



Notice of Annual Meeting and Agenda

Notice of Annual Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Annual Meeting of the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH) will be held on Tuesday 12 September 2023, commencing at 14.00.

The meeting will be held at 15 Hatfields, London SE1 8DJ and online.

[\(https://www.15hatfields.com/find-us/\)](https://www.15hatfields.com/find-us/)

NB: The primary method of voting at this meeting will be online. Members attending the in-person event are strongly encouraged to bring an internet/Wi-Fi enabled device such as a smart phone, tablet or laptop to facilitate secure online voting.

Dated this 18th August 2023

By order of the Board of Trustees

Phil James Chief Executive

Registered office: Chadwick Court, 15 Hatfields, London SE1 8DJ

Contents

Agenda	2
Ordinary business	2
Special business.....	5
Other business	16
Notes on admission and voting	16

Agenda

1. Welcome from the Chair of the Board of Trustees
2. To note the minutes of the AGM held on 16 June 2022 and the minutes of the Special Meetings held on 23 March 2023 and 27 April 2023
3. Update from the Chair

Ordinary business

4. To consider and receive the report of the Board of Trustees on actions taken to implement motions carried on 16 June 2012, 23 March 2023 and 27 April 2023:

Annual General Meeting 16 June 2022

Motion 1 – Amendment of Byelaws: REnvH designatory letters for Environmental Health Practitioners

His Majesty’s Privy Council approved the amendment of the Byelaws on 22 September 2022. CIEH registered EHPs were then informed of this and issued with new digital credentials and permission to use the new designatory letters. EHRB registrants were encouraged to join the CIEH register free of charge during 2023 so that they may also use the REnvH letters.

Motion 2 – Amendment of Byelaws: EHO title

Significant issues of wording were discussed with the proposer and seconder of the motion and an amended version was agreed. Privy Council confirmed that the necessary steps to amend the Byelaws had not been followed. The usual process has now commenced, which involves consultation with organisations who may have cause to object to the proposal. Once this consultation has been satisfactorily concluded, an amended motion can be put to a future AGM, so that the matter can be voted on again by members before being put to Privy Council for their approval.

Motion 3 – Council and Chief Executive to take urgent steps to ensure that advice provided by fully qualified EHOs is considered at all relevant meetings of the CIEH, including the Executive Management Team, and to ensure that the CIEH is properly represented at meetings with Government Departments and other agencies in England by persons holding such qualifications, in order to deliver the objects under our Charter.

A new post of Executive Director of Environmental Health has been created on the Executive Management Team, with the remit to lead a new member engagement strategy to support and empower CIEH members to represent the Institute at such

meetings and other occasions. Central to this is the review and improvement of CIEH's Advisory Panels, so that members are able to participate with an emphasis on maximising expertise and minimising administrative burden. This work will include the establishment of new Advisory Panels, and a framework that allows new interest- and task-groups to be born, to deliver outcomes, and to close down as appropriate.

Special Meeting Thursday 23 March 2023

Motion 1 - The CIEH will in future adopt a more transparent and democratic approach to its members.

This motion called for:

- Future Annual and Special Meetings to be held on a hybrid basis.

The Board confirms that it is CIEH policy to hold Annual and Special Meetings on a hybrid basis and welcomes members to this, the third such hybrid meeting of 2023.

- Minutes of the Council and its subsidiary committees and groups to be published on the CIEH website.

The Board confirms that it is CIEH policy to publish minutes of its meetings on the CIEH website and takes this opportunity to direct members' attention to MyCIEH where these are located.

- Changing the balance of elected to co-opted members on the Council from 6:6 to 9:3.

The Board has implemented this change to its Operating Procedures.

- Make the appointment of the President for 2024-2026 under Byelaw 19 the subject of a confirmatory vote at the next Annual General Meeting.

The Board has implemented this change and draws members' attention to the agenda item announcing the confirmatory vote for the 2024 President Designate.

Motion 2 - This meeting has no confidence in the current Council to maintain a professional body run by its members.

