

Minutes of Assembly Meeting held on 20th July 2022 – via VC

Present: Claire Anderson (CA) - Chair, Martin Astbury (MA), Sibby Buckle (SB), Andrew Carruthers (AC), Audrey Thompson (AT), Thorrhun Govind (TG), Mike Hannay (MH), Alisdair Jones (AJ), Ruth Edwards (RE), Tase Oputu (TO), Lynne Smith (LS), Cheryl Way (CW), Eleri Schiavone (ES), Mary Evans (ME)

In attendance: Paul Bennett (PB), Karen Baxter (KB), Rick Russell (RR), Avril Chester (AC), Ravi Sharma (RS), Elen Jones (EJ), Clare Morrison (CM), Alison Douglas (AD), Corrinne Burns (CB), Melissa Dear (MD), Wing Tang (WT), Neal Patel (NP), Aman Doll (ADoll) – Item 03a only

Observers: Jessica Corrigan, Kieran O’Brien, Latoya Oyediji, Yasmin King – RPS Interns, 9 Members registered to observe the meeting

Apologies: None

Item	Paper	Notes and actions	Action by
Item 01 Welcome & Apologies		CA welcomed all to the meeting. There were no apologies.	
Item 02 Items for Noting	22/03/ASB/02	The following items were noted: a) Code of Conduct & Remit of Assembly & COG b) Declaration of Interests c) Minutes of the Open Business Assembly Meeting 16 th March (noted and approved) d) National Pharmacy Board Reports e) President’s Report f) Treasurer’s Report g) Education update and minutes of Education & Standards Committee Meeting 3 rd March	

		<p>h) Science & Research update and minutes of Science & Research Committee 16th June</p> <p>i) Inclusion & Diversity update</p> <p>j) Schedule of Assembly meetings 2023</p> <p>AD reported that updated declarations of interest had been received from ME, ES and RE.</p>	
<p>Item 03 Matters Arising</p>		<p>a) Panel of Fellows/Membership Committee EDI data</p> <p>The paper providing an update of the EDI data collected for the RPS Panel of Fellows and Membership Committee was noted.</p> <p>ADoll explained that as not all members of the Panel and Committee had completed the survey, she was only able to report based on the individuals who had which may not represent the true picture of the advisory boards. Although aggregated statistics of the survey will be shared on completion in the future, however due to the sensitive nature of the data and the small number of responses so far, the data could not be shared at present as it maybe be easy to identify the respondents.</p> <p>TO expressed disappointment that it had not been possible to share the data as she believed there was currently an issue with the lack of diversity of the two committees. She appreciated completion of the survey had been voluntary but didn't think this was acceptable as it meant the Society would be unable to move forward in this area and felt it should be possible to mandate completion.</p> <p>ADoll noted the difficulties in moving from a voluntary survey to making this a mandatory requirement and was unsure that this could be enforced for roles that were voluntary. She suggested instead that the data for members on all the main governance bodies might be collected and as this would be a much larger cohort, it should be possible to then share the results with Assembly.</p> <p>TG suggested that completion could more easily be mandated if a 'prefer not to say' option was included as a possible response to all questions.</p> <p>PB felt it would be wrong for Assembly members to make a decision on this today without fully understanding what any legal implications to compelling completion might be. ADoll will therefore liaise with the Society's Data Protection Officer/Legal team and will bring a paper for decision back to Assembly in November.</p> <p>ACTION – ADoll</p>	<p>ADoll</p>

