



## **MINUTES of the LOC COMMITTEE MEETING**

Held virtually on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2023 at 6.30pm

### **Attendees**

Emma Spofforth (ES)  
Kevin Lewis (KL)  
Hayley Moore (HM)  
Jasraj Bhangra (JB)  
Bhups Battu (BB)

Sheila Purser (SAP)  
Mike Daly (MD)  
Maggie Glover (MG)  
Vickie Hamilton-Barr (VH)  
Reshma Patel (RP)

David Dixon (DD)  
Mark Carhart (MC)  
Katie Kingcott (KK)  
Philip Bridgford (PB)

### **Observers:**

Pooja Bij  
Kiran Lal  
Sana Asif – PES (arrived 20.30)

Minutes taken by KK

### **23/61 Welcome and apologies**

Welcome from SAP.

Apologies from Chris Rushen and Sara Porter who are unable to attend.

Welcome to observers – Pooja Bij and Kiran Lal (contractor in Stanway and Colchester).

New meeting format to keep meetings running on time. Business covered first.

### **23/62 Conflict of interest statement**

Pooja and Jas will need to leave before the end of the meeting as both have conflicts of interest.  
PES reports unable to be shared with either.

### **23/63 Co-Opt Pooja to Essex LOC committee – Chair**

Pooja has attended and observed three committee meetings. Would like to join committee. Proposal to Co-Opt Pooja onto the committee by MG, seconded by RP. All agree. Carried unanimously.

### **23/64 Banking mandate agreement – Treasurer**

Adjustments have been made to the banking to get DD on the system and remove MD. Plan is to have DD and SAP with full access, but other officers, ES and CR, will be able to log in to view account. Proposal ES, seconded MG. All agree, so carried unanimously.

DD has suggested opening a higher interest account for operational reserves. SAP has a meeting with HSBC next week to be able to open this new account. Proposal to open a higher interest account by DD, seconded by MC. All agree. Carried unanimously.

Cap has been put on daily limit of money being transferred out of LOC account - £5,000.

### **23/65 NOC – Secretary**

NOC is 13/14<sup>th</sup> November 2023. Attendees this year will be DD, VH, HM, MG and RP. ES also planning to attend as the AOP chairman- not in LOC role. Those who are attending need to do reports to cover as much of the event as possible. Need a team leader to make sure people are attending what they should etc. WhatsApp group to be set up for the NOC, to include officers. DD to be team leader.

Lots of areas of concerns about LOCSU. Might be an issue at the NOC.

MC – comment from last years NOC. They had a conference feedback app - feedback had limited space, didn't feel it was fit for purpose. MG suggests flagging this with LOCSU. ES will do. SAP emphasises it's important to be honest at meetings.

Reporting – need to make sure reports come in fairly soon after NOC so they can be shared with the rest of the committee. Reports due by the end of the month.

### **23/66 Budget Review update – Treasurer**

Haven't done a budgeting forecast previously - will help DD to see if the stat levy needs to be adjusted. DD to look at this in April next year after the end of the financial year.

Might have a bit of extra cash to spend on projects. Like to £75,00 in reserves, currently have closer to £90,00. May reduce stat levy next year.

### **23/67 Stat levy review update – Treasurer**

Stat levy – monitor for the time being. Some queries about payments received from domiciliary companies – might have lost over 10k over the year due to the change in domiciliary provider fees. Outside Clinic and Specsavers Domiciliary Essex both get money from domiciliary fees which are now allocated to different ICSs where these companies are registered.

NH suggests if there is a way to forecast how much we will receive from GOS tests. Would we then forecast for the next 6 months for example and then review to see if the forecast matches?

Q: MG – could we request that the people who are getting our money in error, send it back to us?

ES – not this simple. Change in accounting that PCSE have done can't currently be changed. This has been raised with evidence to LOCSU. LOCSU don't have access to any data of who gets what money. ES to chase this as haven't had an update. Not easy getting any info from PSCE.

Q: MG – could this be deemed as fraud? ES – no because it's a change in the money allocation. The argument is who the money belongs to. Now it is which ICS the business owner is registered in, not where the px had the GOS test. So previously for domi work, it was allocated to the County where the px lived who had the GOS test levy fee.

SAP – NHSE clinical leads haven't been transferred a budget to do their work such as practice visits for GOS Contracts changes. Currently visits are not happening as they don't have the funds.

Q: MC – DD mentioned we may reduce levy, is this correct? SAP – yes, the amount of money we have in reserve is in excess of what we believe we need in the reserves.

### **23/68 CPD - Secretary**

Few evening sessions coming up.

Event coming up on 8<sup>th</sup> November – Richard Edwards from OCCS running a peer review event. We need facilitators. ES asks if any committee members want to be a facilitator? Don't get 3 peer review points if facilitating, only 1 self-directed peer review. Richard offered to run event an hour before for facilitators in order for them to get their peer review points. ES to contact Richard to clarify the situation. If Richard is unsure, take to the GOC.

Q: KL – what's the minimum number of people per group in peer review? HM - 10 max, minimum of 4.

ES asks for people to email her if happy to be facilitators.

Next year trying to get more CPD for DO's. Considered facilitating an IP peer review. Also talked about using more of local consultants in independent sector providers.

HM talked at last committee meeting about putting an evening on and doing a foreign body workshop.

### **23/69 Honoraria review - Secretary**

Officers spent a lot of time analysing finances. Committee needs to do a review of what the honoraria covers. Offers done brief analysis of workload.

Options for honoraria were - invoice hourly rate, consider a day rate, compare to others doing similar roles, ask for more info from LOCSU benchmarking or leave as now.

