

# THE ROYAL PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN

## Transcript of the Public session of the Council meeting held on 28 March 2007

[NB: Decisions in square brackets and narrow type are taken from the unconfirmed minutes of Council and therefore are subject to amendment].

*The Transcript of the public meeting of the Council is not the formal record of the meeting. The formal record comprises the papers presented to the meeting and the minutes as subsequently approved. The policy of the RPSGB is actively debated at the meeting. The views expressed in the transcript do not necessarily represent the Society's agreed policy.*

### Present

President	Mr H Patel
Vice-President	Mr G Alexander
Treasurer	Mr J Jolley
Mr M Astbury	Mr J Buisson
Mr S Dajani	Professor S Denyer
Mrs D Drury	Mrs D Eustace
Mr J Gentle	Mr A Gush
Mr J Hanlon	Mrs S Hikins
Mrs C Hunt	Mrs L Jacobs
Mrs L Morgan	Mr G Phillips
Mr C Ranshaw	Mr D Simpson
Mr D Thomson	

### In attendance

Mr P Bennett, Chairman English Pharmacy Board; Mr P Jones, Chairman Welsh Pharmacy Board; Dr Rose Marie Parr, Chairman, Scottish Pharmacy Board

### Apologies for absence

Ms S Agha, Mr D Carter, Dr B Curwain, Dr P Entwistle, Mr R Jobling, Mr A Kershaw, Professor B Michell, Ms M Saunders, Professor M Schofield, Mr S Wells

### 15(a) Pharmacy and Pharmacy Technicians Order - Administrative determinations: Forms

**The President, Mr Hemant Patel:** Dr Ambler will introduce the item on administrative determinations.

**Dr Sue Ambler, Acting Director of Education & Registration:** This paper represents the final step in the implementation of the FTP and registration parts of the Pharmacy and Pharmacy Technician Order. Section 60 fitness to practise and registration. These are administrative determinations for Council to make, essentially paper 25. Council is asked to make determinations in relation to the Registration Rules by approving forms detailed in the appendices. Essentially, the changes made are detailed in section 3. Any suggestions?

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** I do not need to take Council through this, but I have had discussion with staff on one or two points on the forms. Most of which have been taken account of already, but they are points that someone like me would be bound to pick up. I do not think we need to specify them I do not there is anything substantive, but there were one or two changes on the form which are in train.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Some of them have been made from the paper:

**Secretary & Registrar:** Shall I explain? We have been aware of some pharmacists who are registered with other regulators other than health regulators. So that is to make sure we capture anyone who is on any licensing or regulating body; for example, accountancy and law, amongst others.

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** The words underlined were behind one of my comments. The draft we have says, "have you ever been disciplined," which is a word open to many interpretations. I think that wording is fine.

**The President:** Can we take the next item, Sue.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Those are the registration, the retention fee, section 4. Then there are particular questions in section 5 relating to annotations. Council is asked to confirm or clarify the Society's policy. Those comments are reflected in appendix 3, which is the draft form for the annotations for supplementary or independent prescribing. "Then in line with existing policy, applications for annotations for registration are to be made within six months from the date on which the qualification was awarded. The Registrar shall refuse any applications for annotations where the specialised qualification was awarded more than six months before the date on which the application for annotation was made, where the pharmacist has not previously had his registration so annotated " This is so things do not run on for a year when people have not actually previously practised.

**Mr Graham Phillips:** Six months is not an unreasonable period, but I could not understand the reason for the refusal.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** It is basically that if you do not cash in your qualification, how long do you give people before it is no longer a valid annotation.

**Mr Graham Phillips:** Is six months too short a period? Would a year be better? Beyond a year seems too long, I am trying to think of a circumstances. For example, you get qualified. You are going to take up a new post to start to use your qualifications and that post doesn't start for six months.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** I think it is different for prescribing, because you are supposed to have everything lined up before you get your qualification. I think that is why we thought we would err on the side of caution. It is a new skill and there is a lot of evidence that people do not start prescribing, even when they claim their annotation, and the longer you leave it, the skill goes and it becomes less safe.