		<p>b) Governance Infographic The new infographic, outlining the main governance bodies of the Society, was noted and welcomed by members who believed it would be a very useful guide for members. Agreed this should now be included in the standing items for noting at the start of Assembly and Board meetings.</p> <p>Members also felt it would be helpful to include a link to the infographic in all future comms related to governance and the work of Assembly and Boards.</p> <p>PB added that an accompanying animation was also in the process of being created.</p> <p>c) De-carbonisation of Investments RR informed members that as it would not be possible for the current LGIM fund to meet the Society’s pledge to no longer invest in fossil fuels he would be seeking approval from Assembly in the confidential business session to close the fund and transfer the investment into the Society’s existing Ruffer fund which was fully compliant with the Society’s commitments in the short term until another suitable fund could be identified.</p>	
<p>Item 04 CEO’s Update</p>	<p>22/03/ASB/06</p>	<p>a) Trainee Pharmacists The Society’s grave concerns around the recent issues at a number of the exam centres for Trainee Pharmacists continue to be raised with GPhC. The Society has also been providing support to the students affected and have called on GPhC to offer them re-sit opportunities well before November. PB remains concerned at the proposed use of provisional registration as the sole solution to this issue.</p> <p>The Society has called for the GPhC to publish the findings of any review of the incidents along with their mitigation plan for future assessments.</p> <p>b) Property Portfolio Following previous instruction from Assembly, the Society flat in Lambeth has now been sold for £960k, and the proceeds from the sale, minus expenditure incurred, will be deposited in the Ruffer fund until the Finance & Investment Committee make a recommendation on a suitable new fund.</p> <p>c) Finances The financial position of the Society remains strong - revenues are ahead of budget and overheads remain under good control with a very positive surplus at end of H1, however the Executive are anticipating a tougher second half to the year.</p> <p>PB confirmed that member support and careful management of finances/costs across the organisation remain the top priorities.</p>	

		<p>d) MCCAs The team have been working to update the RPS guidance on MCCAs, last published in 2013. PB acknowledged that it would never be likely to reach a consensus on this issue across all stakeholders but stressed the importance of pharmacists having informed guidance to make the best decisions.</p> <p>e) 66ES Work on re-configuring the office space on the 3rd floor of East Smithfield has now been completed. Phase two of implementation of the new ways of working within the organisation is now underway and will include consideration of the overall Employee Value Proposition in order to attract and retain great talent. Members are able to visit all three of the Society’s offices and the museum on the ground floor of 66ES has also now re-opened to the public.</p> <p>f) RPS Conference The RPS Conference will be held on Friday 11th November at ETC Venues, Hounsditch – programme to be announced shortly. A ‘Celebration of Science’ will also now be held at 66ES on Thursday 10th November.</p>	
<p>Item 05 AGM Motions</p>	<p>22/03/ASB/07</p>	<p>At the Society’s Annual General Meeting on 25th May, a commitment was made that Assembly would consider all of the motions that had been submitted to that meeting, regardless of whether they were considered as part of a consolidated motion or whether they passed or failed at the voting stage. All 38 motions (detailed in Appendix A with corresponding commentary provided by the Executive) would therefore now be considered by Assembly members. A summary of the main resulting discussions points, grouped by theme, is provided below</p> <p>i) Membership of FIP Assembly members are asked to consider whether to:</p> <p>(a) submit an application to FIP that would enable the Society to re-join that organisation (b) undertake a member poll to ascertain whether a majority would wish the Society to re-join FIP before making a decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the decision