

Summary of outcomes - Annual General Meeting held on 25th May 2022 via Zoom

Speakers: Claire Anderson (CA) – President & Chair, Paul Bennett (PB) – Chief Executive, Jon Jarrett (JJ) – Head of Finance, Malcolm Brown (MB), Mohammed Hussain (MH), Steve Churton (SC), Matthew Tennyson (MT), Nahim Khan (NK)

Present: 170 members and staff present in total (see Appendix 1)

Item	Notes and actions
Item 01 Welcome & Apologies	CA welcomed all to the meeting. Apologies were received from Andre Yeung (AY), Treasurer.
Item 02 Annual Review	PB presented highlights from the 2021 Annual Review.
Item 03 Financial Highlights	A video from Andre Yeung (Treasurer) was presented highlighting aspects of the 2021 Annual Accounts and the work of the Finance & Investment Committee. Jon Jarrett (Head of Finance) presented further highlights of the 2021 Annual Accounts.
Item 04 Q&A	PB was asked that full details of member numbers of the Society be published in full, broken down by category. PB noted that Assembly had taken the decision to publish the headline total of members only at present [Note: this request also formed part of Motion 5 and would therefore go on to be considered by Assembly at the meeting in July]. PB was asked for assurance that education and professional development were taken seriously by the Society. PB noted the restructure of the Executive Team that was being undertaken and confirmed the Society's commitment to education within the 2021 -26 RPS Strategy. He noted the strength of the existing education team, and stressed that this remained a critical area of focus for the organisation.
Item 05 Motions	[Note: RPS received 39 motions from members for this year's AGM. One was subsequently withdrawn and, the planned meeting duration would have been insufficient to debate each of the 38 motions individually it was agreed with the motion proposers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> key themes for which multiple motions were submitted should be prioritised for the AGM to ensure maximum opportunity for member involvement in discussion on these topics overlapping motions would be consolidated into one motion. To ensure transparency, each individual motion that contributes to the consolidated motion was published in full in in a paper circulated in advance of the meeting (see Appendix 2). the outcome of the discussions at the AGM for every motion, and the supporting motions sitting underneath the consolidated motions, would go on to be considered by Assembly or the Boards individually and not collectively as consolidated motions, regardless of whether they have been part of a consolidated motion that passed or failed at the AGM]. CA confirmed that only members in the categories MRPharmS and FRPharmS were eligible to vote.

Motion 1 – Speaker: Malcolm Brown

It is proposed that RPS reconsiders its decision to leave the International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP) and seeks to re-join. This should be discussed at the next Assembly meeting in open business, including the potential for a membership vote.

For: 92% Against: 4% Abstain: 4% MOTION PASSED

Motion 2 – Speaker: Mohammed Hussain

A motion of no confidence in the executive and Assembly in the manner of the handling of exiting the FIP without member engagement, conducting the matter in closed business only and not informing members when the exit came into effect.

MH clarified that this was a motion of no confidence *in the decision taken* not a motion of no confidence in the bodies of Assembly or the Executive themselves and should not be viewed as a formal ‘confidence vote’ in either.

For: 32% Against: 36% Abstain: 33% MOTION FAILED

Motion 3 – Speaker: Steve Churton

Following extensive consultation in 2008, the independent Clarke Inquiry into the future role of the professional leadership body concluded that the RPS should be considered a body akin to a Royal College; with the intention that it should seek Royal College status in due course. The RPSGB and its membership accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the inquiry. This motion calls upon the Assembly to reaffirm this commitment, and to further commit to a timeframe in which it expects the Society to become a Royal College of equivalent status to those recognised by the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges.

For: 51% Against: 30% Abstain: 19% MOTION PASSED

Motion 4 – Speaker: Matthew Tennyson

It is proposed that Members should be able to vote on fundamental decisions concerning the future of the RPS that are proposed by Assembly, including election of the Officers of the Society

For: 69% Against: 20% Abstain: 12% MOTION PASSED

Motion 5: Speaker: Nahim Khan

It is proposed to increase the transparency of RPS meetings and decisions. The following should be considered by Assembly for Assembly, Board and Expert Advisory Group meetings:

