

**BACP Public Protection Committee Meeting  
Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> February 2026  
MS Teams at 10:00hrs**

**Report Information**

<b>Meeting Date</b>	Wednesday 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2026
<b>Venue</b>	Teams
<b>Confidential/Non-Confidential</b>	Confidential
<b>Author</b>	Clair Parfrey, Governance officer

**Purpose of the Report**

To obtain approval	✓	To canvas opinion	
For information/ to note	✓	Regulatory requirement	
To provide advice		To highlight any emerging risks	

**Attendees**

<b>Committee Members Present</b>	Dr Paul Taylor	PT	Committee Chair
	Dr Lynette Harborne	LH	Committee Member
	Pippa Menzies	PM	Committee Member
	Leon White	LW	Committee Member (from 3.1)
<b>BACP Staff Present</b>	Phil James	PJ	CEO
	Dr Lisa Morrison	LM	Director of Professional Standards, Policy and Research
	Clair Parfrey	CP	Governance Officer
	James Pickering	JP	Registrar
	Jo Holmes	JH	Safeguarding Lead
	James Walker	JW	Register Manager
	Caroline Jesper	CJ	Head of Professional Standards (item 3.1 only)
	Sarah Watson	SW	Accreditation Lead (item 3.1 only)
<b>Apologies</b>	Ciaran Doyle	CD	Committee Member

Item No	<b>General business</b>
1.0	<b>Preliminary matters</b>
1.1	<p><b>Welcome, introductions, apologies, declarations of interest and quoracy.</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed all in attendance. Apologies have been received from Ciaran Doyle. The meeting was noted as quorate. There were no declarations of Interest.</p>
1.2	<p><b>Confirmation of agenda</b></p> <p>The Chair outlined the changes to the agenda and asked the committee to provide feedback. The Committee agreed that the agenda covered all relevant topics.</p> <p>The use of the question sheet for submitting queries was discussed and it was confirmed that SLT/paper authors would respond before the meeting enabling all members to see the answers. Questions on papers can still be raised during meetings.</p>
1.3	<p><b>Minutes of last meetings</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2025 were reviewed and approved for signature.</p> <p>It was noted that going forward the open actions will be included in the agenda.</p>
1.4	<p><b>Governance update</b></p> <p>PJ gave an update on the Charity commission’s feedback on the recent internal investigation around financial irregularities in and around the boardroom and governance concerns. It was confirmed that the Charity Commission are happy with BACP’s actions. We were able to tell them that learnings have already been taken, and new procedures are in place, including a review of the articles.</p> <p>We are looking for BACP members to be part of the working group to review the articles and would particularly welcome input from this committee. It is hoped that the revisions will be ready for sharing with the BACP membership in July to allow them to be voted on at the AGM in November 2026. If it transpires that this is not feasible then an extraordinary general meeting could be staged in the spring of 2027.</p> <p>Two of the more public outcomes from that investigation were the departure of the chair and the deputy chair from the board.</p> <p>Communications to BACP members are currently being prepared</p> <p>The CC also commented on our response to the CASS review which relates to the treatment for gender dysmorphia amongst young people and asked us to be aware of our responsibilities.</p>

	<p>It was noted that the PSA have been aware of the situation and are happy with the resolution.</p> <p>The Chair and committee thanked the CEO and staff for their extensive input into resolving this issue</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>Items for noting</b>
2.1	<p><b>Safeguarding of members</b></p> <p>JH had submitted a report which provides an update of safeguarding activities, trends and progress made since the last update to the PPC and to consider any risks to the profession.</p> <p>There were no matters of emergent risk.</p> <p>This item was taken as read. No questions had been raised by committee members prior to the meeting.</p>
2.2	<p><b>Register Development Report</b></p> <p>JP has submitted a report that details activity that is ongoing within or that impacts the Register which contributes to BACP's wider Public Protection remit.</p> <p>This item was taken as read. No questions had been raised by committee members prior to the meeting.</p>
2.3	<p><b>Serious Case Report</b></p> <p>JW presented a short overview on the current serious cases - this has since been added to the meeting pack.</p> <p>An interim suspension order may be imposed on a member on initial receipt where we think there is a risk of public protection or followings an investigation and assessment by committee. This allows us to ask the board to approve an article 12.5 resolution which maintains the member in membership for the purposes of Professional Conduct, this is essential to allow us to publicise the potential risk.</p> <p>An overview of the current open serious cases was presented.</p> <p>The committee discussed the relationship between BACP and the judiciary and the wider criminal justice processes.</p>
2.4	<p><b>Ethical framework Review</b></p> <p>LM updated the PPC on progress of the Ethical Framework review and specifically the findings informing the new Ethical Framework. The continued hard work of the team was noted.</p> <p>There were no questions raised.</p>

