

Minutes of Assembly Meeting held on 16th November 2022 at 66ES and via VC

- Present: Claire Anderson (CA) - Chair, Martin Astbury (MA), Sibby Buckle (SB), Andrew Carruthers (AC), Audrey Thompson (AT), Alisdair Jones (AJ), Ruth Edwards (RE), Tase Oputu (TO), Lynne Smith (LS), Cheryl Way (CW), Eleri Schiavone (ES) – via VC, Mary Evans (ME), Thorrun Govind (TG) – part meeting
- In attendance: Paul Bennett (PB), Karen Baxter (KB), Avril Chester (ACh), Helen Gray (HG), Rick Russell (RR), Elen Jones (EJ) – via VC, Clare Morrison (CM) – via VC, Alison Douglas (AD), Aman Doll (ADoll), Neal Patel (NP), Wing Tang (WT)
- Observers: 14 Members registered to attend the meeting, STAFF OBSERVERS
- Apologies: Mike Hannay (MH), Neville Carter (NC)

Item	Paper	Notes and actions	Action by
Item 1 Welcome & Apologies		CA welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from MH, TG and NC.	
Item 2 Items for noting	22/11/ASB/02	The following items were noted: a) Code of Conduct & Remit of Assembly and COG b) Declarations of interest c) Minutes of the Open Business Assembly Meeting 19 th /20 th July d) National Pharmacy Board Reports e) President's Report f) Treasurer's Report	

		<p>g) 2022 Education & Standards Committee Report & minutes of Committee 4th October h) 2022 Science & Research Committee Report & minutes of the Committee 11th October i) Education & Professional Development update j) Inclusion & Diversity update k) 2022 Health & Safety Report l) 2023 Election Scheme</p> <p>The 2023 Election Scheme was noted and adopted. SB observed that the Scheme set out a requirement for candidates to the EPB to have 10 nominators while candidates for the WPB only needed one. AD reminded members that the number of nominators was wholly in the gift of the individual National Boards and that EPB discuss the number required each year, taking the decision earlier in 2022 that the number of nominators require to stand would remain at 10 for 2023.</p>	
<p>Item 03 Matters Arising</p>	<p>22/11/ASB/03</p>	<p>a) EDI Data Collection</p> <p>ADoll joined the meeting and outlined the various options that had been considered for collecting EDI data across the membership of the Society. She highlighted that the low completion rate of the optional survey issued in the last two years had meant it was not really possible to get an accurate picture of the overall membership and a more sustainable solution was therefore needed.</p> <p>TO stressed the importance of being able to track and measure any impact of the work the team were doing on I&D which was very difficult to assess without baseline data. She agreed the response rate to the survey was not good and the optional nature of the exercise clearly didn't give the Society the information it needed, despite being a significant amount of work for the staff to implement/undertake.</p> <p>Members agreed the addition of a mandatory field at the application stage, with the option to select a 'prefer not to say' response, should be introduced. However, additional measures would also be needed to capture information on current members and ADoll therefore additionally proposed running a campaign throughout the year, co-ordinated with other related campaigns to encourage existing members to submit responses, and will liaise with other Royal Colleges to see how they approach this.</p> <p>AGREED Option 1 as outlined in the paper would be implemented ie optional collection as part of the membership joining and renewal processes and storage in CRM (identifiable to the individual).</p> <p>ACTION - ADoll</p>	<p>ADoll</p>