- *Meetings to be recorded and uploaded on RPS website for members to view*
- *Open business to be used as default except when relating to financial or human resources matters impacting individuals*
- *Any changes to RPS regulations that are gazetted should be discussed in open business*
- *All closed business items should be listed on the agenda*
- *Votes on Assembly and Board meetings to be recorded against individuals*
- *Expert Advisory Groups to publish agendas and minutes, and be open for members to observe*
- *National Board Chairs’ forum to publish agenda and minutes, and be open for members to observe*
- *Assembly/Board sub committees to publish agendas and minutes*
- *All hospitality, donations and attendance fees made to RPS elected officials are declared and published*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Corporate and Board risk registers are published and scrutinised at Board/Assembly meetings •Publish annual membership numbers, listing all cohorts and demographics <p>For: 89% Against: 5% Abstain: 6% MOTION PASSED</p> <p>Motion 6 – Speaker: Mohammed Hussain <i>A motion that requests that a public and independent review of the RPS governance structures should be undertaken, with the final report and responses from the Assembly published in open business. This should include the frequency of meetings, the format of meetings, the documentation of meetings and policies relating to elected members including expenses</i></p> <p>For: 81% Against: 9% Abstain: 10% MOTION PASSED</p> <p>Motion 7 – Speaker: Mohammed Hussain. (MH declared an interest as a Trustee of Pharmacist Support) <i>A motion that seeks that as the professional leadership body for pharmacy the RPS supports the profession’s charity by donating a minimum of £1 per member per year to Pharmacist Support.</i></p> <p>For: 94% Against: 3% Abstain: 3% MOTION PASSED</p> <p>Motion 8 – Speaker: Andrew Griggs <i>I would like to submit a motion that RPS investigates the provision of Professional Indemnity Insurance for members. This would help retain members and avoid members having duplication of services and choosing other membership organisations that also provide Indemnity Insurance at a similar cost.</i></p> <p>As AG was not present at the meeting there was no debate or vote on this motion. It will, instead, be taken for discussion as an item in open business at the Assembly meeting on 20th July.</p>
<p>Item 06 Closing Comments</p>	<p>CA thanked all for attending and those who had contributed to the meeting. She confirmed that all motions proposed for the meeting would now go on to be discussed in open business at the next meetings of either the Boards or Assembly as appropriate and encouraged all present to register to attend these sessions and observe the discussions if they wished to.</p>

APPENDIX 1 - RPS AGM 25th March 2022 - Attendees

First Name	Surname
Colin	Adair
Brian	Addison
Abimbola	Adebowale
Adebayo	Adegbite
Dr Adetomilola	ADEROUNMU
Rosie	Adsley
Ola	Akinsola
Rita	Akonoghrere
Angela	Alexander
Sue	Alldred
David	Alldred
James	Allen
Isaiah	Amoo
Claire	Anderson
Sotiris	Antoniou
Diane	Ashiru-Oredope
MARTIN	ASTBURY
Jay	Badenhorst
Darrell	Baker
Paul	Baker
Sharmini	Balashanker
Stephanie	Bancroft
John William	Barnes
Karen	Baxter
Rahmah	Bello
Paul	Bennett
Jennifer	Boncey
Christine	Bond
Rebecca	Bone
Emma	Boxer
Laura	Broad
Malcolm	Brown
Robert	Brown
Samantha	Buckland
Sibby	Buckle

APPENDIX 1 - RPS AGM 25th March 2022 - Attendees

Susan	Buekes
Bruce	Burnett
Corrinee	Burns
Elizabeth	Butterfield
Tamara	Cairney
Andrew	Carruthers
Anthony	Cartwright
Helen	Chang
Steve	Churton
Barbara	Conway
Cathy	Cooke
Deborah	Crockford
Lola	Dabiri
Lola	Dabiri
Robert	Darracott
Helen	Davies
Lucy	Dixon
Amandeep	Doll
Alison	Douglas
Ciara	Duffy
Ruth	Edwards
Mary	Evans
Richard	Evans
Gail	Fleming
Sue	Fray
Pavitar	Gandham
Sandra	Gidley
Vilma	Gilis
Roz	Gittins
Joan	Gladders
Hayley	Gorton
Thorrin	Govind
Nicola	Gray
Helen	Grey
Kat	Hall
Liz	Hallett
Kieran	Hand
Mike	Hannay