3	<b>Items for discussion</b>
3.1	<p><b>Service Accreditation Criteria</b></p> <p>CJ's paper asks that the committee Consider and endorse the development and oversight processes and procedures involved in the revision of the Service Accreditation criteria and to recommend approval to the Board.</p> <p>The service accreditation scheme review's main objective was to complete an in-depth review from an equality, diversity and inclusive perspective and ensure the scheme is fit purpose in the current climate following the recent high-profile case with one of our accredited services and also to increase oversight of larger organisations.</p> <p>Embedding EDI into the scheme is key to ensuring that services are increasing accessibility for marginalised and disadvantaged clients whilst also raising the standards for working with diverse client groups and ensuring the scheme supports services to diversify their workforce.</p> <p>Learning was taken from the processes used in the course accreditation scheme review and then adapted for developing the service scheme criteria.</p> <p>A working group and focus groups reviewed the scheme and made suggestions for developing the criteria.</p> <p>Following this an expert review panel were commissioned to review the new draft criteria and provide specialist input.</p> <p>The committee discussed the paper and in particular the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Perceived inconsistency in language.</b> SW noted this and will check however there is some deliberate use of different terms due to the spread of services affected.</li> <li>2. <b>Contracting</b> It was raised that there didn't appear to be a specific section on contracting. It was explained that contracting is covered in criteria A3 and B1 and is also addressed throughout the rest of the criteria.</li> <li>3. <b>Specific requirements around supervisors</b> also needing to keep their knowledge of anti-oppressive, inclusive and culturally informed practises up to date. SW commented that this is embedded in the required annual CPD for staff and associates/volunteers on anti-oppressive practise and EDI training The concerns about supervisors ongoing CPD in this area will be carried forward into the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase or our review of all our supervision requirements.</li> <li>4. <b>Section B13 - safeguarding</b> does not appear to include trainees or volunteers. SW noted this and will check that it is covered.</li> <li>5. <b>Accreditation of larger organisations</b> such as 'Better Help' and 'Health Assured' was discussed. The current scheme has restricted oversight of the larger organisations that are already accredited and it was felt that it is necessary to tighten up those elements, particularly around online working and working across broader geographical areas.</li> </ol>

	<p>6. <b>Will the amended criteria put accreditation out of the reach of some organisations?</b> CJ commented that she is confident that there is no reason why services cannot meet the criteria, even those operating on restricted funding. We offer support and can help them prepare.</p> <p>7. <b>Complaints procedure.</b> SW confirmed that we will be asking for all a service providers policies including their complaints policy to be visible to the public on their websites</p> <p>8. <b>Trainee status.</b> In the ethical framework it is stated that clients must be aware of the trainee status of a therapist, this is the responsibility of the trainee and the organisation as they both agree to adhere to the ethical framework.</p> <p>Supplementary guidance will be produced for existing and new services seeking accreditation about the types of evidence that we're looking for to support them to meet the criteria.</p> <p>There has been careful consideration of the criteria to ensure that we are not excluding some of the smaller accredited services. The risk that existing accredited services may be unhappy with the new criteria has been discussed within the focus groups, there have also been numerous opportunities for service providers to raise concerns around this during annual reviews and the BACP course and service day. Based on feedback it is felt that these criteria will be welcomed.</p> <p>A carefully planned implementation period is planned to ensure that we are supporting services to get to where they need to be with the criteria.</p> <p>The committee and CEO thanked the staff involved for their work on this project.</p> <p><b>Decision</b></p> <p>Following these discussions the committee agreed to endorse the development, oversight processes and procedures involved in the revisions to the Service Accreditation criteria and recommend approval to the board.</p>
3.2	<p><b>Enhancing Public Protection</b></p> <p>LM's paper highlights the current work around the case for enhanced regulation, statutory or voluntary, which will then help inform the launch of our consultation with the wider BACP membership.</p> <p>This work involves looking at what we do not just in relation to ensuring that we meet the standards that the PSA requires for the register, but across the whole organisation and in particular where we think about things like course and service accreditation and the robustness of the assessment that we have. We need to ensure that our own assessment processes meet the revised criteria.</p>