to leave FIP had been taken for a number of very good reasons and those Assembly members who had voted to leave felt it was the right decision at the time given the lack of perceived value for money/tangible benefits for the level of membership fees the Society was paying and other associated costs 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not being a member doesn't easily fit with being an international leader of the profession or with our diverse membership • feedback received from a number of stakeholders (including from some RPS EAGs) who would wish the Society to re-join • a number of members were keen to understand what the wider membership views on this might be – debate as to whether this should be done now or at a later date, but should be done in the most cost-effective way and would not be a referendum on the matter, rather it would be an exercise to gauge opinion • consultation with members after FIP meeting in Sept would enable info on any new fee structure etc to be included • noted that SPB & WPB Board members unanimously would have wished to remain in FIP • FIP have now had a chance to look at their own member offer/fee structure & clarity would therefore be needed from FIP on a number of matters (including member fees, benefits that might be made available for individual RPS members) should the Soc seek to re-join • noted FIP would be holding its annual congress in Sept at which point any new membership offer/fee structure would likely be announced <p>PB noted that he had been in contact with FIP to gauge how any request to re-join might be received by FIP and received the following response from their Chief Executive:</p> <p><i>It was with great sadness that FIP received the notification that RPS was leaving membership at the end of 2021. As agreed upon departure, we would always welcome the RPS back into membership.</i></p> <p><i>As you know, FIP is working on membership categories, member fees and value. We are having a Council workshop on these items in Seville, informed by the series of High-Level Meetings we have had during 2021 and 2022. The issues of fees and categories will be for Council to vote on during the third Council meeting on Thursday 22nd September.</i></p> <p><i>We know that one area of potential interest to RPS is fee calculations of those member organisations with individuals as members, where membership is voluntary. Should RPS vote to rejoin, FIP remains ready to discuss the process of readmission and the impact of the membership work on RPS fees.</i></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>A general willingness to re-join was agreed, subject to caveats, but there was no consensus on whether the views of the wider membership should be sought or at what point in time this should be done and votes were therefore held as follows:</p> <p>Consult wider membership before re-joining: For – MH, SB, AC, TG, TO, LS, ME, AT, AJ - carried Against – CW, ES, AS, RE, CA</p> <p>Undertake member consultation now or in September: Now – MA, SB, CA, ME, RE Sept – MH, TG, AJ, ES, CW, AC, LS, TO, AT – carried</p> <p>A member consultation exercise should therefore be undertaken once the updated member offer information from FIP was available. The results of this consultation should then be brought back to Assembly in November.</p> <p>ACTION - PMED</p> <p>ii) No Confidence in Executive & Assembly handling of exiting FIP Assembly members are asked to consider whether to:</p> <p>(a) retrospectively seek permission from all parties concerned to publish records of the discussions on FIP membership held in confidential business during 2020/21 and, should this prove to be unanimous, publish all relevant Assembly minutes on the RPS website</p> <p>(b) retrospectively seek permission from all parties concerned to publish the relevant papers considered by Assembly during 2020/21 in reaching its decision to leave membership of FIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that a number of statements to outline the context of the decision had already been issued earlier in the year • some members cautioned against the retrospective opening up of discussions held and papers issued under confidential business as this would, in effect, mean the end of the ability to hold any 	<p>PMED</p>
--	--	--	-------------