APPENDIX 1 - RPS AGM 25th March 2022 - Attendees

Karen	Harrowing
Christine	Hastie
Gill	Hawksworth
Jamie	Hayes
Christine	Heading
Michael	Holden
Susan	Holland
Philip	HOWARD
Clare	Howard
Gareth	Hughes
Mohammed	Hussain
Fuad	Hussain
HIEU	HUYNH
Jon	Jarrett
Hanna	Jenvey
Brendon	Jiang
Alisdair	Jones
Elen	Jones
Gareth	Jones
Banji	Kelan
Sophie	Kellett
Mary-Claire	Kennedy
Nisa	Khan
Nahim	Khan
Carol	Lange
Jayne	Lawrence
Mike	Maguire
Jonathan	Martey
Sandra	Martin
Gino	Martini
Joela	Mathews
Claire	May
Sarah	McAleer
Geraldine	McCaffrey
Lindsay	McClure
Munira	Mohammed
Clare	Morrison
Chinwe	Nnachetta

APPENDIX 1 - RPS AGM 25th March 2022 - Attendees

Janice	Oman
Raliat	Onatade
Tase	Oputu
Jay	Padasian
Paresh	Parmar
Ron	Pate
Mahendra	Patel
Rajendra	Patel
Neal	Patel
Rosalyne	Payne
Eileen	Peebles
Catherine	Picton
Darren	Powell
Colin	Ranshaw
Adam	Rathbone
Carilyn	Ratray
Carolyn	Ratray
Rick	Russell
Paula	Russell
Victoria	Rutter
Amrita	Sandhu
Ellen	Schafheutle
Alan	Screen
Sarwar	Shah
Ravi	Sharma
Karen	Shuker
Terence	Silverstone
Ian	Simpson
Catriona	Sinclair
Amina	Slimani-Fersia
Heather	Smith
Alison	Smith
Lynne	Smith
Harvinder	Sondh
Paul	Summerfield
Michelle	Swanson
Wing	Tang
Andrea	Tarr

APPENDIX 1 - RPS AGM 25th March 2022 - Attendees

Claire	Taylor
Melanie	Taylor
Matthew	Tennyson
Nicholas	Thayer
Richard	Thomas
Anne	Thomson
Tracey	Thornley
Alan	Timmins
Mary	Tompkins
Chris	Toothill
Lucy	Torosyan
Catherine	Truman
Robbie	Turner
Beth	Ward
Bruce	Warner
Cheryl	Way
Angela	Weeks
Barbara	Wensworth
Anita	White
Laura	Wilson
Heidi	Wright

MOTIONS FOR THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING: 25 May 2022

Introduction

RPS received 39 motions from members for this year's Annual General Meeting (AGM). One was subsequently withdrawn, and the remaining 38 motions are listed in full in this paper.

RPS welcomes the engagement of members in the AGM and every motion has been considered for inclusion. Unfortunately, the planned meeting duration is insufficient to debate each of the 38 motions individually. Therefore, it was agreed with the motion proposers that:

- (1) Key themes for which multiple motions were submitted should be prioritised for the AGM to ensure maximum opportunity for member involvement in discussion on these topics.
- (2) Overlapping motions are consolidated into one motion. To ensure transparency, each individual motion that contributes to the consolidated motion is published in full in this paper.
- (3) Consolidated motions are recognised as a mechanism to enable the smooth running of the AGM. To ensure the meaning of each individual motion which contributes to a consolidated motion is not lost:
 - a. When the outcome of the discussions at the AGM is considered by Assembly or the Boards, each motion will be considered individually and not collectively as consolidated motions.
 - b. Either Assembly or the Boards will consider all motions, regardless of whether they have been part of a consolidated motion that is passed or failed at the AGM. This is in recognition of the fact that the individual motions have not been tested individually and therefore, while the passing or failing of a consolidated motion can inform Assembly/Boards, it cannot provide a definitive outcome on each individual motion.

Summary

There are 8 motions for debate covering the following topics:

- Membership of FIP (2 motions)
- Royal College status (1 motion)
- Membership involvement in RPS (1 motion)
- Transparency of RPS (1 motion)
- RPS governance structures (1 motion)
- RPS business (2 motions)
- RPS policy (no motions)

Membership of FIP

Motion 1:

It is proposed that RPS reconsiders its decision to leave the International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP) and seeks to re-join. This should be discussed at the next Assembly meeting in open business, including the potential for a membership vote.