JP commented that our regulatory frameworks need to give us confidence that standards are being upheld and that we are doing everything we need to do to protect the public. By broadening that out and really understanding that everything we're doing has an impact on that public protection piece and improving those regulatory functions, making them work internally, we then project that to the public, to people like the PSA, to government, to employers. This will result in real confidence that BACP we are the absolute gold standard in terms of protecting the public and that that BACP stamp really means everything that we want it to mean.


Enhanced regulation will be needed at some point in the future and we need to prepare ourselves for that. We need to be at the forefront and be able to speak from a position of authority when these discussions are brought to us.

The activities set out in the paper show the work being undertaken in phase one of this priority workstream.

The committee discussed:

1. The relationship with other **PCPB members**.
2. **Sharing of data** - The PCPB members have been discussing data sharing - particular about barring of members.
3. **Understanding the differences between the organisations** and therefore education of the public on the benefits of a choosing a BACP member for therapy
4. **The need for certificate of proficiency** - JP stated that this will be considered as work progresses in the area.
5. **Benefiting from previous experiences** - in particular the Irish Association of Counsellors and Psychotherapists
6. **The management of the requirements** for public protection and our membership.
7. **Helping our members understand what regulation is**, why it is needed and the benefits to membership.
8. **How the PSA engage with the public** and making people aware of what the PSA does and what the accredited register is.
9. **Shared data** - The PSA have already agreed to a shared register for all the accredited registers, meaning that the public will be able to go to the PSA website and search for registered therapists from all accredited registers in one central place,
10. **The significant expansion in psychological professionals** in the NHS along with the development of many new roles, that may fall outside accreditation and regulation.
11. **Understanding the types of practitioners available** - The current onus on the public to understand the type of practitioner that would be most beneficial to them and also whether they should check their qualifications.
12. **Protected titles**- not just a silver bullet that solves all public protection issues

	In conclusion LM commented that we need to adopt a multi-pronged approach as there are key stakeholders that we need to influence. As the government listens most strongly to the collective voice working with the PCPB and the PSA will be beneficial.
3.3	<p><b>Resolutions and the Review of BACP Articles</b></p> <p>JP talked through the need for Resolutions.</p> <p>In order to prevent a member from resigning during a complaint case a 12.5 resolution is undertaken. This is essential because if they are not a current BACP member we cannot publicly advise somebody that a person is under investigation for a serious offence which creates a public protection issue.</p> <p>The current process is that a resolution goes to the board via email for voting - 7 out of 10 trustees must vote to accept or decline the resolution.</p> <p>The information provided in the resolution documentation is clear and concise however it is felt that a deeper understanding of the context that would be provided from the PPC members would make them less challenging to resolve. Therefore, it is suggested that it may be more appropriate for this activity to be undertaken by the PPC committee or members of.</p> <p>In order for this to happen the Articles need to be revised to allow for the Board to delegate this responsibility to a panel or committee.</p> <p>If in agreement with the transfer of responsibility, the details of the procedure can be discussed at a later date, it could be possible to delegate it further to the Registrar.</p> <p>The committee were in agreement with this potential way forward.</p> <p>The articles are currently being reviewed, and members were asked if they might be interested in joining the working group. there is an opportunity to learn more at an informal chat on 5<sup>th</sup> March at 4pm.</p>
4	<b>AOB</b>
	There was no additional business.
	<p><b>Next meeting:</b></p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> May 2026 - Q1 standard meeting</p> <p><b>Meeting closed at 12pm</b></p>

Approved by Committee on	20.05.26
Signed by Chair as approved	

--	--