This motion called for:

- The date of the next Annual General Meeting to be 12 September 2023 and not as previously recorded.

This has been implemented.

- Council to have the power to amend the Regulations and Operational Procedures to give effect to these proposals.

The Board (Council) confirms that it has the power to do this.

- Require the Chief Executive to provide a report to the Council on the current financial position of the CIEH within two weeks of the date of this meeting.

This has been implemented.

Special Meeting Thursday 27 April 2023

Motion 1 - This meeting has no confidence in the current Council to maintain a professional body run by its members and in consequence agrees to replace the current elected trustees for the remainder of their terms.

The remaining elected Trustee was replaced by Judith Hedgley as specified in the motion.

5. To open the confirmatory Vote for President

The Board is delighted to announce that Mark Elliott CEnvH FCIEH has been selected as the 2024 President-Designate. Mark was recommended for appointment by the Appointments and Remuneration Committee following an open and competitive process. The Board unanimously accepted this recommendation and now seeks the confirmation of members to appoint Mark as President from 1 January 2024. All members will be able to cast a confirmatory vote, which will open on Friday 15 September and close on Monday 2 October.

6. Fellowship and Honorary members

To note that Professor Roy Harrison OBE was awarded Honorary Fellowship in 2022.

To note that the following members were awarded Fellowship during 2022:

Timothy Bage
Anthony Baldock
Roberta Borges Stewart
Vanessa Brett
Richard Chubb
Mark Flanagan
Appollo Fonka
Helen Groves
Warren Haynes
Terenja Humphries

Paul Oatt
Ian Sanders
Charles Spencer
Stuart Wiggans

7. Annual Report and Annual Financial Statements

To consider and receive the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees and the Annual Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2022.

8. Election of auditors

To appoint Crowe UK as auditors and to authorise the trustees to fix their remuneration.

Special business

9. To consider the following motions:

Motion 1 - the removal of appointed trustees

Proposer: Janet Russell CEnvH FCIEH
Seconded: Janet Catley-Young CEnvH MCIEH

1. In pursuance of article 8(b) of the Charter of 1984 as amended in 2016 ("the Charter") it is hereby resolved that, subject to such modifications as the Privy Council may require and the Council of the Chartered Institute may agree in consultation with the proposer and seconder of the motion, the Chartered Institute should petition His Majesty for the following amendment to the Byelaws to provide clarification as to the power to remove appointed trustees.

In Byelaw 20 the second paragraph shall be amended to read as follows:

"Members of the Council may be subject to removal in accordance with Regulations."

Notes on Charter and Byelaws changes:

If passed as a Chartered Institute Special Resolution (requiring a 2/3 majority) the amendments will only come into effect if they receive the approval of the Privy Council. The existing Charter and Byelaws can be viewed on the CIEH website:

<https://www.cieh.org/governance/how-cieh-is-governed/governance-documents/> - a hard copy can also be requested via the Membership Team.

2. If the proposed changes to the Byelaws are agreed by the Privy Council, the Council will amend its Regulations accordingly.

Reasons for the motion

In the discussions over the motions at the Special Meetings in 2023 to remove trustees from the Council (Board of Trustees), it became clear that there were inconsistencies between the Byelaws and the Operational Procedures. This motion seeks to put all trustees on the same footing. This does not interfere with the Council's own powers to appoint trustees under Byelaw 18 and cancel such appointments but provides a long-stop power for members to remove such trustees which have lost their confidence and when the Council fails to act.

Motion 2 – Improved transparency and effectiveness

Proposer: Lisa Griffin CEnvH MCIEH

Seconder: Tim Everett CEnvH FCIEH

The CIEH needs to improve the transparency of its dealings and governance arrangements, and to that end it is proposed that:

- (a) The declared interests of all members of the Council (also known as the Board of Trustees) and the Executive Management Team shall be published to members within one month of this meeting, and in future published in the Annual Report.
- (b) Any interests declared by Council members at the start of each meeting shall be published in the minutes without redaction.
- (c) The details of all consultants and the reason for their engagement who have been paid more than £5k in the last 12 months shall be published to members within one month and in future such details in bands of £5k will be published in the Annual Report.
- (d) The Council shall review all contracts for the supply of goods and services which have not been subject to competitive tendering within the last three years.
- (e) The Council shall publish to members within three months of this meeting a list of all such contractors, with the proposed arrangements and timetable for advertising and tendering these contracts.