Consolidated motion from individual motions listed below
Speaker: Malcolm Brown

Motions received which contribute to motion 1

Malcolm Brown

I propose that the Royal Pharmaceutical Society (RPS) continues to be a member of the International Pharmaceutical Federation (FIP) that facilitates effective participation in international pharmacy and so advances pharmacy in Great Britain; the solution is to re-join the FIP.

Three benefits are:

1. Pharmacists aim to contribute to the health and well-being of the public and that is an important thrust of the royal charter of the RPS. To best contribute, our professional body should be at the forefront of pharmaceutical knowledge, education, research and practice. Britain does not have a monopoly of pharmaceutical knowledge. Four million pharmacists in other countries outside Britain have knowledge that we lack. Our founders around 1843 were proud of the international dimension of pharmacy; witness the non-British supporters of the Society's shield. Our society still needs an efficient, modern, international network of support. The FIP offers.
2. The RPS should be a member of the FIP: an international professional organisation linked to the WHO and the World Health Assembly. The FIP is part of the World Health Professions Alliance. There, pharmaceutical, medical and nursing professions express a joint view on the maintenance of standards of quality and service. That strongly influences governments struggling to provide comprehensive health care with limited resources. The RPS has lost this influence by giving up its membership of the FIP.
3. A chartered object of the RPS is "to safeguard, maintain the honour, and promote the interests of pharmacists in their exercise of the profession of pharmacy". All pharmacists should be able to access the additional resources for their section of practice that would be available from the RPS as a member of the FIP.

For example, industrial pharmacists make the medicines. Non-pharmacists also make the medicines — and do so with great competence, knowledge and expertise. To successfully compete, industrial pharmacists must maintain cutting-edge expertise.

The FIP provides, for example, a journal, webinars and a network of international contacts.

Those benefits amply justify the fee that the RPS would, again, pay to the FIP. It is less than £1 per person per year: minuscule.

So, assembly members: please re-join the FIP.

Michael Holden

In a recent statement the RPS announced that it had taken the decision not to renew membership of FIP in 2022. In the same statement it says that they remain outwardly focused, internationally aware and recognise the important role that FIP plays in pharmacy. How can they hope to achieve this in light of that decision? In defence of the decision, the RSP President stated that there were concerns regarding the extent of membership costs of £31,000 (about £1 per member?) and the discretionary costs incurred by RPS representatives participating in FIP events and meetings (£53,000). When voting on the decision, some Assembly members apparently questioned the value of membership and return on investment. This is understandable in relation to the expenses costs which should be managed better, but surely not the value of being a part of and learning from the future of global pharmacy leadership. This motion calls upon the Assembly to review and reverse its decision to cease membership of FIP and thus actively demonstrate its leadership position within a global profession which, alongside other key activities, will have a positive impact on its effectiveness and status as our professional leadership body in Great Britain

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that asks for a membership consultation and a vote to reverse the decision to leave the FIP.

Motion 2:

A motion of no confidence in the executive and Assembly in the manner of the handling of exiting the FIP without member engagement, conducting the matter in closed business only and not informing members when the exit came into effect.

Received from: Mohammed Hussain
Speaker: Mohammed Hussain

Further motions received about FIP membership and written responses:

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that demands that all papers and minutes setting out the options for leaving the FIP, and at which the final decision was made at the closed Assembly meeting be published in full to members.

Written response:

A written response will be provided after consideration by the Assembly.

Royal College status

Motion 3:

Following extensive consultation in 2008, the independent Clarke Inquiry into the future role of the professional leadership body concluded that the RPS should be considered a body akin to a Royal College; with the intention that it should seek Royal College status in due course. The RPSGB and its membership accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the inquiry. This motion calls upon the Assembly to reaffirm this commitment, and to further commit to a timeframe in which it expects the Society to become a Royal College of equivalent status to those recognised by the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges.

Received from: Steve Churton
Speaker: Steve Churton

Membership involvement in RPS

Motion 4:

It is proposed that Members should be able to vote on fundamental decisions concerning the future of the RPS that are proposed by Assembly, including election of the Officers of the Society.