		<p>confidential discussions in future and it would therefore be better to look forward and ensure more business was taken into the open sessions of meeting at future meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • info considered by Assembly included commercially confidential info supplied by FIP which could not in any instance be more widely disclosed by the RPS • suggested that some info might, where confidentiality might permit, be included in the consultation with members <p>As there was no consensus on whether the information should be published a vote was held as follows: Seek permission to publish confidential minutes of discussion - AC Not seek permission to publish confidential minutes of discussion - MA, RE, LS, CA, SB, ES, CW, AJ, MH, ME - carried Abstain - TG, AT, TO</p> <p>Members then unanimously AGREED not to seek permission to publish the relevant confidential papers.</p> <p>iii) Royal College Status Assembly members are asked whether: (a) given current workstreams and strategic plans, further consideration of pursuing Royal College status should be undertaken in advance of the current timeline (ie before discussions on the next five year Strategy (estimated Q4 2025 to Q1 2026). (b) whenever it is appropriate for further consideration by Assembly to be given to incorporating an application to become a Royal College into its strategy development, should the membership be asked for its view first to gauge what level of support or otherwise there might be for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no authoritative definition of a Royal College existed, rather there are a number of different definitions • the Society already undertook the vast majority of activities typically associated with other medical and non-medical Royal Colleges • members remained unclear as to what exactly the Society might be able to do if it was re-named as a College that it couldn't do at present as the barrier to furthering our ambitions in the 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>education, accreditation and credentialling space was reliant on receiving the necessary ‘delegated authority’ from GPhC rather than on whether the organisation was a Society or a College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no decision had been made definitively not to ever seek to become a Royal College, rather that it was felt not to be a priority at the present time as the Society was already undertaking the role • those who continued to be vocal in calling for a change to Royal College would better be placed to support the Society in its pursuit of acquiring more activities in the accreditation and credentialling space and lobbying the Independent Commission to recommend GPhC grant us the ‘delegated authority’ for post-registration education etc • focus on obtaining the necessary delegated authority would better serve our members’ interests at present than seeking to pursue a change of name • possibly the inclusion of the word ‘pharmaceutical’ in the existing title is actually more problematic than either Society or College as many externally still think RPS represents the pharmaceutical industry rather than pharmacists and the profession of pharmacy • it may be sensible to wait for the recommendations from the IC before any further consideration of pursuing RC status • members could be consulted at some point in the future on a potential change of name • the value of any action in this area should also be considered in terms of whether it would bring any benefit to the public and patients <p>As there was no consensus as to whether the wider membership, at a time when it was considered by Assembly, should be asked for their views a vote was taken as follows:</p> <p>For – ES, CW, TG, MH, AJ, SB, CA, AT, MH, LS, RE, AC - carried Against – none Abstain – TO, ME</p> <p>Members then also voted on whether it might be appropriate, at a time of Assembly’s choosing which may be informed by the recommendations of the IC, further consideration of pursuing Royal College status should be undertaken [before discussions on the next five-year Strategy] a vote was taken as follows:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>For – SB, TO, ES, CW, TG, AJ, ME, MH, RE, AC, LS, AT, CA - carried Against – MA</p> <p>iv) Membership Involvement in RPS a) Decisions with affect membership Assembly may wish to consider if there are any additional actions beyond supporting and responding to the independent review of member participation and communication that are necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not practical to go out to members for consultation when the Society is operated on an elected governance system that delegates responsibility to BMs and AMs • may be better to think about electing President and/or AMs <p>AGREED Assembly would support and respond to the recommendations of independent review of member participation and communication currently being undertaken by Luther Pendragon.</p> <p>b) President to be directly elected by membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that directly electing the President might require a change to the Charter and that specialist legal advice would therefore be needed in this area • only 14 people electing President doesn't feel very democratic <p>AGREED that a paper outlining potential options for direct election of President by the voting membership should be brought back to Assembly for future consideration. Options should also be included in the paper on direct election of Assembly members.</p> <p>ACTION - AD</p> <p>v) Transparency of RPS a) Recording of Meetings (a) Assembly members are asked if the decision taken in 2020 [not to record meetings] should be re-considered.</p>	<p>AD</p>
--	--	---	-----------