Reasons for the motion

As evidenced by the results of the Special Meetings there is widespread distrust among members as to how the affairs of the CIEH have been managed in recent years. There are concerns that gaps caused by redundancies are being covered more expensively by consultants who have been recruited without a proper process being followed. There are also concerns that certain commercial interests may seek to capture the voice of the CIEH. It is good corporate practice to ensure that all such services are periodically tested to ensure value for money, and to avoid the risk of becoming an employer without a proper recruitment process. With limited resources it is vital that they are used as effectively as possible to deliver the charitable objects.

Motion 3 – Review of Charitable Status

Proposer: Peter Wright MCIEH

Seconder: Emily Latimer CEnvH MCIEH

The CIEH has not reviewed the merits of continuing as a Charity for many years, both in terms of finance and the effects on the involvement of members in its governance. It is therefore proposed that the Council review the arguments for and against retaining its charitable status and report back to the Annual Meeting in 2024, to include a continuation vote for members to decide its future status.

Reasons for the motion

Over the last 30 years HMRC have periodically questioned the legitimacy of professional bodies being charities, and this may anyway be subject to future changes in Government policy and legislation. Any financial arguments must be weighed against the greater operating freedom allowed to a company and against the loss of control by members of the body they founded and funded. It has recently enabled trustees who have overwhelmingly lost a vote of no confidence by the members to refuse to resign.

NB The Royal Charter was granted to the Institute as a company limited by guarantee, and it previously operated under company rather than charity legislation.

Motion 4

Proposer: Dr Chris Day MCIEH

Seconder: Ian Gray MBE, FCIEH

Wording of the Overarching Motion:

This Meeting is of the opinion that the newly elected and appointed members of the Board of Trustees (the 'Board') must chart an immediate course of actions to re-build the CIEH – and, with it, the reputation of the profession and the status of those in its practice.

This Motion, and the series of matters detailed in the sub-sections below, arise out of the Special Meetings held in March and April 2023. The proposers of this Motion have previously offered these same suggestions in an 'Open Letter' to the Executive, President and Vice-President entitled: *An action plan for recovery: proposals for the rebuilding of the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)*. This was sent to them on 26th May 2023.

This Motion is focused on restoring the CIEH's professional identity which has become diluted in recent years as the Executive strove to expand the membership base. As a result, the CIEH's role as a professional body, representative of those holding a recognised environmental health qualification, has become confused. In addition, alterations made to the practical and professional training requirements and their assessment caused '*a significant proportion of employers*' to express the opinion that the qualification no longer provided the holistic skills in the core areas of environmental health practice needed for a flexible workforce.

This Motion calls upon the Board, and through them, the Executive, to restore the CIEH's professional focus by re-affirming its commitment to the professional qualification; further, to seek recognition for the public health competences of EHPs performing increasingly diverse roles in many different settings. Only by doing so, we believe, will the profession achieve the status it deserves and the CIEH its rightful capacity to influence.

Central to this 'recovery plan' is the need to re-establish the core technical competencies required of those securing the qualification, reinstating independent registration of practitioners, and pursuing co-registration of EHPs with the UK Public Health Register (UKPHR) as public health professionals operating at 'Practitioner' level.

The proposers further believe that the CIEH should improve the membership experience by encouraging engagement; doing more to share the outcome of local research and the exchange ideas; and inviting criticism through its hard-copy and online organs of communication, as it discovers a new vibrancy as a

dynamic organisation intent on moving with the times, yet holding firm to its standards and values.