**The President:** Can we agree the changes and move on? **(Agreed)** Next item. Sue.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** "Applications for restoration and annotation made 12 or more months following the removal of the annotation should be treated as an initial application." so basically people go back. "Requiring successful completion of any return to prescribing practice or identified CPD rules." If you have not been using it, you go back and it is a return to practice issue.

**The Vice-President, Mr Gerald Alexander:** Is there any process of review built into this?

**Dr Sue Ambler:** We can put a process of review in. We will have to review these when we do the formal rules.

**The Vice-President:** Just as problems occur down the road, if you bring them to us, then at some future stage ----

**Dr Sue Ambler:** As part of the rules, these were all return to practice under the CPD rules. So you will have a chance to agree policy formally then. The first draft will be hopefully with you next time.

**The Vice-President:** To build in some kind of review process might be beneficial.

**The President:** It will come back anyway.

**The Vice-President:** As long as we have that as an understanding in principle.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** "Applications for restoration of annotation made within 12 months following the removal of the annotation to be restored on payment of the required fee for the annotation." That is the 12 months, not the initial registration.

**The President:** Anything else?

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Not unless Council are not happy.

**The President:** Is the Council happy with all the recommendations? **(Agreed)**  
Next item, administrative determination certificates.

[Council confirmed (i) the general principles and policies on which the forms had been based, and approved (ii) the forms detailed in the appendices to the paper, appropriately amended.]

**15(a) Pharmacy and Pharmacy Technicians Order - Administrative determinations: Certificates**

**Dr Sue Ambler:** This is paper 26. It is a similar administrative determination, this time relating to certificates. Essentially, the Order, following responses to the consultation, does not require the part of the register to be put on the certificate. So therefore Council has the option of the determining if certificates of registration should stay part of the register in which the pharmacist or pharmacy technician is registered. So you do not have to do this, but you can do it. There are two options set out below. Option 1 is maintaining the status quo. So all those with the old certificate will keep the old certificate. People new coming on the register, or asking for new, will get the new certificate. Alternatively, we call everyone's certificate in and reissue them, which clearly has the costs set out in option 2.

**Mrs Lesley Morgan:** When the technicians' statutory register is opened, are the technicians going to be issued with new certificates?

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Yes, we have budgeted for that, because it is a formalisation of a new process.

**Mr Graham Phillips:** I was going to propose option 1, to cut the debate out. **(Agreed)**

**Mr David Thomson:** Seeking clarification on the appropriateness of certificates, with the forthcoming need just to name the responsible pharmacist rather than to display a certificate.

**Secretary & Registrar, Miss Ann Lewis:** That is an annotation on the register. We will have to consider it separately. That is the main certificate you get when you qualify.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Can I confirm the form of the certificates is okay. We are going to go for option (i). Finally the fee for a replacement of the certificate should be £10.00.

**Professor Stephen Denyer:** Can I check, is the £10.00 reflective of actual cost?

**The President:** Packing, posting and...

**Secretary & Registrar:** It probably costs more than £10.00.

**Professor Stephen Denyer:** You know what my next question would be.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Yes, we can review it. I expect we will be reviewing all our fees, don't you?

**Professor Stephen Denyer:** I do not mean to prolong it, but we are all conscious of costs of things we emit from here, and indeed if it cost £30 to stay on the register of prescribers, this looks like it is a modest cost to get a certificate.

[Council agreed (i) the form of the certificates of registration, as set out in the paper; (ii) that, in terms of the information to be detailed on certificates the status quo should be maintained for pharmacists; (iii) that the fee for replacement certificates be set at £10; and (iv) that the fee be reviewed to ensure that it covered fully the cost of replacing certificates, and be amended appropriately if required.]

