

Royal College of Psychiatrists

Preparation of College Policy (including Faculties, Sections and Divisions) and approval of the College response to Consultations

29 March 2012

Approval of the College response to Consultations

After Consultation with relevant Faculties, Sections, Divisions and other Members of the College (if required), the College response will need to be sent to the following for approval:

1. Senior Member of Staff

A Senior Member of Staff needs to check the College response before it is submitted for approval.

2. Associate Registrar (Policy)

The Associate Registrar has the responsibility to sign off College responses, but can involve the Registrar where necessary.

3. Registrar

Each College response should be sent to the Registrar and the Registrar can advise if necessary.

4. Chief Executive and Director of Communications and Policy

Each College response should be copied to the Chief Executive and to the Director of Communications and Policy for information purposes.

Guidance to Chairs of College policy working groups

1. Introduction

The following procedures are recommended to ensure the smooth running of working groups. This applies to all policy working groups established by the Central Executive Committee (CEC) and to working groups established within Faculties, Sections, Divisions and Special Interest Groups.

Details of all proposed working groups should be submitted to CEC in accordance with the following procedures, regardless of whether or not these will attract costs. This is to ensure that an accurate list of policy working groups is maintained centrally, in order to prevent duplication of work, and to assist the College's Library and Information Service in responding to enquiries.

2. Chairmanship and membership of the working group

The Chair of a College working group will usually be nominated by the parent committee (eg CEC, Faculty or Section Executive Committee) or an Officer of the

College. The membership may be determined by the Chair, with advice and possible nominations from the parent committee or Officer. Experts from external organisations or from within the College may be co-opted when necessary.

3. **Preparation of a budget**

A budget should be submitted to the parent committee for approval. The following items should be taken into account in preparing the budget:

- 3.1 The likely duration and number of meetings:- Many working groups are limited to 18 months; consideration should be given to the extent to which work can be conducted by correspondence and telephone, thus reducing the number of meetings.
- 3.2 Estimated travelling expenses of the members:- Members are expected to claim reimbursement of travelling expenses locally where possible. If the employing Trust or authority is unwilling to pay expenses, estimated costs should be included in the budget. Travel claimed through the College must be booked at least two weeks (but preferably three weeks) in advance of the travel date in line with College guidance. Any bookings made less than two weeks in advance will need to be arranged and paid for personally and reimbursement will normally be made at the level of an advance fare (i.e. not what has actually been paid). If mileage is claimed, the lowest of mileage cost or the cost of advanced rail travel will be paid. The cheapest possible flights must be booked rather than flexible fares. Hotel accommodation should only be booked where absolutely necessary. As far as possible, meetings should be held in the afternoon to reduce the cost of travel. The working group may wish to consider meeting outside the College premises if this reduces travel time and expenses. The College will reimburse reasonable travelling expenses (2nd class rail fares) of non-College members if their parent organisation is not covering them.
- 3.3 Administrative support - It will not normally be possible for support to be provided by a member of College staff, but where this is considered essential, an estimate of staff time should be included in the budget, and the permission of the Chief Executive should be sought.
- 3.4 Estimated catering costs - e.g. tea, coffee, lunch.
- 3.5 Publication costs do not need to be included in the budget, as it is expected that these will be recouped by the sale of the Report.

4. **Remit**

The remit will have been drafted by the parent committee or relevant Officer, and should be circulated to the Finance Management Committee (FMC) & CEC together with the proposed budget and membership list. All documents submitted to CEC must have a front sheet which identifies, among other things, the responsible Trustee. The front sheet is available from the CEC web site for those who have access (ie any member of CEC), or from the College Committee Manager responsible for CEC.

5. Procedures concerning the preparation and submission of the Report

5.1 Format of the Report:

In addition to the main text, the Report should usually consist of:

- Date
- Introduction
- Executive summary, incorporating a list of recommendations
- members of the working group
- other contributors (if applicable)
- complete list of references (in the Harvard style*)

* Incomplete referencing is the main cause for delay in the editorial/publication process. For all references cited in the text, full publication details should be included in the reference list. Publications not cited in the text should not be included in the reference list. If necessary, an additional list of 'Further reading' (references not cited in the text but thought useful to readers of the report) may be appended. Again, care should be taken to include full publication details. For further advice about referencing style, see appendix I.

5.2 Consultation of other College Committees, Faculties, Sections and Divisions:

The working group should consult relevant College Committees, Faculties and Sections in the preparation of the Report. Advice should also be sought from the Scottish, Northern Ireland and Welsh Divisions to ensure that the Report addresses any differences in legislation and practice. It should also be specified whether any statistics contained within the Report apply to the UK or to England and Wales.