To these ends Members are asked to vote in support of Motion 4 and in each of the following subsections:

Motion 4a: *That the Board seeks to restore the status of the qualification by re-setting the standard of competence necessary for entry to professional practice and eligibility for CIEH membership based on an immediate, thorough, and multi-disciplinary review of the qualification and the process of assessment.*

It is a feature of successful professions that they preciously hold on to their knowledge base and standards of practice because this safeguards the right of those individuals who practice in its name to be trusted and treated as a professional. This has been frequently and repeatedly emphasised in reviews of the CIEH Curriculum and the qualification process down the years.

Restoring our professional credibility is key to the future status of the profession and practitioners, as well as the recovery of CIEH's capacity to influence. This, we believe, will only be achieved if the CIEH clearly and unambiguously re-affirms its commitment to the professional qualification, recognises and celebrates the diverse nature of work performed by EHPs, and ensures that the core technical competencies - given less prominence under the previous administration - are again made central to the qualification process.

Motion 4b: *That the Board explores alternative systems of formal registration for Environmental Health Practitioners, including those independent of CIEH membership, for those completing a prescribed course of instruction and training in the discipline as a whole, or in one or more areas of specialist practice.*

Those tasked with developing the successor to the former Environmental Health Registration Board (EHRB), should have regard to the criticisms expressed at the time the EHRB was dismantled. Most notable was that admittance was for life without the need to determine that the person had maintained their competencies. It would seem to be a reasonable and practical requirement to expect an EHP to maintain their membership of the CIEH, and registration with the re-formed EHRB, through CPD.

The irony should not be lost that in May 2020, when asked who the CIEH considered were competent to perform the role of a Tier 2 'Clinical Contact Caseworker', it responded by releasing the EHRB register to assist EHPs wishing to apply to be recruited by NHS Professionals. Based on this alone, there is little doubt that EHRB registration stood for something, making it hard to understand why the Board of Trustees at the time allowed it to be wound up, when it was the conditions of registration that needed to be reviewed, not the EHRB itself.

Motion 4c: *That the Board secures the recognition of EHPs eligible for registration to apply, after a suitable period of relevant experience, for co-registration with a professional body responsible for overseeing entry to practice in Public Health.*

The proposers and their supporters strongly believe that Environmental Health graduates, facing the prospect of going through the qualification process, should consider that they are also being equipped to join the public health workforce on an equal footing to all other health professionals working in public health and health protection.

The performance of EHPs in meeting the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic provides ample evidence for believing them to be equal to the multiplicity of public health demands that have arisen over recent years. However, memories fade, and consequently we consider securing the opportunity for co-registration to be essential for our future, not an extravagance.

Motion 4d: *That the Board provides the means by which EHPs are able to exercise their professional voice, free to criticise decisions made in their name, and to share and exchange knowledge gained through research and practical experience and reflection.*

The proposers believe that the following are largely achievable through a change of focus and direction, but also appreciate that they will be limited to the extent that finances will allow:

- the remit of *Environmental Health News* (EHN) should be extended to become a tool of two-way communication with members and readers, incorporating a 'Letters' page and inviting 'Comment' from guest contributors;
- EHN should be re-modelling for a wider national and international public health audience, incorporating, inter alia, published guidance and opinion, evidence of effective practice, and research Abstract; and,
- the *Journal of Environmental Health Research* (JEHR) should be restored under an experienced editorial team, with a suggested biannual publication.

Motion 4e: *Restore the value of membership by ensuring that matters relevant to EHPs working across all fields of Environmental Health practice are covered by the Advisory Panels and that the resources they and others have contributed down the years are made available to Members, where necessary, with updating and amendment.*

An immediate matter of concern is that there is no Advisory Panel currently in place to consider Public Health issues, despite the CIEH referring to the existence

of five active Panels. It is suggested that when this shortcoming is addressed it is referred to as the 'Advisory Panel for Public Health & Health Security' reflecting that its area of interest and expertise extends to all aspects of health improvement and health protection.

