and holding the Chief Executive and her staff to account.

Most of the 27 Council members are elected by members based on where members live or their work.

Council can delegate its functions (but not its overall responsibilities) to committees and there are at least 12 CSP committees that currently meet regularly. Based on benchmarking with other organisations the CSP’s current committee structure is overly complicated and bureaucratic, with far more committees than others.

**Governance review update**

The CSP Council’s work will ensure that the CSP governance structure and processes are ‘**fit for purpose’**, that is they:

* 1. Promote and progress the CSP vision and strategic priorities
  2. Enable and support member involvement and influence
  3. Enable appropriate strategic decision making
  4. Reflect good practice and value for money

Every Council member is a representative of CSP membership elected to lead the profession. Under new arrangements there will be a shared understanding that **Council members consider *all* members’ needs and work in the best interests of the profession** **as a whole**, informing their work using a range of communication methods and their own expertise and analysis. This means that current ‘segmentation’ of Council seats, with protected seats for particular members based on what they do or where they live, is longer necessary.

In December the Council identified a **preferred model** for future governance, with a **smaller Council consisting of 12 elected seats**. The review is now looking at election systems and how long Council members should serve to balance fresh perspective and new opportunities for members with continuity and shared knowledge.

**Small Council (c. 12 members)**

Providing leadership of the physiotherapy profession and governance of the CSP

Small number of permanent committees dealing with on-going Council business

Short life working groups to deal with time limited issue as required.

Drawing expertise to inform decision making as required (e.g. ERNs, country boards, professional networks, associates, students & union groups)

The review is looking to ensure that Council reflects the **diversity of the CSP membership**. Council must be credible with all members wherever they live and work and a separate briefing paper on this issue, posing questions to members, has been published (response deadline is 21 February).

Principles are being developed to **ensure Council taps into particular member perspective or expertise** to inform its decisions as necessary, e.g. by using the English Regional networks, country boards, professional networks, focus groups or surveys. This principle will also apply to Council committees and working groups.

In Council’s preferred model there are **fewer committees** meeting regularly to carry out work delegated by Council. Decisions about the work of these committees will be taken at the March and June Council meetings. Proposals will be based on what work Council needs support with, rather than current structures and arrangements.

At the December meeting Council agreed other measures to streamline and modernise CSP governance. **‘Alternates’,** individuals who shadow and stand in for Council members, do not feature in the preferred model. Council members’ shared responsibility for CSP finance and resources will be reinforced with the removal of the **Honorary Treasurer** role.

**Next steps**

Any significant change is for members to agree at the Annual General Meeting on 11 November 2017. In preparation, Council will work up the details of its preferred model. Members will be updated after Council meetings in March and June. An information session will also be held at the Annual Representative Conference on Monday 6 March.

More information about the review can be found of the CSP website. Any questions or comments should go to the Governance Working Group [Governancereview@CSP.org.uk](mailto:Governancereview@CSP.org.uk)