**16. Amendment to the examination regulations**

**The President:** Item 16, paper C/27. Amendment to the examination regulations.

**Dr Sue Ambler:** Essentially these are two proposed amendments to the Byelaws governing the

registration exam. They have been requested by the Examination Board, which as you know is an armslength body working independently of Council. This is a change to policy that is being requested. They are two relatively minor administrative things. The recommendation that needs to go from here is to the Privy Council to amend the Byelaws. I know it is laborious, but it is due process. What the Examination Board are asking is to make two changes to the byelaws. The first is to introduce or extend the formal period by which people have to notify for an amendment or an external -- I cannot think of the right word -- if they have got a disability they can have additional time. It is currently six weeks' notice, although we do take them right up to the last minute, if something happens at the last minute. The Examining Board is asking can they bring it forward to 12 weeks in the Byelaws, to give more time for the sittings? Clearly if something happens between that 12 weeks and the final, we can accommodate it. It is just to process the bulk of them in a timely sort of way. The second change is to remove a provision that is never used now and which has fallen out of use since we have had the overseas exam course and also the assessment that is done that Council agreed last year. What we are asking for is to remove from the Byelaws the ability or the option to complete a 26-week registration period. If you do the overseas courses at the universities, you have then to do one year. So this is essentially redundant. All it does is confuse some of the candidates who think they might be able to do 26 weeks. Those are quite straightforward administrative changes. **(Agreed)**

**The President:** Agreed, (i) (ii) and (iii).

[Council agreed (i) the proposals to amend Section 3.3 and Schedule 2 of the Examination Regulations as set out in the paper; (ii) that statements to explain the changes be issued, and (iii) that the amendments be forwarded to the Privy Council for approval.]

#### **17. Rules of procedure for the Society's Annual General Meeting**

**Secretary & Registrar:** Can we move to 17. You have before you the rules of procedure for the Society's AGM. Those who have been around a bit recall we usually bring these to the May meeting, but at the last time AGM there was a discussion in the course of the meeting as to whether motions should or should not be amended. I think we let ourselves in for a debate we need not have had. So we are bringing these rules of procedure to you. They do allow for amendment of motions and they make sure that we are making sure we have proper procedure ahead of time and are not caught on the hop. I hope you will agree them. Are there any questions?

**The President:** Can we agree? **(Agreed)**

[Council agreed the revised Rules of Procedure for the Society's AGM.]

**Mr Martin Astbury:** Mindful of time constraints at the AGM. I broached the subject before, and that is regarding the financial reporting. I would recommend that the Treasurer puts his financial report and then it is opened up for questions and that we do not go down the process we have done in previous years, unless we have to, when we have the accounts team presenting -- I will not say ad nauseam -- the extra bit.

**The President:** We will have chance to look at the programme at the Officers meeting. Any other comments? Can we go to AOB?

#### **18. Any other business: Council election 2007 – election statements**

**Secretary & Registrar:** President, the Officers recommended that the election statements of the candidates for this year's election be published on the website. Normally, if there is a ballot, they would be circulated to everyone as part of the ballot arrangements. That opportunity will not arise, so it is suggested they are published on the website.

**The Vice-President:** Perhaps with consultation with the editor of the Journal.

**The President:** There should be information available to all publications. This information would be available for downloading. That way, we keep all the channels of communication open. I did get a complaint from the editor of the C&D to say that he was not aware of the development until he read it in the PJ. The information relating to the election was not released to other publications.

**Ms Averil Ridgway, Head of Corporate Secretariat:** It was, President; I did it.

**The President:** Can you take it up with him? I would appreciate that. Also I am sure the Treasurer -----

[Council agreed that for the 2007 election, the election statements of candidates be published on the Society's website.]

**Secretary & Registrar:** Which bit of business are we in?

**The President:** Open. Any other item in open business? If not, can we go to closed business to take AOB.

**19. Council update and progress on strategic objectives**

**20. Infringements Committee: statistics**

**21. Diversity action plan update**

**22. Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence (CHRE): draft minutes for 11 January 2007**

**Secretary & Registrar:** Can we note the items here? The Council update. Infringements Committee statistics. We will return to that at the next meeting, because the President wanted to make a comment while Dr Entwistle was here. CHRE draft minutes. If there are any questions, perhaps we will take them after the meeting. **(Agreed)**

[Council noted items 07.03/C/29, 30, 31 and 32.]

The President closed the public session of the meeting.