

# MINUTES

---

A Meeting of The Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland was held at 7 pm on Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> November 2010, in the Society House, 73 University Street, Belfast. BT7 1HL

---

## **Present**

Ms A Bowen (President)  
Mr M Nelson (Vice-President)  
Mr P Kelly (Hon. Treasurer)  
Mrs M Singleton  
Mr R Anderson  
Mrs R Tasker  
Mr D Byrne  
Dr L Byers (*arrived at agenda point 3*)  
Mr J Hamill (*arrived at agenda point 4*)  
Ms J Dougan

## **Apologies**

Prof G Linden  
Prof D Woolfson  
Ms A McCollum  
Dr C Fitzpatrick  
Dr G Fleming  
Prof J McElroy

## **In Attendance**

Mr T Patterson (Chief Executive)  
Mr B Kerr (Registrar)  
Mr M Neale (Head of Public Affairs)  
Mrs Julie Greenfield (Professional Forum Manager)  
Helen McNeill (Clerical Officer)

## **Public Attending**

None

---

### **1. Introduction and Welcome, Apologies.**

The President welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Mrs Julie Greenfield, Professional Forum Manager. Apologies were accepted.

### **2. Election of Officers**

The Chief Executive informed Council that there was only one nomination received for each Office, and invited Council to suggest ways in which to proceed.

Council unanimously agreed that voting procedure should still take place.

All Council members present at the meeting submitted their ballot papers for each Office. The votes were counted by the Registrar, and the results were as follows:

- Ms Ann Bowen was duly re-elected as President.
- Mr Mark Nelson was duly re-elected as Vice President.
- Mr Paul Kelly was duly re-elected as Hon. Treasurer

### **3. Minutes of the Council meeting 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010**

#### **i. Matters of Accuracy**

None.

#### **ii. Adoption of Minutes**

October's Council minutes were proposed by Mr D Byrne, seconded by Mrs M Singleton and agreed by Council.

#### **iii. Matters Arising**

- Clarification of legislation in relation to Inspectorate costs: The Registrar informed Council that issues to do with pharmac~~ies~~**ies** are not being reviewed, and so Section 75 of the Medicines Act is not affected.
- Future Committee and Council meeting dates are covered in the Chief Executive's report (Agenda Point 5.1).

All other action points from the previous meeting have been completed.

#### **Tabling of Any Other Business**

No other business was tabled.

### **4. Correspondence**

The incoming correspondence log – 22.10.10 to 18.11.10 was included in Council packs for information.

#### **(i) Letter from Department of Health regarding non medical revalidation**

- The Department has already given seed funding for regulators in England for revalidation purposes.
- Any approach for funding for the PSNI for this purpose would need to be directed to Joyce Cairns.
- The Chief Executive sought Council's opinion on whether or not to proceed with the research, but not actually pilot the revalidation work.
- There was some discussion around the political context of Department funding for revalidation and the Head of Public Affairs reminded Council that with Assembly elections in May 2011, the timescale for putting forward a proposal may be too tight.

Council agreed in principle to the Chief Executive continuing with work around revalidation, but not yet approaching the Department for funding, until a clearer proposal for funding is produced.

#### **(ii) NCAS event**

- Information and a draft delegate programme about an NCAS event was distributed in the packs. The Chief Executive indicated to Council that it

may be beneficial for the Registrar to attend, as it may be useful for further work on revalidation in Northern Ireland, particularly when NCAS becomes self funding and is no longer funded by DH London.

- No further comments were made on this piece of correspondence.

**(iii) E Mail correspondence regarding risk assessment research report for PSNI by University of Manchester**

- The University of Manchester has been commissioned to carry out research in the form of a report regarding return to practice. This would form the basis of a risk assessment by the PSNI.
- The correspondence presented before Council showed that there have been significant delays in the survey. In addition, the initial response rate (from the Register) was negligible, so the University has begun to survey/interview employers, Trusts and Boards in order to gather quantitative data.
- Roberta Tasker informed Council that she had been contacted as part of this process, and her experience had been that the interview was disappointing in relation to the parameters of return to practice and that the communication had not been followed up.
- A short discussion followed on the financial implications of commissioning the report, and whether any penalty could be imposed if the report was not satisfactorily delivered.
- The Chief Executive sought Council's opinion as to whether or not the University should continue with the quantitative part of their research.

**Key Decision Point:** Council agreed in principle that, despite frustration with delays, the University should go ahead with the survey, but the report must be produced at the earliest opportunity.

**E Mail correspondence between Gail Anderson and Registrar regarding new legislation (draft Order)**

- This was included for information purposes and as an update since the previous Council meeting.
- Responses to any comments have been forwarded to Council by e mail. There were no further comments made.

