

SHA London Executive to London members -

Members Consultation

Here is the analysis of our 5 day online survey 29.8.20 – 2.9.20. and consultation, which had to be timed to enable us to convey the results to the national Chair by 3rd September as he asked of us in our urgent branch Zoom meeting on 24th August.

To be clear – none of the questions has been designed to override national Central Council or to be unconstitutional (as has been incorrectly suggested in correspondence made public via national admin). This is about making our collective views and recommendations known as we cannot now do that as an integral part of CC. We seek to address pressing issues both in terms of our internal functions as an organisation and in the wider context of a public health emergency.

We have rightly kept our correspondence about this contained to our immediate member list, not to 'consented' or former members etc. We are very saddened that these sincere efforts to find solutions within the context of this very difficult situation have been widely misrepresented to the member list and others in the above categories, many of whom were not happy to receive said unasked for communication. Said action has not been helpful in terms of finding a constructive dialogue.

You will note that the link to the letter from SHA national Chair and Secretary was circulated in our meeting notes to all London members. We are a branch exec who since the 2014 re-launch has always taken every care to be fair and balanced in our communication.

It has been suggested by some members who have not previously been involved with the branch that a survey is not something we should be doing. However, please note, this is perfectly within the powers of the branch executive to hold urgent meetings and run online surveys and other activities in order to ensure that any pressing situation is consulted upon and any member who wishes has the opportunity to comment – in this instance on a sudden shift in the organisation's infrastructure with significant impact on the branch and putting up added barriers to communication.

Also in terms of those who have voiced concerns that this survey goes against the SHA Constitution None of the suggestions are unconstitutional - Central Council has the power to co opt if it chooses to or to set up a working group ; the ideas in the communications section are all within the power of the CC to grant; the SGM had already been requested and suggested again to us last week, and is within the Constitution, so also needed to be addressed in this context. We were also asked to address the scheduling of the national AGM in the context of the current internal debate with respect to due notice to branches and the situation with branch delegates - as well as the possible impact of the Covid pandemic on the AGM. We also included reference to the Labour SocSoc urging societies not to focus unduly on internal elections this year - so all views made available with a view to making recommendations to Central Council. The suggestion that this would override Central Council is constitutionally impossible - however, having lost our integral voice on CC, we needed to be able to have our own discussion, establish our view and make our that known. Only the CC has the power to set the date of the national AGM – which, as per any voluntary body - is not absolutely bound by a 12 month rule (usually a 15m flexibility if needed). The key thing is (as we have seen!) is ensuring adequate notification to branches. All points raised have been made by members and everyone has been invited to comment and contribute further thoughts. That really is the point of consultation.

Let us also please be clear. This is not about 'injunctions' to the national Chair (as one commentator unfortunately believes), but finding the means to work through solutions to building bridges, honouring member views and creating a better way of working than is currently on offer, and in particular ensuring the branch is officially represented on our national elected body - along with all 12 others in GB, not just one.

Although 3 individual members who commented in the survey reported that they individually have good communication with the SHA national body, this year has produced a sudden decline in overall internal communication with London and other branches, which absolutely has to be addressed. For example* :

- notification re AGMs etc and total refusal to discuss despite verbal and email queries x 5
- sudden barring of delegates without any prior notice and no appeal
- a complete bar to the branch communicating direct with Central Council
- complete lack of information sharing re internal decision making and policy work streams.

It has to be recognised that this would not normally be acceptable in the workplace, nor in the voluntary sector – nor in the context of publicly elected representatives.

None of these experiences in fact are commensurate with the running of an effective affiliate and definitively need to be addressed, so it is not unreasonable for our branch to address these issues and seek to find solutions. Indeed it is an obligation on the London Exec to address this.

We have worked very hard over the summer to do this in a constructive way.

Please see below the full details of the analysis and content of our survey .

NB We acknowledge that Electionbuddy is not the best research tool for this exercise, but as a small voluntary organisation, we have no budget for a more sophisticated mechanism - and we also had to set this up quickly, so no time to research & experiment with other apps. However, although some members stated that they actively avoided engaging with the survey because they did not approve of the format, the exercise has revealed input from enough members (more than 5 x those stating they did not wish to join in – including those who specifically stated a No Vote for that reason) - and we are pleased that we can now produce some straightforward recommendations going forward.

SURVEY ANALYSIS

225 members on list supplied by national office.

48 completed (22% response = higher end of average 10-30% response to online surveys)

3 additional members were in the midst of completing their survey but ran out of time.

One of these supplied comments to be added.

Overall 789 votes cast.

31 abstentions.

3 emails from members asking to register an overall No Vote because they disapprove of the questions and the survey itself.

NB. Apologies that despite several efforts to include 4 comments boxes, Electionbuddy only allowed one box, but good to see that has sensibly been used by contributors for all questions. All comments included below.

Response to Questions 1- 4

1.

To find a positive way to overcome the sudden loss of voting status and CC engagement ie disenfranchisement -

Of the 48 responders to the survey (22% of the list)

67% of respondents support asking the CC to co-opt all of our 9 delegates to CC (30).

This concurs with the majority views put forward in our Zoom meeting 24th Sept.

Of the other options :

Co opt chair and anr officer

Working group (just 2 in support)

9 voters asked for 'something else' which includes keeping the current arrangement until next AGM and organising as many co options as possible – including ensuring those branches without CC reps of any kind are given space.