Consolidated motion from individual motions listed below
Speaker: Matthew Tennyson

Motions received which contribute to motion 4

Matthew Tennyson

I would like to forward a motion that, the assembly cannot make decisions for members which affect their membership in the royal charter. The assembly may have an opinion that can be presented to the members, but ultimately should be voted by a simple majority vote by a simple majority through online ballot.

Nahim Khan

Motion to propose that the RPS President to be directly elected by the RPS membership. I have observed one secret ballot of the RPS President, and was perplexed about the lack of transparency of the process.

Transparency of RPS

Motion 5:

It is proposed to increase the transparency of RPS meetings and decisions. The following should be considered by Assembly for Assembly, Board and Expert Advisory Group meetings:

- Meetings to be recorded and uploaded on RPS website for members to view
- Open business to be used as default except when relating to financial or human resources matters impacting individuals
- Any changes to RPS regulations that are gazetted should be discussed in open business
- All closed business items should be listed on the agenda
- Votes on Assembly and Board meetings to be recorded against individuals
- Expert Advisory Groups to publish agendas and minutes, and be open for members to observe
- National Board Chairs' forum to publish agenda and minutes, and be open for members to observe
- Assembly/Board sub committees to publish agendas and minutes
- All hospitality, donations and attendance fees made to RPS elected officials are declared and published
- Corporate and Board risk registers are published and scrutinised at Board/Assembly meetings
- Publish annual membership numbers, listing all cohorts and demographics

Consolidated motion from individual motions listed below

Speaker: Nahim Khan

Motions received which contribute to motion 5

Mohammed Hussain

Assembly and board meetings should be recorded and uploaded to the RPS website (they are already conducted by zoom to allow members to observe), to allow more members to watch the proceedings at a time that best works for them.

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that all matters are defaulted to be in open business except in extraordinary circumstances where the matter relates to active financial dealings or is a Human Resources matter impacting named individuals.

Nahim Khan

Motion to ensure that any changes to regulations that are gazetted and feedback resulting from gazette notices are discussed in open business at RPS Assembly meetings.

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that all closed business items for Assembly and National Boards should be listed on an agenda that is published so that members can have visibility of the types of matters being discussed in closed business, even if they cannot observe the conduct of business for such items.

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that allows for all voting on Boards and Assembly meetings to be recorded against each voting individual so that members can have visibility on how their elected officials vote.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that all AGM motions passed at the AGM must be discussed at an open Assembly/ Board meeting and a vote held to approve/ reject each motion. The votes by the Assembly/Board members for and against each motion must be recorded by name in the minutes for maximum transparency.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that all Expert Advisory Groups established by the RPS allow members to observe all meetings and have their agendas, and minutes published for members to read online.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that all sub committees established by the Assembly and Board publish their agendas, and minutes for members to read online, unless the items are closed business.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that all hospitality and payments by any party, including donations made via online tools such as Patreon and attendance fees by pharmaceutical companies for roundtables, made to RPS elected officials on the Boards and Assembly are declared and published to member scrutiny annually.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that the RPS publishes its corporate and Board risk registers for members to scrutinise and that this should be a standard ongoing open business item at each Board/Assembly meeting.

Nahim Khan

Motion to propose allowing members to attend the National Board Chairs' Forum and receive minutes.

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that demands that the RPS publish its annual membership numbers, clearly setting out the different membership cohorts, pharmacists, students, pharmaceutical scientists, etc.

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that demands that the RPS publish its membership numbers, by demographics, at the very least to include gender and ethnicity and set out very clearly how this differs from the registrant demographics data published by the GPhC.

Further motions received about organisational structure and written responses:

Nahim Khan

Motion to publish details of non-members who have attended expert advisory group meetings. This is to be broken down to each expert advisory group, profession, and why they were invited.

Written response:

A written response will be provided after consideration by the Assembly.

RPS governance structures

Motion 6:

A motion that requests that a public and independent review of the RPS governance structures should be undertaken, with the final report and responses from the Assembly published in open business. This should include the frequency of meetings, the format of meetings, the documentation of meetings and policies relating to elected members including expenses.

Consolidated motion from individual motions listed below
Speaker: Mohammed Hussain

Motions received which contribute to motion 6:

Mohammed Hussain

A motion that requests that a public and independent review of the RPS governance structures should be undertaken, with the final report and responses from the Assembly published in open business

Mohammed Hussain

Assembly and Board meetings should be held a minimum of 6 times per year to ensure they are able to fulfil their functions for setting the strategy and holding the executive to account

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that 'verbal updates' at the Assembly and Board meetings are minimal and only used for urgent matters where no paper could be produced in time. All items should have a written update in either a document or slides layout, to ensure there is a written record of the updates provided that can be reviewed by members.