**5. Staff Reports**

**(i) Chief Executive's Report**

**White Paper Work**

**Key Engagements**

*Regulator's Forum*

- This was attended by the President and the Chief Executive. The event was productive, and there were discussion forums around the following

three areas: UK wide/devolved regulation, Revalidation and changes to CHRE funding.

#### *Meeting with RPS*

- The Chief Executive reported to Council that the meeting with RPS had been extremely productive, and was encouraged by the shared vision, and the desire to continue mutually beneficial working relationship.

#### **Priorities**

Work is continuing on evidence gathering and production of the performance review material for CHRE. The deadline for this is 14<sup>th</sup> December.

There were no comments or questions regarding the current priorities detailed on the spreadsheet provided in the pack.

#### **Future Meeting dates**

The Chief Executive asked Council for comments in relation to the proposed schedule of meetings in 2011. Council meetings can be held every six weeks, and the next scheduled meeting will take place on January 13<sup>th</sup> 2011.

Following the Chief Executive's proposal to schedule one more meeting, Council agreed that a meeting should be scheduled for February 24<sup>th</sup> 2011, and six weeks apart thereafter. This proposal can be reviewed in March 2011 to ascertain if Council need to meet more frequently.

All Council members present agreed with the view that it is helpful to have more time between meetings in order to gather/read information.

<p><b>Action Point:</b> The Chief Executive will circulate a schedule of proposed meeting dates for 2011 and this will be brought to the January 13<sup>th</sup> Council meeting. A Council meeting has been scheduled for February 24<sup>th</sup> 2011.</p>
---

#### **CPD development options paper**

##### Background

The Chief Executive informed Council of the background to the paper which was included within their packs:

Taking into consideration the forthcoming statutory provisions to make compliance compulsory, measures may need to be implemented in the following areas: consistency, verification and transparency of outcomes.

Variation amongst assessors has led to some significant changes to outcomes, as shown in the statistics

##### Options for Council to consider

The Chief Executive then presented Council 4 options for consideration (further detail of each of these options can be found on page 4 -6 of the paper in the pack):

1. Take no action at all.

2. Keep the basic process but introduce further assessment of tutors.
3. Reduce by half the number of samples (from 20% to 10%), reallocating the money saved towards introduction of improvements to the quality and verification of external examination process.
4. Review current process and radically change approach (there would be a cost associated with this option).

#### Comments from Council

- Some discussion ensued around the issues raised by this, such as how significant changes to CPD would fit into the proposed model of future regulatory structures, and the size of the sample taken.
  
- The President suggested Council was offered more time to study the paper and the different options, before coming to a decision about any further action and Council agreed that this would be helpful. Council also agreed that they were happy to continue to support the temporary position of post registration facilitator until any further decisions are made on new CPD measures.

**Action Point:** CPD options paper to be circulated to Council by e mail for their review in their own time and this agenda item to be brought to the January Council meeting for further consideration.

#### **Professional leadership and regulation**

Council were asked to review appendix 3 of the CE's report, which sets out future roles and responsibilities in relation to professional leadership.

There was some discussion around point 3.1 (Use of titles).

- Some of the comments from Council members centered around the use of titles in the Professional Forum, and the 'ownership' and context of using the Fellows title (FPSNI).
- It was noted that the use of different titles in the media and other public contexts could appear confusing to patients.

A discussion regarding the remit and authority of the Professional Forum (Point 3.3) followed with the following points being made:

- Will the Professional Forum have the (legal) authority to issue guidance in relation to standards and practices or should they endorse guidance produced by the regulatory body.
- Some clarity is needed over the ***interpretation of guidance*** and whether the Professional Forum should generate guidance without being asked or take more of a support role.
- What legislative changes would be appropriate for Council to consider if the Professional Forum will be delegated authority to manage financial issues and decisions?

**(ii) Head of Public Affairs Report**  
**Political Issues**

There is a clear indication coming from the Assembly that the timeline for introduction of new legislation is tight, especially in view of elections in May 2011. The topic of reintroduction of prescription fees has been largely left aside by MLAs, although some media interest remains. Party political conferences will be taking place during December and January.

**Media**

A request to participate in a BBC Spotlight programme focusing on health issues, was accepted, but the issues which the programme focused on (price of alcohol/smoking ban) were not relevant to the PSNI's agenda or remit.

**Fellows Dinner**

This event takes place on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2010 at Malone House. RSVPs are currently being gathered, and Jim Wells MLA will be the speaker.

**Patient Public Involvement Group**

- The Head of Public Affairs asked for Council's view on the usefulness of this group, and described some of its activities to date. The future of the group is being considered by the Chief Executive Steering Group as to whether or not it will continue to function.
- The Head of Public Affairs informed Council that his attendance at the group's meeting have been useful in terms of best practice forum, and for putting forward the NI agenda. Should the group continue to function, the costs and time involved would amount to 3-4 meetings a year, with only associated travel costs.