		<p>b) Independent Commission</p> <p>PB gave a brief update on the work of the Commission to date. The five Working Groups established to gather evidence are progressing and have been asked to come up with three core, and up to two additional, recommendations each which will then be considered by the Commission as a whole and included in the final report. He believed the Society was as engaged as it could be with the Commission and added that a number of staff and members were part of the Working Groups and had also attended the related webinars, as well as having a very positive relationship with the Chief Pharmaceutical Officers and the Chairs of the Commission. The Society has also made its own extensive submission outlining plans to be bold, forthright and demonstrate leadership to the Commission which it sought members' comments on in advance.</p> <p>PB did not wish to pre-empt the findings of the Commission but did want the Society to be in a position to be able to respond rapidly once the recommendations were published in January and felt the current Commission Working Group areas might therefore be useful for the Society to map onto in the first instance ahead of any findings.</p> <p>He believed it was likely some of the recommendations could well prompt the need for change, particularly in the area of governance of pharmacy professional leadership bodies, but stressed that the final Commission recommendations would need to be discussed in full by Assembly. AGREED that an additional half-day meeting of Assembly should be scheduled for February to consider the Commission outcomes in the first instance head of the formal Assembly meeting in March.</p> <p>ACTION – AD</p> <p>SB noted that an element of funding for work to implement any agreed outcomes from the Commission recommendations had already been included in the budget.</p>	<p>AD</p>
<p>Item 04 CEO's Report</p>		<p>Annual Conference</p> <p>PB thanked the team for making the 2022 Conference such a great success – over 550 people had attended in person and over 200 had joined online, which was a great turn out for the very first hybrid conference. Staff would be undertaking a deeper analysis of the data on workshop attendance etc and the information obtained would be used by the PMED team to help better shape the member offer to</p>	

		<p>individual areas of interest etc. Overall feedback indicated a very high level of engagement by participants and the key note speakers had been particularly appreciated.</p> <p>RE noted that further engagement with PhSC would help increase student member attendance for future years and would look at how this might best be achieved for 2023.</p> <p>Celebration of Science The event held at 66ES the evening before the Conference had also been a success, with over 75 people attending.</p> <p>Professional Practice PB highlighted the work done by the PMED team to support professional practice - in particular the work done to revise the RPS Standards for Hospitals, which had seen a very collaborative approach taken to create the final document by working in partnership with Pharmacy Forum for Northern Ireland (PFNI) and APTUK, as had also been the case for updating the Standards for Error Reporting. The Society will be collaborating further with APTUK and PFNI in 2023 on work around Duty of Candour and has been commissioned by the Welsh government to undertake phase two work on standards for Prison Services. Andrew Evans (CPhO Wales) in particular was thanked for his support with this.</p> <p>Luther Pendragon Review Noted that the final report from LP into member engagement and communication had been received by Assembly at an additional session on 7th November. The report had identified a number of recommendations and work was now underway within the PMED teams to implement the ‘quick fix’ area identified. A further Assembly session will be held on 1st December to fully discuss the overall findings.</p>	
<p>Item 05 AGM related Items</p>	<p>22/11/ASB/05</p>	<p>a) Direct Election of President The legal advice outlined in the paper setting out the ambiguity on the current wording of the Charter and the ability for any changes to be made to the way in which the President was elected was noted and members agreed that this should be considered in 2023 as part of the expected wider review of governance expected to be necessary as part of the outcomes of the Independent Commission. MA asked that the ambiguity of the current wording of the Charter on the ability to make changes to the composition of Assembly be similarly included in the review.</p> <p>b) Recording of Open Business The different options outlined in the paper were considered.</p>	