In addition, the resources available to Members should be improved and increased by the following:

- reviewing, and where necessary updating, the materials currently available in the 'Resources' section of the CIEH website: retrieving materials from previous versions of the website; and, seeing them indexed and reposted.
- requesting the Advisory Panels to identify reports, guidance and information sources that can be of use to members and others accessing the website;
- creating a facility on MyCIEH where members might share useful 'open source' material; and.
- investigating and reporting on the feasibility of reinstating the CIEH library as a repository for documents and other items that represent our professional heritage.

Statement in support of the Day-Gray Motion to the CIEH AGM

This statement in support of our Motion is largely drawn from an 'open letter' entitled: *'An action plan for recovery: proposals for the rebuilding of the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH)'* that we drafted, with contributions from Rachel Flowers MCIEH and Dr Rob Couch, MCIEH in May 2023. It was prompted by the principal authors attendance at the Special Meetings held in March and April, and their view that it was vital for newly elected and appointed members of the Board of Trustees to re-build the CIEH – and, with it, the reputation of the profession as a key player in protecting and promoting health - based on the core values of environmental health.

The 'letter' was circulated on 26th May to members of the Executive, the President, the Vice-Presidents with a background in Environmental Health, and the person co-ordinating the affairs of the Association of Chief Environmental Health Officers in the hope that it might initiate / stimulate local debate, encourage candidates coming forward for election to the Board to support the proposals, and ultimately, but only if necessary, to bring pressure to bear on the Governance of the CIEH to deliver on these points. For reasons of brevity, these points were not developed in the text, but in each case the authors provided references to source material that supported their contentions.

Throughout the 'letter', emphasis is made of the urgency for action given the precarious state of the organisation's finances and the danger that students and recently qualified EHPs might question their decision to pursue a career in Environmental Health. Here, we have simply turned the narrative into statements arranged in paragraphs and with the invitation to anyone who wishes to read the unexpurgated version to contact the authors.

1.0 Statement in support of Motion 4a: *That the Board seeks to restore the status of the qualification by re-setting the standard of competence necessary for entry to professional practice and eligibility for CIEH membership based on an immediate, thorough, and multi-disciplinary review of the qualification and the process of assessment.*

1.1 EH education providers still seem keen to build their programmes of academic instruction around a prescriptive curriculum (the 'Environmental Health Curriculum 2011'), underpinned by a core body of knowledge of sufficient academic rigour to satisfy university demands. Yet, time has moved on, and a review would serve to establish whether this was still 'fit for purpose'. More importantly for the CIEH, is the need to have confidence in the route to qualification provided through professional training and assessment of the knowledge and skills expected of an EHP.

1.2 Rather than leaving anything to chance and to avoid uncertainty, we would recommend that the review start from first principles and encourage those charged with conducting it to begin with a period of self-reflection during which the Board considers what characterises an EHP today, and what special skills and 'values' they bring to the role. We offer ways in the 'letter' as to how this might be performed, drawing attention to how the traditional descriptions and definitions of 'public health' and 'environmental health' should accord, additionally, with the goals of 'one world, one health', and the need to embrace the safeguarding of the living environment.

1.3 While a fundamental review of all elements of the qualification process might sound daunting, a suitable starting point might be the model developed when conducting the review of the Curriculum, Portfolio of Professional Practice, and the assessment of candidates for registration in 2014/15. These were passed over by the incoming Executive in 2016, but a summary appeared in the 21st Edition of Clay's Handbook of Environmental Health that year.

1.4 Here, in Chapter 2 entitled: 'Environmental health – a changing practice' the author outlined the essential object of the review was: '*...to win the minds of employers to regard competence – underpinned by a suitable qualification – as being vital to their purposes...*'. To this end it focused on three 'tasks':

- the promotion of the 'competent practitioner' as the means by which health is best protected;
- the promotion of 'registration' as the means of best underwriting the competence of practitioners; and,

