



FACULTY OF  
OCCUPATIONAL MEDICINE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Faculty Meeting Room | 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor | New Derwent House | 69-73 Theobald's Road | London WC1 8TA

**Wednesday 08<sup>th</sup> June 2016**

**Present:** Richard Heron (RH) Chair      Mark Groom (MRG)      Judith Willetts (JW)  
Jayne Moore (JM)      Alan Bray (AB)      Ian Aston (IA)

**In attendance:** Alpa Yadav (AY)

| AGENDA<br>ITEM |  | ACTION |
|----------------|--|--------|
| 1              | <b>WELCOME AND APOLOGIES</b><br><br>RH welcomed everyone to the meeting.<br><br>Apologies were received from Julia Smedley (JCS) |        |

| AGENDA ITEM |   | Action   |
|-------------|---|----------|
| 2           | <p><b>MATTERS ARISING NOT ON THE AGENDA</b></p> <p><b>5.2 February Management Accounts</b></p> <p>SEQOHS update from JW – changes have been made to the draft contract. This can now be signed and backdated to January 2016. The contract will run to June 2018, with a 12 month notice break clause being included for June 2017. There will now be a period of review focussing on certain charges made by the RCP and the IT/development charges from the IT company, the contract with whom will be reviewed and, ideally, put out to tender.</p> <p><b>4.3 Qualifications and Examinations</b></p> <p>Implementation of development proposals is deferred pending appointment of Head of Business Development (to replace Head of Professional Standards).</p> <p>All other action notes completed</p>  | JW/AH/MG |
| 3<br>3.1    | <p><b>FOM General Business</b></p> <p><b>3.1 Governance Review Update</b></p> <p>Over 100 people completed the recent survey. (Comments were received by 16 members in the first consultation round.) The majority of survey responders were in favour of the Academic Dean and Registrar positions being elected rather than appointed. The majority were in favour of the new Board and Council structure. Several responders assumed co-opting non-member (other than lay) representatives would incur cost, which would need to be clearly refuted and explained. JW will prepare a document with amended proposals prior to the AGM. There will be a 40 minute discussion at the AGM on governance and also an opportunity for an informal chat before the Board meeting, both taking place on 29 June. The Board will agree next steps and ultimately there will be an independent poll of all members to finalise the changes.</p> | JW       |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM |   | ACTION       |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| 3.2            | <p><b>Risk Register</b></p> <p>Increasing the number of accredited specialists remains the highest challenge and risk. Mechanisms of funding and training were highlighted as the highest risk to achieving this. RH suggested that 360 feedback should be undertaken among Board members, key appointments and staff, on shared values and behaviours, to be approved by the Board in June. RH suggested this should be part of an annual review process for Board members and job descriptions and key objectives should be agreed. A code of conduct will also be drafted and discussed at the October away day.</p>   | JW           |
| 4<br><br>4.1   | <p><b>Academic Team/Academic Issues</b></p> <p><b>Academic Dean's report</b></p> <p>IA talked through his report (see document E16/additional)</p> <p>The figures from the National School of Occupational Health (NSOH) need to be re-visited as complete accuracy is not reflected in the report. There is a need to distinguish if a trainee is from industry, the private provider sector, the defence deanery or the NHS. A meeting is required with the NSOH to devise an action plan on clarity of results and to take forward the suggestion to improve the access to information via their website. The FOM needs to consider the best way of promoting the speciality including NSOH and providing information on our own website.</p> <p>Pinnacle competences will ultimately make the CESR route much more streamlined. It was agreed at meeting that Ad Eundem doctors should pass the AFOM examination before being able to use the MFOM post nominal. Charges for Ad Eundem will be revised.</p> <p>Following discussion about quality of information available to prospective applicants RH requested a draft note be sent to the John Harrison to improve the NSOH website. Information about the procedure of selection for applicants must be much clearer. JM to be advised of future meetings between training and the NSOH so she can be in attendance.</p> | JM<br><br>JM |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM |  | ACTION |
|----------------|--|--------|
| 4.2.1          | <p><b>NHS Workforce Survey Update</b></p> <p>The proposed next steps after receiving a report from HEE with reference to a lack of data on the NHS Occupational Medicine (OM) workforce: a letter of response to Ian Cumming (IC) at HEE about our recent survey is to be sent. The current draft will be circulated to the Exec for comment, in the light of the HEE report by Vicky Lyons. RH requested initiation of a formal meeting with IC, everyone present agreed that the data being provided is not accurate and therefore it is not a true representation of recruitment needs. RH advised unless we get more training posts now we will not be able to replace the 50% of physicians who are likely to retire within 8 years, even to maintain current workforce levels.</p>   | JW/RH  |
| 4.2.2          | <p>There was concern raised by a member that there is a discrepancy in the Northern Ireland figures. JCS has been in correspondence with the member regarding this. RH will follow up with him.</p>  | RH     |
| 4.3            | <p><b>CPD Issue</b></p> <p>A discussion took place on the reduction in duplication of appraisal process. JW advised that the CPD audit is time consuming and felt this should no longer be a requirement for the FOM. RH advised that since the RO took over responsibility of describing a process that meets the GMC requirements for revalidation, the requirement of the FOM to assure the quality of CPD had disappeared. Effectively the requirement for demonstration that you are good standing has moved to the RO process that includes appraisal, CPD and 360 feedback in five years. Therefore there is no requirement in carrying this out twice everyone in agreement. Relating to this JW advised there will be a review of how CPD points are awarded to bodies delivering CPD to ensure a high level of standard and quality is demonstrated before FOM accreditation is awarded.</p> | JW     |

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b>                |  | <b>ACTION</b>    |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|
| <p><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b></p> | <p><b>Finance Update</b></p> <p><b>May Managements Accounts</b></p> <p>RH thanked Andrew Harrison for his effort in preparing the may management accounts and clarity of the summary. There was nothing to draw attention to before the Board meeting in June. The only question raised by IA was if the restricted funds can be used and JW confirmed these will be used effectively.</p>   |                  |
| <p><b>6</b></p>                   | <p><b>Board Communications</b></p> <p>RH had asked for feedback after the last Board meeting on Board communications and behaviours. RH has invited a small panel to convene to take this forward. This will be chaired by RH and include two other elected member and a lay representative</p>  | <p><b>RH</b></p> |
| <p><b>7</b></p>                   | <p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>MRG had attended the Honorary Treasurers' Meeting and advised that there is a keenness amongst Some Royal Colleges to set up regional centres (for examples the RCP North Centre of Excellence). These initiatives provide an opportunity, in principle, to co-locate and for smaller Colleges and Faculties To rent space. There is concern amongst Colleges that officer work will increasingly have to be backfilled Some Colleges cannot afford to do this but the larger Colleges, RCP, RCOG and RCGP, are already having to do so.</p> <p>JM advised that educational and clinical supervisors have to be accredited by the GMC by the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2016. The local deaneries should hold a list of people who are already accredited. JM advised that the training department of the Faculty have liaised with trainees to identify their supervisors, who can then be contacted to verify that they have been approved. If the supervisors are not on the accredited list the individual trainees training will cease. JM advised there are approximately 60 trainees. RH advised a signed list is required so all trainees can be ticked off as completed, JM to action.</p> | <p><b>JM</b></p> |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM |  | ACTION |
|----------------|--|--------|
| 8              | <p><b>Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016, 09:30-12:30</b></p> <p>FOM office<br/>3<sup>rd</sup> Floor New Derwent House<br/>69-73 Theobald's Road<br/>London<br/>WC1X 8TA</p> |        |