		<p>AT, whilst fully supportive of the move to increase transparency, noted that the paper outlined a ‘not insignificant’ level of resources needed to implement this proposal and wondered if it would be worthwhile set against how widely used the resource would be. WT explained that the work would mainly be one-off to complete the necessary preparatory legal and technical work and then would predominantly be any editing of the final recording necessary prior to publication.</p> <p>SB queried why any editing of the recording would be necessary given that the open business sessions of the meetings were already live streamed via Zoom and believed any editing would automatically change the accuracy of the record of the meeting. PB understood that any need for editing would be highly infrequent and would only be done in the interests of preventing things like propagating the publication of any slanderous statements etc.</p> <p>Members discussed whether the recording should be published behind a member log-in firewall. ES asked what other Royal Colleges did in this area and WT replied that the only other comparable body that did publish recordings of its meetings was the Royal College of Nursing, and that they published this behind a member firewall.</p> <p>AC questioned the period of 60 days for keeping a recording on the website and felt it would be more appropriate to keep until formal agreement of the minutes of the meeting had been completed. WT confirmed that once the agreed period had elapsed the recordings would be permanently deleted and no ‘master copy’ would be kept by staff, as the formal record of the business of the meeting would continue to be via the production of written minutes. RPS has made its own extensive submission outlining our plans to be bold, forthright and demonstrate leadership to the Commission which it sought members’ comments on in advance.</p> <p>AGREED to implement Option 3 ie to move to implement digital recording and publication of open business of RPS governance meetings to members only behind a membership log in. Live observers will continue to be welcome and written minutes will remain as the official record of the meeting. The recordings will be made available for time limited period only to minimise data protection risks/storage requirements and will only be kept until the formal agreement of the minutes of the meeting at the next meeting.</p> <p>Recordings would only be edited in very exceptional circumstances and any edits should be flagged up to Assembly/Boards in advance.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>ACTON – WT</p> <p>c) Open/Confidential Business The proposed amendments to the Standing Orders for Assembly were APPROVED ie the reason for classification must be identifiable and must be included on the cover sheet for the paper, headline confidential business agendas to be published on the relevant Assembly meetings section alongside the full open business agenda and open business papers.</p> <p>Assembly Standing Orders will now be updated and a recommendation will be taken to the next National Board meetings to be formally adopted for Board meetings as above.</p> <p>ACTION – AD/Country Directors</p> <p>d) Declaration of Interests The proposed amendments to the Conflicts of Interest, Gifts & Hospitality Policy and annual Declaration of Interests form for governance members were APPROVED and will now be implemented for the 2023 declaration forms.</p> <p>ACTION – AD</p> <p>e) Charitable Donations RR summarised the history of the Society’s support for the Pharmacist Support charity over the past decades and members discussed the proposal that an option be included on each membership form which, post-payment of the membership fees, will allow members to add a separate charitable donation to Pharmacist Support.</p> <p>RR noted that the team were currently working through practicalities involved in enabling members who didn’t renew by direct debit to make similar donations if they wished to and were liaising directly with Pharmacist Support on the best solutions but that the limitations of the resources available in the tech team would impact on whether or not this could be implemented in time for the 2023 renewals.</p> <p>TO asked if thought had been given to enabling members to donate in this way to other charities. RR noted that only PS had been looked at present but felt it would be possible to incorporate other charities</p>	<p>WT</p> <p>AD/EJ/CM</p> <p>AD</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