The working group must ensure that ethnic issues have been taken into account (see Paragraph 6).

5.3 Length of currency of the Report: (i.e. the number of years that the Report should remain College / and or Faculty policy.)

College Reports are given an 'expiry date', usually a period of five years, after which time they are reviewed, and either reconfirmed as statement of current policy, or updated as appropriate. The Chair of the working group is asked to make a recommendation about the length of currency, for consideration by the CPCC.

5.4 Prior to submission of the Report to Central Policy Co-ordination Committee, the Chair of the working group is asked to supply the following:

5.4.1 An electronic copy of the Report;

5.4.2 A separate copy of the summary of the Report (up to 300-400 words in length), for publication in the Psychiatric Bulletin (to bring the report to members' attention), for inclusion on a publicity sheet/order form prepared by the Publications Department for wide circulation to other bodies and agencies, and for inclusion on the College website <http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/publications>. This summary may be adapted from the Report's executive summary and

should include a list of key features/recommendations of the report, and information about the target audience/readership.

- 5.4.3 A list of names and addresses of relevant key bodies or individuals to whom it is suggested that a complimentary copy of the full Report should be circulated. (This should include the members of the working group which produced the Report.)

There are specific guidelines relating to the joint publication of Reports in collaboration with other professional bodies/Colleges. Any joint report should be discussed with the Head of Publications (djago@rcpsych.ac.uk) at an early stage.

6. Administrative support provided by the library

- 6.1 The library can provide literature searches and document delivery for working groups of College Reports on the topic or subjects relating to that area.
- 6.2 The information can be retrieved in a suitable format within 2-5 working days.
- 6.3 This service can be used for Consultations.
- 6.4 The library provides this service free of charge to members.

7. The College's Race Equality Action Plan

7.1 Introduction

In April 2003 Council agreed that, as part of the General Duty placed upon it under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, the College will take active steps to eliminate racial discrimination from all College policies, procedures and standards. In order to achieve this the College will need to ensure that a system is established so that all such policies, procedures and standards are routinely examined to ensure that they do not directly or indirectly racially discriminate. The major differences relating to culture should be acknowledged, when appropriate, in all College documents.

7.2 Guidance

Working groups producing or reviewing College policies, standards and procedures should consider the following issues:

- 7.2.1 If the Chair or working group believes that the policy will affect racial groups differently then they should consider whether the working group has the appropriate expertise amongst its membership. If they require assistance in identifying an additional member with such expertise they should contact the Chairman of the Transcultural Special Interest Group.

The policy should address the specific needs of different racial groups. Service users may come from many different ethnic backgrounds with wide cultural differences. They may need interpretation services and the policy should refer to these. Cognitive assessment is highly dependent on language ability, and the outcome of the assessment has important implications for treatment. The working group should ensure that the

validity of rating scales for different ethnic groups has been considered. The Transcultural Special Interest Group is willing to provide advice in these areas.

- 7.2.2 The working group should consider how any policy, standard or procedure will directly or indirectly affect different ethnic groups when it is published and thus in the public arena. The working group should consider what is already published about different ethnic groups in the particular context of their report.

For example any future College report on child abuse should refer to the findings of the Victoria Climbié Inquiry (Report of an inquiry by Lord Laming, January 2003).

How the report will contribute towards meeting the General Duty under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. This requires the College 'to have due regard in carrying out their functions to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination; promote equality of opportunity; and promote good relations between persons of different racial groups'

In order to ensure that this guidance is embedded into all College structures it is been agreed by Council that initially, all policies, standards and procedures will be scrutinised by the College Policy Unit before being forwarded to Council or the Education Training and Standards Committee. Please contact the College Policy Unit for further advice or guidance.

8. **Progress**

The working group must keep CPCC informed about its progress.

9. **Legal advice**

Approaches to lawyers for advice about the content of draft reports should not be made by the working group without prior approval from the College Chief Executive.

10. **Media interest**

In the event that the draft report or details of the proceedings of the working group are leaked to the media, the Chair is advised to contact the College's Director of Communications and Policy, Deborah Hart, on extension

127, so that a strategy can be formulated to ensure that the College responds effectively to any media coverage. If the subject of the report is likely to raise media interest, the Chair should advise Deborah Hart when work commences. Members of the working group are advised not to enter into a dialogue with journalists until advice has been sought from the College.

Richard Burton

29 March 2012

Appendix I

References

Cross-check all references with the list.