	<p>(b) If so, should a paper outlining legal implications/pros/cons of recording open business sessions of Assembly/Board meetings be brought back to Assembly for formal consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some support in general for a new paper being produced for consideration of recording open business of main governance body meetings only • EAGs/NBCF meetings should not be recorded as these were not governance meetings <p>AGREED that a paper as detailed under (b) (ie covering open business of Assembly/Board meetings only) above should be brought back to Assembly for future consideration</p> <p>ACTION - PMED</p> <p>b) Open Business Assembly members are asked if they wish to re-define the existing categories of confidential and restricted business for Assembly and Board meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall feeling that some items are currently included in Confidential business that could be taken under Open business • Item 6 under Confidential business description (<i>'the fact that a specific topic under consideration is, in itself, confidential'</i>) seemed to be unnecessarily broad and should be removed or replaced with more specific examples • Item 7 under Confidential business description should include a requirement to state what the identifiable reason might be • members re-affirmed a commitment to having as much business as possible in Open sessions • any recommendations from the Luther Pendragon review in this area would need to be considered in due course <p>AGREED that a paper including the points above should be brought back to Assembly in November for future consideration.</p> <p>ACTION - AD</p>	<p>PMED</p> <p>AD</p>
--	---	-----------------------

	<p>c) Closed Business Assembly members are asked to consider publishing headline agenda item descriptions for confidential and restricted business at Assembly and Board meetings unless there is a particular reason of confidentiality that prevents this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would be a need to handle restricted business differently <p>AGREED this would be included in the paper to be produced for 5b above.</p> <p>d) Changes to the Regulations Assembly members are asked to ensure proposed changes to the Regulations are discussed in open business at Assembly meetings unless there is a particular reason of confidentiality that prevents this.</p> <p>AGREED</p> <p>e) Voting on Boards & Assembly meetings Assembly members are asked to affirm their continued commitment to the Regulations (ie that names of members participating in all votes taken at Assembly & Board meetings are included in minutes as per Appendix F & G).</p> <p>Members unanimously affirmed.</p> <p>f) AGM Motions Assembly will wish to consider reaffirming the established procedure for dealing with AGM motions.</p> <p>Members unanimously re-affirmed.</p> <p>g) Expert Advisory Groups (a) Assembly will wish to consider if this motion [ie that all EAGs allow members to observe meetings and have agendas and minutes published on-line] is worthy of support given the form and function of EAG's.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>(b) If it is, should it be at the discretion of the Chairs and members of the EAG themselves, recognising that all members would need to be comfortable to have observers in attendance and for any agenda and minutes produced to be made available more widely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that some EAGs did already publish minutes of meetings • important that Board and Assembly members are aware of what is being discussed by EAGs so should, at a minimum, be available to these members • observers not felt to be appropriate as only advisory, not governance meetings and membership is voluntary – members are not accountable to the wider membership in the same way that Board members are, but that this could be left to discretion of Chairs • concern that if minutes were more widely published they could incorrectly be seen as containing the policy stances of the organisation • noted that the three Country Directors had already been tasked by the National Boards to work with the EAGs to better increase connection with the Boards – this process was already underway but would by necessity take time to complete. In the interim, agendas are already published in advance and an ‘outcome/action points’ template to summarise each meeting for circulation to the Boards has been created as full minutes of meetings are not produced <p>AGREED it would not be appropriate, given the role and remit of the EAGS, to mandate observers or the publication of agendas and formal minutes but that the advice produced by EAGs be made available to Board and Assembly members through the template referred to above and the process already under way by the CDs be allowed to continue as currently planned.</p> <p>h) Sub-committees</p> <p>Should the Committees of the Assembly segregate their agendas into ‘open’ and ‘confidential’ business, recognising that given the nature of their business that some will have none, or very little, that could be categorised as ‘open’.</p> <p>AGREED that, whilst most business of the governance committees would fall under confidential business, these committees should be asked to segregate their agendas in the same way that Assembly and Boards do.</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>ACTION – AD/RR</p> <p>i) External Payments to Governance Members (a) Does the Assembly wish to add to the list of disclosures already required. (b) If so, what specific additional disclosures should be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that Patreon, as referenced in the full detail of the related motion, was an on-line mechanism whereby Twitter users could give money to other Twitter users (eg for services undertaken or just to ‘buy someone a coffee’ virtually) and tended to be for small sums of money (ie £2-£3) but that it might helpful to add reference to on-line donations in general • noted that attendance by members at round table events were nearly always ad-hoc in nature so would be very difficult to specifically declare in advance • suggested that the Board/Assembly members’ expenses listing in the Annual Report be broken down by category rather than headline total only and any additional governance position held by individuals be noted • the Society’s Expenses Policy already included a robust ‘pre authorisation’ process for attendance at additional events <p>AGREED a paper be produced outlining amendments/additions to the current list of disclosures and brought back to Assembly in November for consideration.</p> <p>ACTION - AD</p> <p>j) Risk Register Assembly members are asked to consider if it would be appropriate to publish the Society’s corporate Risk Register.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted that, by their very nature, Risk Registers would contain mostly confidential information • not published by other comparable organisations 	<p>AD/RR</p> <p>AD</p>
--	--	---	------------------------

	<p>AGREED it would be inappropriate for the Risk Register to be published.</p> <p>k) National Board Chairs' Forum Assembly members are asked to:</p> <p>(a) consider if it would be appropriate to allow members to attend non-confidential items as observers at meetings of the NBCF.</p> <p>(b) consider if it would be appropriate to publish non-confidential minutes of meetings of the NBCF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBCF is not a governance committee, has an informal, more operational role to help the three Chairs and Country Directors align work streams, set joint meeting agendas etc • given the role/remit, a number of members could see no benefit to the wider membership observing the meetings but thought that it would be helpful if Board Members, particularly Vice-Chairs, were able to attend and observe if they wished to <p>As a consensus could not be reached on this item, a vote on whether the wider membership should be allowed to attend as observers was taken as follows:</p> <p>For – AC, TO, AT Against – SB, MA, ES, CW, AJ, RE, CA - carried Abstain – LS, TH, MH, ME</p> <p>Members then voted on whether Board Members should be allowed to attend as observers as follows:</p> <p>For – SB, TG, MA, TO, AJ, ME - carried Against – ES, CW, CA, RE Abstain – LS, AC, MH, AT</p> <p>ACTION – RS/EJ/CM</p> <p>A vote was also held on whether minutes of non-confidential items at NBCF meetings should be published for the wider membership as follows:</p>	<p>RS/EJ/CM</p>
--	--	------------------------