<p><b>Motion to Council:</b> Council unanimously agreed that this group was useful and that the Head of Public Affairs should feed this back to the next Steering Group meeting.</p>
--

- To conclude his report, the Head of Public Affairs highlighted one recent meeting with CHRE which looked at issues of how CHRE will be funded in the future, and how this will affect Northern Ireland issues in particular.

**Professional Forum update – Julie Greenfield**

- The Professional Forum Manager informed Council of recent developments in the formation of the Professional Forum, highlighting the following points:
- 13 candidates have nominated themselves for the 8 (elected) spaces on the Professional Forum.

- Their details are currently being published on the PSNI website, Pharmacy in Focus and a prospectus is being prepared for mail shot to all registrants.
- Voting will be open from the end of November, so Council were requested to encourage their colleagues to vote.
- The Professional Forum Manager outlined the income and expenditure of the Professional Forum programme, and explained to Council that the original dates (as outlined in the paper in Council pack) need to be put forward.
- The Hon. Treasurer confirmed to Council that the projected costs outlined were in line with the projected income.

**MOTION:** Council unanimously agreed to approve the re-phasing of the budget in line with the programme development of the Professional Forum.

## **(ii) Registrar's Report**

The report was taken as read, however, the Registrar gave a verbal update to Council on current work priorities:

- Work is continuing on gathering and production of evidence for each standard of the CHRE performance review to be submitted by mid December.
- The role of the Chair of the Statutory Committee has been expanded and will be changing in due course.

### Questions/comments from Council

Dr Lisa Byers asked the Registrar if there was any update on the PSNI guidelines for multidose. The Registrar informed Council that the Consultation on collection and delivery is completed, and further information on multidose will be available in the new year.

## **6. Proposed response to DHSSPS premises fee consultation**

The chief Executive drew Council's attention to the words in italics in the letter included in the Council packs.

The Department of Finance gave no reason as to why the funding proposal was rejected, however, the Chief Executive did comment that the Department of Health had been keen to put forward the PSNI's points about the costs being covered.

There is clear evidence that the costs which need to be maintained by PSNI will

Key Decision Point: Council unanimously agreed that they were happy for the Chief Executive to respond by sending the letter shown within the Council meeting packs.

be more than £40,000.

## 7. Report from Committee Meetings

### (i) Education Committee

The Chair of the Education Committee, Roberta Tasker gave Council a verbal account of the previous meeting minutes.

- There should be an update in December regarding the core curriculum for pharmacists across Europe.
- There were no motions to Council.
- The cardiovascular disease course was withdrawn by NICPETT due to budget cuts. A request has been made for a breakdown of all courses offered by NICPETT.
- There will be no Education committee meeting in December.

The minutes of the Education Committee from 3 November 2010 were proposed by Roberta Tasker, seconded by the President and accepted by Council.

### (ii) Finance and House

The Honorary Treasurer presented the minutes of the previous finance and house committee meeting

- A matter of accuracy was noted – Mark Neale should be noted as present.
- The decision to move accounts to Bank of Ireland is being stalled, pending further information.

The minutes of the Finance and House committed meeting (15<sup>th</sup> November) were proposed by Mark Nelson, seconded by Jacqui Dougan and accepted by Council.

### Financial Plan 2011-2012

- A copy of the financial plan income and expenditure assumptions 2011-2012 was distributed to Council for consideration.
- There was some discussion about the details of the budget forecast and how it would be affected on the premises fee decision.
- The Chief Executive clarified for Council that items 60, 62 and 63 would be most affected by the premises fee decision.

**Motion to Council by Chief Executive:** To agree in principle to the outlined financial plan income and expenditure assumptions for 2011-2012.

Council noted and accepted the broad figures in the plan in principle, but requested that the plan be re-presented at the next Council meeting (January 13<sup>th</sup> 2011), so that clarification could be sought over the projects which are definite and those which are possibilities, and how the size of the overdraft would be affected.

**ACTION POINT:** Financial plan income and expenditure assumptions for 2011-12 to go on the agenda for the next Finance and House committee, a new draft to be produced and re-presented to Council for further review.

**(iii) Legislation, Standards and Practice Committee meeting**

No minutes were presented as no meeting had taken place since October's Council meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010.

**8. PGEU**

A copy of the report was distributed to Council within the packs. Raymond Anderson asked Council if they were still happy to receive a hard copy of the report, and the response was that it is useful information to have.

**9. Recent and Coming Events**

All events were detailed in the circulated agenda.

**10. Any Other Business**

**11. Date of Next Meeting – January 13<sup>th</sup> 2011**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**The Chief Executive, Registrar and Clerical Officer left the meeting at 10.00pm in order that a confidential staff related matter could be discussed.**