- the promotion of membership as the best means of maintaining registration through Continuous Professional Development and adherence to other conditions, including ethical practice.
- 1.5 We hold to the view that nothing has changed, and whilst happy to concede that through a concerted effort spearheaded by the President in 2021, some of the technical demands of the qualification assessment process have been reinstated, the CIEH needs to be certain that it has 'covered all bases'. In addition, those who entered the assessment process between 2018 and 2021 might need to have a supplementary 'pathway' mapped out for them should they wish to be eligible for registration with the Environmental Health Registration Board.
- 1.6 To those who might doubt the need to go to these lengths, think how unsettling it would be to know that the GMC had decided a doctor-in-training need no longer demonstrate a full range of clinical competences. It is a feature of successful professions that they preciously hold on to their knowledge base and standards of practice because this is what safeguards the right of those who practice in its name to be trusted and treated as a professional. This has been frequently and repeatedly emphasised in reviews of the Curriculum and qualification process down the years.
- 2.0** **Statement in support of Motion 4b:** *That the Board explores alternative systems of formal registration for Environmental Health Practitioners, including those independent of CIEH membership, for those completing a prescribed course of instruction and training in the discipline as a whole, or in one or more areas of specialist practice.*
- 2.1 Once a review of the curriculum and qualification has been successfully concluded it should be perfectly possible to reinstate registration through a reformed Environmental Health Registration Board or whatever it might be called in future. It was its freedom to act independently of the CIEH as the membership body, that was considered to be its strength and its value, this being an essential feature of a profession that wishes to exercise its right for autonomy, free from interference from a higher authority. Importantly, a reconstituted EHRB would make Continuing Professional Development (CPD) a condition of on-going registration.
- 2.2 One significant criticism at the time that the affairs of the 'old' EHRB were being wound up was that it provided 'registration for life', with no consideration of the registrant's on-going fitness to practice or their professional behaviour. Consequently, an important caveat would be that the person had maintained their competencies and was still 'a fit and proper person' before the law. It would seem a comparatively simple task to require an EHP to maintain their membership of the CIEH, and registration with the reformed EHRB, through CPD.
- 3.0** **Statement in support of Motion 4c:** *That the Board secures the recognition of EHPs eligible for registration to apply, after a suitable period of relevant*

experience, for co-registration with a professional body responsible for overseeing entry to practice in Public Health

- 3.1 In calling upon the new Board to secure recognition through third-party endorsement of the central role played by EHPs in public health, we would point out that we have been here before. Accordingly, we would urge the newly elected members of the Board to instruct the Executive to resume the overtures made to the UKPHR in 2012 when we sought recognition of the qualification for the purposes of defined registration of EHPs as public health professionals at 'Practitioner' level. At this time, we were informed that: 'graduates from the CIEH 2011 curriculum can be said to have met nearly all of the UKPHR practitioner standards'.
- 3.2 Inevitably, a degree of back-tracking over the content of the professional training programme and its assessment will have to be performed. Furthermore, reinstatement of an independent registration mechanism through a reconstituted EHRB might be an essential pre-requisite (see Endorsement 2). However, then, if negotiations took us back to where we were ten years ago the prize would again be co-registration of EHPs with bodies regulating entry to both environmental health and public health, which, in the case of UKPHR registration, might be professionally advantageous to the individual and the profession at large.
- 3.3 In the meantime, we would encourage further dialogue with the Faculty of Public Health (FPH) to explore other means of underscoring our public health credentials, though the recent mechanism by which members can access Associate Membership of the FPH was a welcome first step in this direction.
- 4.0** **Statement in support of Motion 4d:** *That the Board provides the means by which EHPs are able to exercise their professional voice, free to criticise decisions made in their name, and to share and exchange knowledge gained through research and practical experience and reflection.*
- 4.1 Airing criticism and provoking healthy debate are important in terms of personal development, creating effective working practices, and building professional networks. Stymy this, and the result is stasis. Accordingly, the Board is asked to instruct the Executive to restore the means by which EHPs are able to exercise their professional voice, free to criticise decisions made in their name, and share and exchange knowledge gained through research, policy making and practice.
- 4.2 As far as *Environmental Health News* is concerned, we would like to see it be given a fresh remit that sets itself sufficiently apart from the CIEH to accept criticism through a double page of 'Questions', and another inviting 'Comment' from an anonymous writer. We believe that EHN should be re-modelled for a wider audience, with a view to it being seen and consulted by other public health practitioners.
- 4.3 We especially like the design and format of the US National Environmental Health Association's *Journal of Environmental Health* which finds a place for 'news' running alongside Abstracts of research papers published elsewhere,

and the International Federation of Environmental Health's magazine *Environment and Health International* which is a 'good read' and a reminder that we should be making a far greater effort to engage with EH organisations and EHPs beyond these shores.