		<p>For – TO, AT, AC, ME Against – ES, CW, MA, SB, TG, AJ, RE, CA – carried Abstain – LS, MH</p> <p>AGREED that the minutes of the meetings should be circulated to Board Members for information.</p> <p>ACTION – RS/EJ/CM</p> <p>MH left the meeting at this point.</p> <p>I) Member numbers & Member demographics Assembly members are asked if the decision taken in July 2021 should be reconsidered and whether to: (a) continue to publish the member numbers annually as they are now (b) publish membership numbers by individual categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it was felt that the wording of b) above was not reflective of the wording of the original corresponding motion which referred specifically to publishing ‘member numbers by demographic, at the very least to include gender, ethnicity • noted that it was already possible to calculate the specific total number of Members and Fellows of the Society each year by using information published in the annual Election Report and that not to openly publish this information made it easier for the Society to be criticised for not doing so formally • noted that the Society did not routinely collect EDI data for its members and the suggestion that this be made mandatory if at all possible was again raised <p>AGREED that, as a minimum, the Society would continue to publish the member numbers annually as they were currently.</p>	<p>RS/EJ/CM</p>
--	--	---	-----------------

		<p>As a consensus could not be reached on whether to include a breakdown of numbers by individual categories, a vote was taken on whether a paper should be brought back detailing options on this as follows:</p> <p>For: ES, CW, RE, AT, SB, LS, CA, AC, TG, AJ - carried Against: MA Abstain: TO, ME</p> <p>ACTION - PMED</p> <p>AGREED that the possibility of mandating collection of EDI data for all members be explored (as noted in Item 03a above) and that this information should be published once it was available.</p> <p>ACTION - ADoll</p> <p>MH returned to the meeting.</p> <p>m) Non-member attendance at EAGs Assembly is asked to consider if this is a worthwhile activity for the organisation to undertake given the purpose of EAGs.</p> <p>AGREED this was not appropriate given the purpose of EAGs.</p> <p>vi) RPS Governance Structures a) Governance Review Assembly members are asked if they wish to consider commissioning a further substantive review of the Society's governance, with a paper outlining options for potential scope/membership, costs etc to be brought back for consideration.</p>	<p>PMED</p> <p>ADoll</p>
--	--	--	--------------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • suggested it would be sensible to wait and see what recommendations the Independent Commission might have that would potentially relate to RPS governance before undertaking a further review • some support for looking at what was in the current Charter that we might want to change • details of what would be required in order to change the current Charter would be helpful to have <p>AGREED a paper outlining options should be brought back to Assembly for consideration in March following the publication of the IC recommendations.</p> <p>ACTION - AD</p> <p>b) Frequency of Meetings Assembly members are asked if a paper outlining options, resources/costs etc for holding additional meetings of Assembly and National Pharmacy Boards be brought back for consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unsure what failings, if any, had been identified that had been caused by holding the current number of meetings • mindful that external workloads for members were already substantial and finding time to attend additional meetings would prove problematic for some • Country Directors currently have a devolved country budget envelope and work within that in terms of meetings <p>AGREED a paper outlining options should be brought back to Assembly in November for consideration.</p> <p>ACTION – RR/RS/EJ/CM</p> <p>RE left the meeting at this point.</p> <p>c) Updates at meetings (a) Does the Assembly wish to change its established approach. (b) If so, what principle should be adopted.</p>	<p>AD</p> <p>RR/RS/ EJ/CM</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noted meetings sometimes do receive verbal updates where a paper could have been produced instead but that members in the past have felt there were too many papers to read before meetings • balance has changed over the last 12 months or so to short concise papers for noting which was encouraged to continue <p>AGREED the established approach would be continued.</p> <p>d) Zoom This has already been introduced, with the majority of Assembly/Board meetings being held wholly remotely, attendance by members for open business of all Boards and Assembly meetings via Zoom facilitated as a matter of course and the option for Assembly Members and Board Members to attend any meetings via zoom where circumstances dictate attendance in person is not possible.</p> <p>AGREED this approach would continue.</p> <p>e) Expenses Cap Assembly members are asked to consider: (a) whether a maximum annual cap be introduced for the total amount of expenses an individual Board/Assembly member can claim and, if so, (b) what level the cap should be set at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not practical or useful as members living in different locations would incur different travel costs • members undertaking additional committee roles and other duties would also have higher expenses • robust Expenses Policy is already in place and enforced <p>AGREED a maximum annual cap would not be introduced.