

2004	Shipman Inquiry: A wholly independent tribunal was one of the key recommendations made by Dame Janet Smith
2007	<p>Government White Paper <i>Trust, Assurance and Safety - The Regulation of Health Professionals in the 21st Century</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The independence of the regulatory bodies is vital ‘to sustain the confidence of both the public and the professions through demonstrable impartiality’. • ‘The independence and impartiality of those who pass judgement on health professionals in fitness to practise proceedings is central to public and professional confidence in their findings and the sanctions they impose’
2008	The Health and Social Care Act established the independent Office of the Health Professions Adjudicator (OHPA)
2010	<p>A consultation by the Department of Health in 2010 recommended a greater separation between the investigation and adjudication of ftp cases.</p> <p>OHPA was intended to be entirely self-financing, charging fees from health and social care regulators to provide independent adjudications in a radically reformed system. It aimed to bring consistency of approach and outcome across professions and reduce costs for the regulators. OHPA was to be responsible for adjudicating GMC cases and those relating to the professions regulated by the General Optical Council, and potentially all other health professionals.</p> <p>2 December 2010 the coalition government came into power and abolished OHPA (little more than 10 months after it had become a corporate body) as part of its review into the number of quangos.</p>
2012	The GMC looked at what to do next and set up the MPTS, initially on a non-statutory basis
2014	<p>Law Commission published its review “Regulation of Health and Social Care Professionals” in April 2014. The Law Commission’s report made specific recommendations on the introduction of greater separation between regulators’ investigation and adjudication functions. It saw the primary benefit being increased confidence in regulation from perspective of the public and professionals alike.</p> <p>‘The Government should have regulation-making powers to introduce a separate adjudication system for any of the regulators, based on the Medical Practitioners Tribunal Service’.</p> <p>The Law Commission review included a draft Bill which would establish a common legal framework for the regulations of health care professionals across the UK.</p>
2015	The Government accepted the Law Commission’s key recommendations and indicated that legislation would be brought forward in due course. It stated: ‘Ensuring the impartiality of fitness to practise panels by increasing the separation between the regulatory body’s role as investigator and the panel’s role as adjudicator has been a long-term policy objective for this and previous Governments ... We agree that the Government should have a regulation making power to enable the regulatory bodies to adopt systems with a greater degree of separation (whether on the MPTS or other model) as appropriate.’

2016	MPTS set up on a statutory footing. It not only reports to GMC Council but also to Parliament.
2017	The Health and Care Professions Council followed the lead set by the GMC and set up a tribunal (HCPTS) but on a non-statutory basis
2017	Department of Health and Social Care carried out a second consultation exercise.
May 2018	The Professional Standards Authority's (PSA) Lessons Learned Review into the Nursing and Midwifery Council's handling of concerns about midwives' fitness to practise at the Furness General Hospital (Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust) , which highlighted the need for greater transparency and better engagement with family members who have been affected by poor professional standards
June 2018	The Gosport Independent Panel Report , which identified a need for efficient and timely resolution of fitness to practise issues
June 2018	Professor Sir Norman Williams' Review of Gross Negligence Manslaughter in Healthcare , which identified the potential for professional regulation to do more to encourage openness and the development of a learning culture
June 2019	Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care published its response to the Williams Review. The Professional Standards Authority's response considers the concept of public confidence in fitness to practise proceedings and notes the differences between the nine healthcare professional regulators; it considers the themes across the professions, including the importance of consistency across regulators and the importance of diversity in order to ensure that the views of the public are represented. However, it also highlights the difficulty in having consistent decisions when the regulators each have their own legislation.
July 2019	Department of Health and Social Care published the response to its consultation: <i>Promoting professionalism, reforming regulations.</i> It addressed the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting the public: The consultation considered the role of professional regulation in protecting the public, and sought views on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How best to determine the appropriate level of regulatory oversight for professional groups; ○ The architecture of professional regulation; and ○ Which regulatory bodies should have oversight of which professions? • Responsive regulation: “Increasing the responsiveness of professional regulation is not a new idea and some changes have already been made to the legislation that governs some regulatory bodies. More could be done to enable all regulators to respond quickly to changes in the way that healthcare is delivered.” • Efficient regulation: “The healthcare system is complex, and there is an opportunity, and indeed an expectation, for the regulatory bodies to work more effectively with one another and with other parts of the regulatory system. This includes sharing data (within the framework of current data protection legislation) and best practice to improve public protection.