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that the Assembly and Boards retain Online (Zoom/Teams) meetings as part of their regular meetings to ensure greater member access, minimise costs and for a reduced carbon footprint

Mohammed Hussain

This motion asks that subsistence and travel expenses for all Board and Assembly members, excluding the President, be capped at £5,000 per annum (some members have claimed nearly £10k pa in travel and subsistence in previous years).

Further motions received about RPS organisational structure and written responses:

Stephanie Bancroft and Christine Heading

It is planned to replace RPS Locals with 14 new Regions. When RPS LPFs (and then Locals) were set up to replace Branches, the Assembly and RPS Directors were anxious to emphasise that these local entities were member arms of RPS. They were part of the whole.

We are concerned that members are increasingly being treated as subscribers to RPS services rather than members. Use of the title 'Ambassador' for the centrally appointed leaders for each Region seems to illustrate this. Most people are aware that the role of an ambassador is to represent one organisation to an alien one. An ambassador cannot represent an organisation to its own members. We therefore urge the Assembly:

- To confirm that the proposed new Regions will be member arms of RPS, just as the LPFs and Locals were.
- To follow the UK precedent for Commonwealth countries and use the concept and title of 'Commissioner' for the leadership of the Regions, and not 'Ambassador'.

Written response:

This motion was discussed with the joint proposers. RPS has committed to the motion being tabled at a Board meeting, after which a response will be published.

RPS business

Motion 7

A motion that seeks that as the professional leadership body for pharmacy the RPS supports the profession's charity by donating a minimum of £1 per member per year to Pharmacist Support.

Received from: Mohammed Hussain

Speaker: Mohammed Hussain

Motion 8:

I would like to submit a motion that RPS investigates the provision of Professional Indemnity Insurance for members. This would help retain members and avoid members having duplication of services and choosing other membership organisations that also provide Indemnity Insurance at a similar cost.

Received from: Andrew Griggs

Speaker: Andrew Griggs

Further motions received about RPS business and written responses:

Nahim Khan

Motion to add all previous removed content back to the Pharmaceutical Journal website and to consult members before any significant changes are made to the website in future.

Written response:

A written response will be provided after consideration by the Assembly.

RPS policy

Motions received about RPS policy and written responses:

Rita Akonoghrere

Motion on how best to increase pharmacy workforce in the UK: a review of the OSPAP programme

Problem statement: SHORTAGE OF PHARMACY WORKFORCE IN THE UK

- There are concerns about a deficit of about 3,000 community pharmacist in England within a 5 year period (since 2017) attributable to more pharmacists being recruited to PCN as well as a large number of pharmacists not practicing, partly due “Cross border working”.¹
- There is a case of demand of pharmacy workforce exceeding supply, an increase in vacancy and locum rates, increasing part-time working, and reduced working hours. These changing working practices have meant that an additional 4,099 were needed to maintain “an equilibrium” in pharmacies.¹
- More pharmacy closures would be ‘unavoidable’ due to pharmacist shortage” and this could cause a significant threat to health care in England. ^{2,3} The shortfall in pharmacy workforce has also been felt in the NHS, obviously making the UK government to include Pharmacists in the “Shortage occupation” list.⁴

Why change is needed:

There are only two routes for increasing the pharmacy workforce in the UK – pharmacy graduates from schools of pharmacy in the UK, or foreign trained pharmacists seeking to practice in the UK. The second route is the objective of this motion.

The GPhC’s requirements states that to be eligible to practice in the UK a foreign trained pharmacist, whose qualifying degree has been adjudged to be equivalent to that obtained in the UK, must complete a compulsory 9-month Overseas Pharmacists Assessment Programme (OSPAP) in a recognized UK university, 52 weeks of pre-registration training in England, Scotland or Wales, and then a GPhC registration assessment.⁵ To achieve this it takes an average of 24 months, or more. The cost of registering for the OSPAP in any university in the UK vary from £10,000 to £12,000 (and even more if the candidate decides to go through the PgDip/MSc route).