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>vii) RPS Business Assembly members are asked to consider: (a) should the Society make an annual donation to Pharmacist Support (b) should the donation be for a minimum of £1 per member of the Society (c) If not, would Assembly wish to consider other options for charitable donations as part of its approach to corporate social responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Society had historically donated significant amounts to PS • what other charitable donations has/does the Soc already make, including gifts in kind? • some support for supporting all pharmacy charities not just PS • could be an option for members to be able to add a donation to PS or another charity of their choice when they join or as part of annual renewal • how donations would be treated in terms of tax relief etc would need to be considered • would the £ come directly out of the fees the member pays or would it come from another pot of money? <p>AGREED a paper outlining options for charitable donations as part of its approach to CSR should be brought to Assembly in November for consideration.</p> <p>ACTION - RR</p> <p>viii) Professional Indemnity Cover Does Assembly wish the organisation to continue to explore the opportunity to develop an insurance offer as part of its membership proposition?</p> <p>AJ declared an interest as a member of the PDA Union Executive and will abstain from any vote on this item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • might there be potential future conflicts of interest if the RPS as producer of professional standards were also provider of PI? • not our core business and should focus on that instead 	<p>RR</p>
--	---	-----------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would be useful to know how far along in the process of exploring this opportunity the team had currently got -have been gauging member interest through a survey – would be useful to see the results of this before taking any further decision <p>As there was no consensus on whether to continue this work or not a vote was taken as follows:</p> <p>For: CA, AC, CW, AT, ES, SB, TO, LS, MH - carried Against: MA, ME Abstain: AJ, TG</p> <p>ix) Further Motions Received</p> <p>a) RPS Locals AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards.</p> <p>b) PJ Content AGREED Assembly supported the currently proposed PJ work plans as detailed in the commentary provided (see relevant section of Appendix 1).</p> <p>c) Pharmacy Workforce AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards and any update following response from GPhC.</p> <p>d) Pharmaceutical Wholesalers AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards.</p> <p>e) PDA Safer Pharmacy Charter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> noted this item was considered at the last joint National Boards meeting where a vote was taken by the EPB but not by SPB or WPB noted that lessons should be learnt from the misunderstandings that arose at the meeting as to how this item would be handled and why papers on the background to this item and the details of 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the endorsement process had not been provided – at no point since discussion of this item was first raised at the Boards has any formal endorsement process been raised with Board members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EPB had voted unanimously to adopt and there was support among some English AMs that this Board should therefore be able to progress adopting the Charter within England, regardless of what SPB and WPB might choose to do • AMs in Wales and Scotland felt the adoption of the Charter should formally follow the Society’s established endorsement procedure (published on the Society’s website) • as with all GB wide policy considerations, the three Board Chairs should attempt to reach a consensus and if this was not possible the matter would then be brought to Assembly for final consideration • some members felt this would appear to contradict the policy remit of Boards as Assembly was not the main policy making forum however it was noted that Assembly does set UK wide policy where the three Boards are unable to reach a common position • noted that there wasn’t currently a process for individual Boards to make endorsements, only the overarching RPS endorsement process, and to diverge from this would be to move away from the current ‘one RPS’ concept of working across the three Boards • noted that some aspects of the PDA Charter were in contradiction to some aspects of existing RPS policy and MEP content so it would not be possible to approve the PDA Charter as written through the existing endorsement process • debatable if PDA themselves had formally sought endorsement by suggesting RPS could ‘sign up’ to the Charter rather than completing the formal written application form. However, it was noted that PDA had attended other meetings with RT, PB and SG (then President) where the Charter had been mentioned and no formal application had been received <p>AGREED WT would circulate the formal endorsement process with Assembly members for information and would also contact the PDA and invite them to formally apply for endorsement.</p> <p>ACTION - WT</p> <p>f) Pharmacist Apprenticeships AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards.</p>	<p>WT</p>
--	--	--	-----------