- 4.4 In support of the reinstatement of the Journal of Environmental Health Research we would just add that it was an important vehicle for EHPs to see their research efforts published in an edited journal, and with its loss, we suffered further 'invisibility'. True, it was expensive to produce as a hard-copy publication, and the editor was never overwhelmed by the volume of contributions, but these are different times, and published, initially, twice-yearly online, with a small, multi-disciplinary, editorial team, and Environmental Health research performed by those best able to do so would be 'back on the map'.

5.0 **Statement in support of Motion 4e:** *Restore the value of membership by ensuring that matters relevant to EHPs working across all fields of Environmental Health practice are covered by the Advisory Panels and that the resources they and others have contributed down the years are made available to Members, where necessary, with amendment.*

- 5.1 The CIEH Advisory Panels benefit from many experienced and well-qualified members, but we have found few original policy documents, the focus being more on responding to consultations. We also are missing an Advisory Panel for Public Health, when surely health protection and our considerable upstream work on disease prevention should be foremost in the CIEH's focus in light of the pandemic, the climate emergency, and the many pressures on our NHS.
- 5.2 We invite the Board to explore ways that the CIEH might improve its service to its member through more informed opinion and guidance based on research and practice across all five of the traditional fields of practice. In the meantime, there is a case for reviewing the materials currently available in the 'Resources' section of the CIEH website, retrieving 'missing' reports and advisory sources, and seeing these updated as far as possible.
- 5.3 A longer-term hope would be to see the CIEH Library reinstated since it contained our professional heritage. Although much of the material held there might never be recovered, an appeal to members for books, documents, and physical artefacts, would, we feel, be surprisingly fruitful, as would the recruitment of a team of honorary librarians to work alongside our academic networks, to recreate an archive accessible virtually, and in time, physically, so restoring this tangible link with our past.

Concluding remarks

We, the proposers of this Motion, went on in our 'letter' to explore means of financing the implementation of the 'plan'. Needless to say, there will be time and costs involved in terms of the reinstatement of the Registration Board, the suggested revisions to EHN, the re-launch of JEHR, and creation of a new 'Library Archive'. Save

for the reconstitution of the Registration Board which should, as in the past, be self-financing, these items of capital expenditure will need to be factored into the 2024/25 budget, though sponsors might be sought to defray the cost.

Chris Day & Ian Gray – 12th July 2023 (Statements subject to minor revision to ensure consistency with the same revisions made to the Motions on 15th August 2023)

Other business

10. To confirm the date of the next Annual General Meeting as Friday 28 June 2024 and that it will be held at 15 Hatfields, London SE1 8DJ and online.

Notes on admission and voting

Admission to the AGM will be restricted to registered members of CIEH who are required to pay a subscription which shall have been received in full by 17.00 on 29 August 2023; and to those registered members from whom no annual subscription is required.

Notice of this AGM is being made available to all members at least 21 days in advance, thus allowing at least seven days for the full* payment of all subscriptions for 2023, which must be received by CIEH by 17.00 on 29 August 2023.

*Including partial payment of a subscription in instalments via a direct debit plan.

Voting by proxy

In accordance with the AGM Operational Procedures, members who are unable to attend the AGM may, on demand of a poll being made, record their votes for or against any particular resolution on matters appearing on the agenda for the meeting. The Chair of the meeting may be appointed for proxy voting as set out in Part 10 of the Annual General Meeting Operational Procedures.

Only members in good financial standing as at 17.00 on 29 August 2023 are entitled to vote, either personally or by proxy and they should instruct the Chair of the meeting, as their proxy, to vote for or against any resolution as appropriate.