		<p>that Assembly might consider appropriate. AGREED that a formal process for any suitable pharmacy related charities to be able to approach the Society for inclusion should be developed, with COG to consider any application. This would then allow Assembly to challenge any decision to reject a charity inappropriate at the next Assembly meeting when it came to the ratification of COG decisions.</p> <p>ACTION - RR</p> <p>f) Frequency of Meetings Noted that the National Boards were able to set the frequency/duration/style of Board Meetings themselves over the course of the year within their individual Board budgets. As Assembly meetings were less able to be fluid because of a number of fixed point fixed-point business and governance requirements for meetings members agreed that the current meeting pattern might be considered in any fuller review of governance undertaken in 2023 following the IC review.</p> <p>g) FIP Membership PB reminded Assembly that a consultation exercise had very recently been carried out with all members on whether they would like to see the Society re-join FIP. A very good response had been received with 184 members being in support of re-joining and only 3 members being against.</p> <p>The reform of terms of membership of FIP was to be discussed by FIP Council members in November before an extraordinary Council meeting is held mid-December. At that meeting the Council will vote to either accept, amend, or reject the proposals. The detail of the proposal is confidential to FIP, but we have been provided with the following summary by the FIP CEO:</p> <p><i>The membership reforms at FIP are set to focus on our membership categories, members fees and voting rights of the different categories to create a more cohesive and transparent model that is inclusive to all who are eligible to be member organisation. These developments are in the spirit of making fees more affordable and sustainable for all, while reducing the reliance of FIP on a few highest paying members, of benefit to all. To this end, we commit to our existing and new MOs that the fees will not increase in 2023, and no inflationary rise is in our plans. Secondly, we will endeavour to ensure individual members of our member organisations will have greater awareness of FIP and their member organisation’s inputs and contributions globally, as well as the wider work of FIP. This will ensure we maximise the benefits of the MO investment in FIP membership to their members, whilst increasing global awareness of FIP activities and influence- a mutual benefit to our members and to FIP and our profession worldwide.</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Given this and that Assembly members were fully supportive of FIPs overall direction of travel, the clear wish among the wider RPS membership to re-join and the tight FIP governance deadlines, Assembly AGREED that the Society should apply immediately after the November Assembly meeting, to meet the FIP’s administrative timetable, but with the caveat that if FIP Council were not to agree favourably revised terms the application be suspended. The Chairs and Officers Group (COG) will assess Council’s decision for expediency. The President welcomed this important decision.</p> <p>Members requested that the final detail of the FIP offer should be shared with Board and Assembly members at the same time as COG for information and to allow them to provide comment to COG should they wish to.</p> <p>ACTION – PB/COG</p> <p>g) Publishing Member Numbers</p> <p>Noted that although the Society does already publish the headline number of members each year as part of the Annual Report the information is not currently easy to find and could be made more readily available on the website. NP added that appropriate narrative would need to be included to acknowledge that the totals may well not be what the Society would want and to give some details as to actions and activities being done to both recruit and retain members. The decision required from Assembly members would then be which figure would be published, the overall headline number of members in total across all categories or whether this should be broken down further by category.</p> <p>Members noted that it was already currently possible to calculate the number of Members and Fellows in a given year from the information provided in the NPB Elections Report but acknowledged that a degree of effort was required to do this.</p> <p>SB suggested it might be beneficial to provide a breakdown of totals by country as it would make members in Wales & Scotland aware of the significant resources they receive per member head. However EJ, CM and a number of Assembly members strongly disagreed and felt this would be a very divisive move. The Country Directors stressed that although a number of staff resources might be based in the Wales and Scotland offices they were actually part of GB wide teams and worked on numerous GB wide projects</p>	<p>PB/COG</p>
--	--	--	---------------

		<p>SB left the meeting at this point to take a phone call. After discussion of the various options the remaining members unanimously AGREED that the top level figure only should be published. [Secretary’s note: SB was absent from the meeting room when this decision was taken].</p> <p>PB stressed that both the PMED team and the Executive did focus in some detail on the granularity of the numbers in all membership categories and received regular breakdowns of the totals in each.</p>	
<p>Item 09 Diversity Targets</p>	<p>22/11/ASB/09</p>	<p>This item was brought forward on the agenda and HG introduced the paper outlining work undertaken to date on diversity monitoring/reporting throughout the recruitment process and the next steps that we are proposing to take. SB returned to the meeting.</p> <p>RE cautioned against drawing any conclusions from such a small pool of data. HG noted that as the new HR reporting system had only been introduced in July data was only available for the last quarter but regular reports would be produced going forward. The team had felt it would be timely to engage an external consultant to help review the Society’s current I&D strategy and will report back on this at the next meetings of the Remuneration Committee and Assembly.</p> <p>HG noted that there were no specific criteria per se for recruitment panels but teams always sought to ensure diversity, particularly at the more senior levels, and she will be working with the external consultant to help develop a recruitment charter.</p> <p>AJ noted that the paper referred to ‘diversity targets’ and asked what these targets were. HG explained that ‘targets’ in general were referenced in the I&D strategy to be representative of the population served by the Society but that the information used to gauge what this might be was taken from the 2011 census at present which she didn’t necessarily think would be the best measure to use and would therefore be looking at this with the external consultants. An update after the meeting on where the Society currently sits against this target will be circulated to Assembly members.</p> <p>ACTION – HG</p> <p>RE noted that the makeup of the pharmacy profession in general in terms of ethnicity and gender was quite different to that of the general population however HG noted that the majority of employees at the Society were not pharmacists.</p> <p>TO did not recall Assembly agreeing these targets previously and felt the paper was still not representative of an appropriate way forward in this area, either for the organisation as a whole or the Executive Team more specifically, and the figures included did not look good in terms of who applied against those who</p>	<p>HG</p>