Officers decided to suggest to the committee a percentage uplift and consider adding in separate claims for the committee meetings as per the committee claims.

Officers felt an uplift of 5% is acceptable to put forward to the committee. Ability to claim meeting rate on top of that which is not how the committee currently works.

Q: MC – are there other options to consider other than a 5% or 10% uplift? ES – no Officers want the committee to consider the options of 5% or 10% uplift, or 5% or 10% uplift with committee fee's on top. Or no uplift. What officers are specifically asking for is 5% uplift with committee meeting fees on top. We know the current budget can accommodate this.

Q: MC – if you're not getting paid the rate for the job are we not perpetuating a problem? ES – this gets reviewed on an annual basis and we suggest this is reviewed in the whole next year when DD does a new budget.

Discussions continue on what is involved in the honoraria work load.

Q: BB – how many hours does each role entail? ES – really difficult to tell as this varies so much. A lot of time is spent on emails. Rough hours are documented on the papers sent out previous to the meeting.

DD clarifies any IT work he does is separate to the treasurer honoraria.

CR doesn't get an honorarium. He claims for all meetings/tasks/emails with a monthly cap on his hourly claims.

DD doesn't feel the honoraria covered the time involved. But this could be because new to the role and learning currently. Supports the 5% uplift.

Officers leave at 19.53 for this to be discussed amongst the committee members. MG is being left in charge as the host with officers out of the meeting.

Committee members discuss the honoraria.

Officers return at 20.14

MC – situation has been discussed and decided 5% rise plus meeting attendance.

Vote as follows: vote on 5% uplift plus meeting rates – 10 yes and 2 no. Majority voted yes.

MC proposes this be backdated to July, MG seconded – carried unanimously.

**For Review only with option to ask questions – all documents shared with members ahead of the meeting:**

### **23/70 Minutes of last meeting agreed and any questions from action log previously submitted – Chair**

Proposed as accurate reflection of meeting by MG, seconded by BB – all agreed.

No comments received by ES on the action log. Will be updated after meeting and shared with committee.

### **23/71 LOC Chairman's report questions – Chair**

No questions.

SAP - WOPEC OSCE last week – had a few drop out at the last minute due to practitioners having to pay. Good event and good feedback. Need to be clearer when advertising.  
SAP thanks HM for her hard work involved with this.

### **23/72 LOC Secretary's report questions – Secretary**

Q: MG – under finances it states that MD had been asked to stay as deputy treasurer but didn't have availability. Will someone else do this? ES – will be discussed at next officer's meetings. Always after people to shadow the officer's roles.

ES – the make up of the committee needs to be reviewed. Very top heavy for performers. KL and NH are currently contractors but in the process of changing work status so will no longer be contractors. They will become performers. So now have too many performers and not enough contractors.

Secretary role needs a successor. Intention for ES to stand down next June.

DD – secretary role seems very daunting. ES has produced lots of 'how to' documents which will help when she stands down.

### **23/73 LOC Treasurer's report questions - Treasurer**

No questions.

### **23/74 ICB update questions – Clinical Lead**

ES clarifies report for new members.

Q: MG – Mid and South Essex section states that a person has been chosen but doesn't state who it is? ES – felt inappropriate to name the person in the report.

Q: KL – Mid and South Essex – no progress, no a and g? What does this mean? ES - Advice and guidance.

### **23/75 LEHN Update – Chair**

SAP – felt like a repeat of the East of England chair and secretary meeting. Chaired by Rupal - spoke about special school's eye testing service changing. Had an ophthalmologist attend who was very positive. ICB's were unrepresented which was disappointing. Lot of reviewing of contracts. SAP to write up report and share with committee.

### **23/76 AOB – previously submitted only**

VH suggest having an Instagram page. VH offers to help with this. ES happy for this to be done.

DD - have had discussions on this before. Issues with photos used and GDPR.

Jas – unidentifiable photos are fine to use on social media.

## **Conflicted members (Jasraj and Pooja) leave meeting at 20.42**

### **23/77 PESL report discussion – All**

Sana joins meeting at 20.30

Q: DD – few bits missing from the pie chart? What does the 11% represent? Sana – this represents 'call 111'.

Q: DD – is there a better way to enable us to compare figures for different regions? More proportional representation. Sana – very good feedback. Will look into this. Getting data is getting easier – previously this was not easy.

Q: KL – start of report mentions that PES has rebuilt glaucoma module. Had been asked to help with this but never heard anymore. Very surprised to hear this. How long away is it? Sana – lots of testing with this module. Glaucoma optoms/practice based optoms looked at this and given feedback. Still haven't got a final deadline.

Discussions continue on this subject between KL, Sana and ES. ES suggests to KL to talk separately away from the committee meeting with herself and SAP.  
Sana to take feedback back to PES.

Q: ES – under NE Essex section, is ESNEFT meant to be Oaks? Sana – yes correct.

Q: RP – Childrens service, been reduction. Does this mean children turning up to practices and not been put onto opera? SAP – since last year practices have just been adding children without mentioning if they are from school screening. Need to find out what is causing this problem.  
SAP currently looking into this.

ES thanks Sana and SAP in their clinical lead roles.

Q: HM – feedback about children's scheme. What method do the school contact the parent with to tell them the child has failed school screening? Parents don't seem to have any information.

SAP – following every school screening, children who fail the test their parents are given a letter with a list of practices who are doing the children's screening.

ES – this scheme is commissioned by Essex County Council. Service spec is very vague.

**Newer committee members (Philip and Vickie), observer (Kiran) and Sana leave meeting.  
Meeting finished at 21.09.**

**Private meeting held – minutes separate.**