In comparison with the requirements to practice in the U.S, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacies (NABP) in the United States of America, requires a foreign trained pharmacist to write a certification exam (Foreign Pharmacy Graduate Exam Certificate (FPGEC) and earn 150 hours of work experience only. The cost of registering for the exam, with other fees inclusive, is less than \$1,000. The cost of registration for the exam includes materials and books to prepare for the exams.⁶ After the FPGEC is obtained, the focus is on “Work Experience” and laws governing practice in each state.

In addition, the average salary of a pharmacist in the U.S is \$99,000 - \$150,000. In Other words, it takes less time and cost for a foreign trained pharmacist to go to the U.S to practice compared to coming to the UK.

Motion/Suggestion:

1. The GPhC should re-evaluate the structure of the pre-registration requirements for foreign trained pharmacist. The OSPAP program should be more practice oriented, and less focused on didactic lectures.
2. Both the OSPAP and the Foundation training should be done simultaneously. A 52-week pre-registration training to include update lectures in the university (2 days in a week), work experience under the supervision of a UK trained pharmacist (the other 3 working days in the week), and a one-time GPhC certification (pre-registration) exam after the 52 weeks of training.

Benefits: This will shorten the time spent for the pre-registration year, possibly reduce the burden of the tuition fees paid for the OSPAP, and eventually encourage qualified foreign trained pharmacist to come to the UK and get certified to practice.

Written response:

This motion calls for actions by GPhC and is outwith RPS's remit. The motion will therefore will be referred to GPhC for its consideration. It will also be highlighted to the country Boards for consideration.

Banji Kelan

I would like to raise a motion that pharmaceutical wholesalers such as AAH and Alliance should be compelled to scrap their outrageous policy of making community pharmacies to pay the following charges:

1. Low spend surcharge
2. Fuel surcharge

Explanation

1. Low Spend Surcharge: Alliance Healthcare imposes £75 fine on community pharmacies that spend less than £5,000 per month on their competitive (non-solus) lines while AAH charges similar amount for community pharmacies that spend less than £4000 on these lines.

A community pharmacy that dispenses less than 4,000 items per month will struggle to meet these targets between the 2 big wholesalers and would therefore be penalized to pay the levy which is highly unfair for small independent community pharmacies who do not have any control over the numbers of items they dispense per month.

2. Fuel Surcharge: Alliance Healthcare makes all their customers who spend less than £10,000 per month to pay fuel surcharges ranging from £60 to £100 per month.

These charges are squeezing life out of small independent community pharmacies such that most of them are at the verge of closing down their business because they cannot do without buying from Alliance and AAH.

The RPS should intervene by compelling Alliance and AAH to scrap these outrageous charges.

Written response:

This motion calls for actions by pharmaceutical wholesalers. After agreement with the proposer, it will be highlighted to Boards to consider whether RPS should take any policy position with regard to this situation.

Nahim Khan

Motion to propose that the RPS adopts the PDA safer pharmacy charter – as this charter is already available; it is proposed that the RPS adopt these rather creating its own standards.

Written response:

This has been tabled for the next Board meeting.

Nahim Khan

Motion for the RPS to explain why members were not informed of the resumption of pharmacist apprenticeship proposals in 2021, despite promising that RPS members would be kept informed.

Written response:

This has been tabled for the next Board meeting.

Nahim Khan

Motion for the RPS to remove itself from the pharmacist apprenticeship employer group. The apprenticeship proposals are highly unpopular with members, and the RPS should respect this by not being part of the employer group.

Written response:

This has been tabled for the next Board meeting.

Nahim Khan

Motion to propose that the primary care and community pharmacy expert advisory groups create a joint statement regarding the calls from other organisations for the halt of recruitment for pharmacists entering primary care. Joint statement will include whether these calls are agreed with or disagreed. The expert advisory groups are able, according to the terms of reference, to respond to requests for comment and act as media spokesperson.

Written response:

This will be considered by the country Boards.

Nahim Khan

Motion to propose to create a campaign to support members with emergency supplies. The RPS aims to support members to be “the best you can be”. Further educational resources should be considered before asking the GPhC to strike pharmacists off the register for refusing to do an emergency supply because the surgery is open – as was suggested by a RPS Assembly member.

Written response:

This will be considered by the country Boards.