	<p>went on to be hired. She felt the large degree of turnover at senior level this year would have represented a good chance to take some positive action in this area which had been missed as there was very little visible diversity at the senior level. She noted that she was now nearing the end of her second year on Assembly but didn't feel there had been any significant positive movement in this area and asked that Assembly have greater sight of the internal I&D strategy and the agreed targets on a regular basis in order to be able to monitor progress.</p> <p>HG noted that I&D had been discussed in greater detail at the recent Remuneration Committee meeting and the I&D strategy had been brought to Assembly in July but she did agree it was not currently the finished article and this was why the external consultant had been engaged. She hadn't been under the impression that Assembly were expecting a new/final Strategy or specific targets for approval at the meeting today as these were both currently being worked on. She agreed that more work is needed in this area and committed to bring back suitable updates on both to the March meeting.</p> <p>ACTION – HG</p> <p>TO asked how RemCom were monitoring progress against the targets at present. HG explained that the Committee were looking at diversity directly but also at the employee journey as a whole in terms of the overall Employee Value Proposition including staff development, succession planning etc.</p> <p>PB welcomed the challenge from TO to progress in this area and echoed HG's commitment to improvement. He noted that the recent rounds of recruitment (particularly to CEMO and Director for England roles) had felt very different and had been open to applicants from a diverse field. Whilst various appointments made this year may not appear to be as diverse as they might have been he reminded members that diversity can take many forms. He felt the Society's endeavours to become more diverse and to be an employer of choice were more beneficial than specific targets per se but thanked TO for keeping this item active.</p> <p>LS asked how opaque the new 'blind' recruitment process was. HG informed members that the new software removes names and also universities etc but agreed there was no real fool proof solution as individuals would always be able to google applicants if they were minded to.</p> <p>ME asked if the language used in recruitment adverts had been looked at. HG noted that the team had done a significant amount of work in this area having undertaken education for recruiting managers, introducing bias reading software tools, providing different types of I&D training such as unconscious bias and disability confidence training (with unconscious bias and on-line I&D training being mandatory for</p>	<p>HG</p>
--	---	-----------

		<p>managers) etc and noted that the level of diversity at application stage wasn't an issue but came further down the recruitment process.</p> <p>PB noted that the recent disability confidence training in particular had been very enlightening and had helped refresh the Exec team's thinking on how to use a similar approach across all areas of diversity, stressed again the team's strong desire to get better and do more on this.</p>	
<p>Item 06 Panel of Fellows</p>	<p>22/11/ASB/06</p>	<p>The annual report from the Panel was noted and Christine Bond (Panel of Fellows Chair) joined the meeting for this item to give a presentation to members.</p> <p>CB noted that although the terms of reference for the Panel allow for a total of eight members there were only seven at present. She was happy with this and didn't believe it was an issue for the work of the Panel but did reflect that it might be helpful to have a representative from industry join as a small but not insignificant number of applications for Fellowship are received from this sector.</p> <p>CB observed that the number of nominations to Fellowship had already dropped off somewhat in 2019 prior to the pandemic and noted that other organisations do tend to give out more fellowships than the Society. She noted that the recent improvements to the nomination process and increased promotion didn't appear to have increased the number of nominations received although the Panel did feel the quality of the nominations had improved. She felt having more blogs on the website on the process might be helpful in this regard.</p> <p>CB would also welcome increased engagement with existing Fellows by the creation of some form of community for them which would also serve as an invaluable resource for the organisation and felt more local events, virtual groups via RPS Connect would all help.</p> <p>She noted that pharmacists were also under represented at the national awards level and felt it might be worth considering how this might be addressed as well as encouraging more nominations for Honorary Fellowships, MA suggested that pharmacy technicians in particular might be considered Honorary Fellowships.</p> <p>CB suggested some form of Pharmaceutical Scientist Fellowship might also be worth considering although she acknowledged there were current barriers to this within the Society's governing documents but might be considered if a wider review of the Charter were to be undertaken.</p>	