		<p>g) Primary Care Pharmacists AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards.</p> <p>h) Emergency Supplies Support TG noted that, as the ‘RPS Assembly member’ referred to in the narrative of the motion as proposed to the AGM her comments had been taken out of context and misrepresented and didn’t fully capture the nuance of what she had said on this matter. She felt it would have been useful to have included reference to this in the commentary provided in the Assembly paper and clarified that she does not support pharmacists being struck off for not issuing an emergency supply when a GP surgery is open but does believe they should be explaining their reasons for not doing so to the patient and noted that the MEP guidance on this is very clear. She therefore requested that when the motion goes on to be considered by the Boards that reference to the ‘RPS Assembly member’ be removed.</p> <p>PB noted that TG would be able to ensure this in her role as EPB Chair, however TG did not want to be open to accusations of abusing her position in this role. CA, MA and AJ agreed that TG’s comments had been misrepresented and were in agreement with the reference being removed.</p> <p>ACTION – RS/EJ/CM</p> <p>AGREED Assembly will note the outcome of discussion of this motion at the National Boards.</p>	<p>RS/EJ/ CM</p>
<p>Item 06 Independent Participation & Corporate Comms Review</p>		<p>NP gave a presentation on the work of Luther Pendragon, the external Comms agency engaged to carry out the review. The survey to members closed on 11th July, with ~1400 responses being received. The final results of the review will be shared with Assembly and also published in full.</p>	
<p>Item 07 Independent Commission</p>		<p>CA attended the first meeting of the Commission yesterday but was unable to provide any outputs at this stage as the meeting had been confidential. She informed members that comms on the meeting would be issued centrally by the Commission but added that the meeting had been very positive and open. A call for</p>	

		submitting evidence to the Commission will be issued in August, with the final recommendations report being issued by the end of this year.	
Item 08 Supervision		PB noted that little progress had been made to date by the national working group. Supervision had been discussed at the recent National Board meetings where consensus had been reached on many points which had then allowed the Society to inform and update its position statement on this matter, subject to final agreement across the three Boards.	
Item 09 Risk Management Policy		The new policy document to articulate the updated organisational methodology for managing risk was approved.	
Item 10 Any Other Business		The dates of the next meeting, to be held on 15 th & 16 th November, were noted. CA confirmed the intention at the moment would be for both days to be face-to-face meetings.	

DRAFT

ACTION SHEET – Assembly Meeting 20th July OPEN BUSINESS

Item	Action	Who by	When
Item 03(a) EDI Data Collection	ADoll to liaise with DPO/Legal team re options for compelling completion of EDI questionnaires	ADoll	November Assembly
Item 05(i) FIP membership	Member consultation on updated FIP membership offer to be undertaken once new information from FIP is available	PMED	mid-Sept
Item 05(iv) Election of President	Paper on potential options for direct election of President by members to be produced	AD	As soon as practical
Item 05(v) Rerecording Open business	Paper on potential options for recording open business of Assembly/Board meetings to be produced	PMED	As soon as practical
Item 05(v) Open/Confidential Business	Paper outlining options for updating Open/Confidential/Restricted business classifications to be produced for November Assembly	AD	November Assembly
Item 05(v) Governance Meetings	Governance committees to segregate agendas into Open/Closed business	AD/RR	Next round of meetings
Item 05(v) Declaration of Interests	Paper proposing amendments to existing list of governance members' disclosures to be produced for November Assembly	AD	November Assembly
Item 05(v) National Board Chairs' Forum	Board Members to be permitted to attend NBCF meetings as observers NBCF minutes to be circulated to Board Members for information	RS/EJ/CM	Next round of meetings

Item 05(v) Member Numbers	Paper outlining options for publishing member numbers to be produced	PMED	As soon as practical
Item 05(vi) Governance Review	Paper outlining options for a potential substantive review of RPS governance to be produced following publication of Independent Commission recommendations	AD	March Assembly
Item 05(vi) Frequency of Meetings	Paper outlining options for changing frequency of Board/Assembly meetings to be produced for November Assembly	RR/RS/EJ/CM	November Assembly
Item 05(vii) Charitable Donations	Paper outlining options for charitable donations as part of RPS CSR to be produced for November Assembly	RR	November Assembly
Item 05(ix) RPS Endorsement Process	Details of RPS formal endorsement process to be circulated to Assembly members	WT	As soon as possible
	PDA to be invited to make a formal application for endorsement of Charter	WT	As soon as possible
Item 05(ix) Emergency Supplies Support	Relevant AGM item to be amended before submission for consideration by National Boards	RS/EJ/CM	Next round of meetings