Text citation

Citation in the text: 'as has been described by Smith & Brown (1978)' or 'as has been described elsewhere (Jones *et al*, 1977)'

For references with two authors, use style: Smith & Brown, 1978

For references with three or more authors, replace second and subsequent authors by *et al* (italic, no point): Barton *et al*

Multiple references in parenthesis: in chronological order and separated by semicolons: '(Smith *et al*, 1998; Adams & Jones, 1999; Barton *et al*, 1999, 2001)'

Reference for an unattributed editorial: give the journal name in the text (Lancet, 1993) and place in reference list under Lancet (Roman in both places).

When a website is referenced as a resource, the URL should be cited in the text only. When a specific document that is available online is referred to, treat the text citation in the same way as for a printed reference.

Do not allow references to unpublished lectures, to documents not available to the reader or to papers/books submitted but not yet accepted for publication. If the unpublished source is written by one of the present authors, replace with '(details available from the author upon request)'; otherwise, query with the author. If he or she cannot find a corresponding published reference, the text reference should read '... Williams (personal communication, 1998) ...', or the name should be avoided: there should be no entry in the reference list. Authors must provide written permission from the person quoted.

Publications 'in press': mark in the margin 'Author: update': details of publication may be available at proof, or publication may have slipped over to the next year. If year is known, but project is still in press, cite in text as 'Smith, 2002' and in reference list as a standard reference, but end with 'in press' for a journal, and '(in press)' for a book. For clarification, see the separate style guide for the journal you are editing.

All psychometric instruments (rating scales, questionnaires) should be referenced – query the author where this has not been done.

Reference lists

Give journal titles in full (except *BMJ* and *JAMA*) and omit the definite article (exception, *The Times*).

List references in alphabetical order.

Order chronologically numerous entries under the same author's name, giving first all those by the single author, then those by two or more authors.

Where more than three authors are listed, give the first three followed by '*et al*' (no point).

Several publications in one year by the same group, or ambiguous citations (e.g. Bloggs *et al*, 1824) should be distinguished as 1824a, 1824b etc in the text and reference list.

Example of list order:

Adams, A. (2002) ...
Adams, P. (1999) ...
Brown, F. (1998) ...
Brown, F. & Smith, J. (1994) ...
Brown, F., Smith, J., Tames, P., *et al* (1988) ...
denBoer, W. (2001) ...

MacDonald, S. (2002) ...
Manfredson, P. (1999) ...
McDonald, D. (2001) ...
van Schmidt, H. (2000) ...
von Schmidt, C. (2002) ...
Taylor, Y. (2001a) ...
Taylor, Y. (2001b) ...
Taylor, Y. (2001c) ...

The following example shows most of the things you are likely to come across in a reference list. Note that law reports are collected at the end of the list, with square brackets around the year. Documents available online should be treated in the same way as published sources, giving the full URL in place of place of publication/publisher or journal name/volume/page number details.

Allen, I. (1994) *Doctors and their Careers. A New Generation*. Policy Studies Institute.
Blenkin, H., Deary, I. & Agius, R. (1995) Stress in NHS consultants (letter). *BMJ*, **310**, 534.
British Medical Association (1999) *Maternity Leave (for NHS Medical Staff)*. BMA.
British Medical Association (2000) *Maternity leave (for NHS Medical Staff). Guidance Note Amendment*. BMA.
Kohen, D. (2001a) Gender and mental health: recognition of unresolved issues (editorial). *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, **7**, 83–84.
Kohen, D. (2001b) Psychiatric services for women. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, **7**, 328–334.
Department of Health (1999) *Reform of the Mental Health Act 1983 Proposals for Consultation (Cm 4480)*. TSO (The Stationery Office).
Held, V. (1993) *Feminist Morality: Transforming Culture, Society and Politics*. University of Chicago Press.
Lancet (2001) Keeping women in hospital and academic medicine (editorial). *Lancet*, **358**, 83.
Law Commission (1995) *Mental Incapacity: A Summary of the Law Commission's Recommendations (LC 231)*. HMSO.
Lord Chancellor's Department (1999) *Making Decisions. The Government's Proposals for Making Decisions on Behalf of Mentally Incapacitated Adults: A Report Issued in the Light of Responses to the Consultation Paper "Who Decides?" (Cm 4465)*. TSO (The Stationery Office).
McGarry, L. & Chodoff, P. (1981) The ethics of involuntary hospitalization. In *Psychiatric Ethics* (eds S. Bloch & P. Chodoff), pp. 203–219. Oxford University Press.

Airedale NHS Trust v. Bland [1993] 1 *AllER* 821.
Gillick v. W. Norfolk & Wisbech Area Health Authority [1985] 3 *AllER* 402.
R v. Bournemouth Community and Mental Health NHS Trust, ex parte L [1998] 3 *AllER* 289.
Re T (Adult: Refusal of Treatment) [1992] 4 *AllER* 649.