		Members were supportive of all these suggestions and also broadly supportive of the suggestion of a death in service award which might possibly be awarded retrospectively for members who had passed away during the pandemic.	
Item 07 Membership Committee	22/11/ASB/07	<p>The annual report from the Committee was noted and Anne Boyter (MemCom Chair) joined the meeting for this item.</p> <p>AB informed members that her tenure as chair was now ending and Nick Thayer had been appointed to replace her but that she would be remaining on the committee in an ex officio capacity for 12 months to help with the transition. She expressed her thanks to Paul Jenks, Vice-Chair, who was also coming to the end of his tenure and to the Committee members for the time they gave up to work on the committee. She believed the Committee now functions very well and the revised Conduct Scheme had proved to be a great improvement on the old process.</p> <p>PB thanked AB for her professionalism and the significant work she had done as Chair.</p>	
Item 08 CPA	22/11/ASB/08	<p>TG joined the meeting.</p> <p>The annual report from the Association was noted and Vicky Rutter (CEO, CPA) joined the meeting for this item to give a presentation to members.</p> <p>CA declared an interest as a trustee of CPA.</p> <p>RE questioned why the commitment of RPS to CPA was being considered in the terms of return on investment as she believed this was something that should be supported regardless of ROI as part of RPS's global leadership remit.</p> <p>VR explained that historically the annual report has tended to focus on finances but that overall she was very focused on looking at the mutual benefits of the two organisations working together. VR would particularly like to work in greater partnership with RPS on global anti-microbial stewardship but stressed that this would require the Society to commit greater time/resources as CPA was currently operating at full stretch. SB noted that the Society did get a very real 'soft' return for any funding and felt it was important to look at this in terms of a wider International Strategy.</p> <p>VR suggested it might be good to look at re-energising the international strategy following the departure of Harvey Sondh a couple of years ago as she was currently unsure who the primary contact within the Society in this area now was.</p>	

		<p>PB emphasised that the amount done and the positive impact CPA were continually able to make with minimal resources was very significant. He noted that when Assembly had been creating the 2021-2026 Strategy consideration had been given to whether the Society needed a stand-alone International Strategy however it had been agreed by Assembly at that point that there was no need as a number of elements of the individual goals contained in the overall strategy would directly touch on international work. He believed now the Executive team had been re-structured to bring pharmacy and education under one Director it would now be easier to take this forward on the global stage and will therefore be asking NC to take international aspects of all areas under his remit into account. He felt there were definitely areas where RPS and CPA could work in greater collaboration and agreed that RoI wasn't the most appropriate language to use although the annual report had tended to be written from this perspective historically to help Assembly fulfil its fiduciary duty and ensure the funding provided was being used well/appropriately.</p> <p>Members asked how they might be able to be more involved with CPA and VR asked anyone who might be interested to email her outlining areas where their strengths might lie .</p> <p>CA noted she had been approached by members in some countries enquiring about the possibility of BNF app access however KB noted that when the PhP team had looked into this previously countries had reported they would prefer to have paper copies rather than app access.</p>	
<p>Item 10 Any Other Business</p>		<p>a) Governance Members' Attendance at RPS Conference The following items submitted by SB were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review the role of and support for board members at the RPS conference. • To propose that all board members travel expenses are reimbursed for attending the RPS conference when representing the RPS (not just President, Chair and Vice-Chairs as is the current arrangement) <p>SB explained that as an Assembly & Board member she had attended the conference as a 'representative of RPS' and had spent significant time on the day speaking to the attendees about the Society. She was, however, aware that a decision had been taken ahead of the conference that travel expenses would only be reimbursed for the Chair/Vice Chair of each Board (or two other 'nominated' members per Board should Chair/Vice Chair not be attending) which she and a number of other Board members felt was iniquitous. She also thought that more formal use could and should have been made of Board and Assembly members during the conference and more support should have been in place to enable them to</p>	

		<p>better engage and interact with members, who they represented yet had no formal opportunity to meet with on the day.</p> <p>TG agreed with the disappointment felt by SB, particularly at a time when the recent Luther Pendragon review had highlighted the degree to which some members felt disconnected from Board Members. She felt BMs could have been better used throughout the programme to chair sessions etc. CW was also surprised at the lack of BMs who attended in person and felt they could all have been made better use of.</p> <p>AC added that the SPB had similarly emailed PB before the conference to express their concern at the lack of funding for more BMs to attend, not least as travel to London from Scotland could be particularly expensive. AT suggested that some EAG members could also have had travel expenses covered as they already gave a considerable amount of unpaid time to the Society.</p> <p>AJ however felt he had attended the conference in a personal capacity and had been happy to speak to individuals once he was there but wouldn't expect to have expenses covered. He did, however, think individuals who had been asked to fulfil a particular role (eg President, session Chairs, speakers etc) should be reimbursed as they were there in a more formal capacity and did have additional responsibilities to fulfil on the day.</p> <p>MA suggested that a paper be brought to the March meeting with a forward plan for the 2023 conference outlining costs in addition to ideas on how BMs could better be used on the day etc that Assembly could then make an informed decision as to whether BM/AM costs would be covered going forward.</p> <p>EJ added that roles at the conference could be incorporated into all three Boards' workplans to enable Board discussion on this, what type of event and involvement BMs might want and how better the Country teams could offer support to facilitate this.</p> <p>PB welcomed the input and passion from members on this item and observed that the first conference held for three years and was arguably the best one yet, with members who were unable to travel being able to attend remotely and still have a great experience. The question was therefore what might be required of AMs/BMs that might make the conference even better next year. He acknowledged there was widespread dissatisfaction among BMs but noted that the conference had been discussed in some detail at Assembly in July following which the team had tried to address the comments made by AMs by, for example, introducing the Zone, the ability to connect with members via the app, names of BMs being made more visible. He noted that a series of communications on expenses had been issued to BMs on reimbursement of expenses well ahead of the conference day although he was aware not all of these may have been received.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>PB informed Assembly that the decision not to fund all BMs travel had been his decision and had been taken in part as the conference already runs at a loss, but that he had discussed the matter with the President and agreed that two members per Board should have their expenses reimbursed. He also noted that the event had been online as well which did make it accessible to all elected and other members.</p> <p>He agreed this would need to be looked at again next year and that more creative thinking might be needed to best use the passion of elected members going forward, particularly to increase opportunities to engage with members and for BMs to be able to give a clear indication of what role they would like to have via discussions at Board levels.</p> <p>ACTION – Conference Team/EJ/CM</p>	<p>Conf Team/ EJ/CM</p>
<p>Item 11 Date of Next Meeting</p>		<p>The next Assembly meeting will be held on 28th/29th March and will be entirely on-line.</p>	

DRAFT

ACTION SHEET – Assembly Meeting 16th November

Item	Action	Who by	When
Item 03a EDI	Membership EDI data collection to be implemented	ADoll	As soon as possible
Item 03b Independent Commission	Additional Assembly session to be arranged for Feb to consider IC recommendations	AD	As soon as possible
Item 05b Recording of Meetings	Recording of open business sessions of governance meetings to be implemented	WT	Next round of Board/Assembly meetings
Item 05c Open/Confidential Business	Amendments to Assembly Standing Orders to be implemented Recommendations for amendments to National Board Standing Orders to be taken to next Board meeting	AD EJ/CM	As soon as possible Next Board meeting
Item 05d Declaration of Interests	Policy and annual declaration forms to be updated	AD	As soon as possible
Item 05e Charitable Donations	Process for pharmacy charities to apply to be included as an option for donations to be created	RR	As soon as possible
Item 05g FIP	Application to re-join FIP to be submitted New member terms to be considered by COG	PB PB/COG	Immediately December 2022

Item 09 Diversity Targets	Report on progress against targets in current I&D strategy to be provided to Assembly	HG	As soon as available
	Revised I&D strategy & targets to be brought back to Assembly for approval	HG	March Assembly mtg
Item 10 Annual Conference	Outline of costings and BM/AM roles to be brought back to Assembly for discussion	EJ/CM/Conf Team	March Assembly mtg

DRAFT