Further ideas welcome.

Absentions - 12

2.

Suggested solutions to communication issues which get in the way of optimising on the branch skills set -

Totals 32, 31, 27, and 24.

Option 22 (not passed).

12 Abstentions.

Comms recommendations :

32/4 support National SHA will notify branches of work with Shadow teams and invite relevant expertise to input

31 SHA will formally notify SHAL and other branches in writing of any actions or decisions which directly impact on branch functions

27 to optimise on skills and avoid duplication, SHA will keep branches in the loop re work involving local CC members

24 CC will agree to set up a liaison group between branch chairs, and to include Wales and Scotland.

22 that branch motions can be presented to CC by non CC members as long as approved by the branch Exec (not passed)

All suggestion but the last one gained enough support (32 - 24 ie. over 50% of respondents) for us to be able to recommend these key points and actions to Central Council. (**see below***)

3. SGM proposal

Responding to requests by some members for a Special General Meeting to national-

19 in support of online SGM

12 in support of online via each branch

1 vote to wait until some CC can be together with live links.

11 not at all (against)

5 Abstentions

The response to this question did not bring a 50%+ majority view.

4. Recommendations for the scheduling of the next AGM cycle – in response to numerous members making suggestions in the light of internal difficulties plus the pandemic

The Electionbuddy format put this into a graded response.

It was not about picking a 'winner', but gauging opinion.

An AGM can be moved earlier or later than a 12 month interval - the main issue for the SHA is ensuring sufficient advanced notice for branches in line with Clause 13. Many members are concerned that should delegates not be co-opted, then we are left with the current situation whereby we carry on with a much less representative CC for several months.

Overall, the most favoured (just) was commensurate with the response to Question 1 -

1. Hold an AGM in 2021, planning appropriately around public health needs, co-opting our delegates onto CC in the meantime. 16,5,3,5,8.
 2. Second most favoured : AGM in 2020 - but also the least favoured of all options. 15, 3, 6,0.13
 - 3 Online AGM in 2021 (assume March, but given the Covid situation this was left open). 1,15,7,12, 2
 4. AGM 2021 - with chairs and anr exec member co-opted in the meantime. 2,10.16.8.1
 5. Wait until the pandemic crisis is ended. (as per Labour SocSoc recommendation) 2,1,6,10,18
- 11 Absentions

(see attachments).

CONSULTATION RECOMMENDATIONS - SHA LONDON TO CC 3.9.20.

Based upon the response to the SHAL London survey 29.8.20 – 2.9.20. and the input to our urgent branch meeting on 24th August (with 47 people attending), these are the London branch requests and suggested solutions as requested to our branch meeting by national SHA Chair on 24.8.20.

1.

In the interests of re-building a coherent and inclusive SHA infrastructure, London branch strongly recommends that Central Council co-opts the branch members lost to Central Council following the sudden email notifications of 18th July to our elected branch delegates relating to the timing and notification of the national 2019 AGM. Other branches likewise.

NB. Some are left entirely without CC representation.

2.

In this context we would support the next AGM taking place in 2021 – in the current circumstances re the pandemic we would assume an online meeting in March.

In the event that Central Council does not agree to interim co-option, in the interests of inclusivity we would expect that the AGM is brought back to December 2020 and proper timely notification to branches in line with Clause 13 in either case.

3.

In addition - in the interests of building better communication and optimising on the skills set in our branch and all other SHA local branches, we ask that Central Council sensibly agrees the following : (listed in preferred voting order – all being 50% + of respondents) : -

SHA will formally notify all branch chairs of pieces of work for Shadow team/s - in the case of London branch with invitation to London members to offer relevant expertise and cross reference with the work input to London City Hall.

To ensure that SHA London and other branches are able to act on matters and business and decisions taken by officers and/or CC which impact on branch function, SHA will formally notify the branch chairs in writing of decisions or actions affecting SHA branches.

In the interests of good communication and organisational good practice, SHA officers will ensure branch executives are kept in touch with local CC member SHA activities.

Further to a suggestion by SHA national Chair, CC will agree to set up a liaison group of all branch chairs to incl Scotland & Wales.

We also note the comment from one of our members about a welcome work stream on issues of race -

with a 75% BAME executive team representing the most culturally diverse area of the country, we would hope that the officers and CC see fit to include us in this work about which we currently have no information,

NB.

All of these recommendations and requests are in line with the terms of the SHA Constitution.

ELECTIONBUDDY RESULTS *

Solving branch disenfranchisement - PREFERENTIAL

Round 1	
- co - opt all 9 nominated 2020 London delegates previously elected onto CC in by the branch	30 votes(66.7%)
- something else	9 votes(20.0%)
- co-opt all branch chairs + anr branch officer (noting whoever is London chair is automatically a London delegate)	4 votes(8.9%)
- working group	2 votes(4.4%)
After round 1, - co - opt all 9 nominated 2020 London delegates previously elected onto CC in by the branch won with 66.7% of the vote.	

45 votes tallied and 3 abstentions

To improve the standard of communication from national SHA to SHAL, we recommend that CC approves the following :	APPROVAL -	View comments
SHA will formally notify the branch chair in writing of decisions or actions affecting the London branch	Apprvd	31 votes(22.8%)
SHA will formally notify all branch chairs of pieces of work for Shadow team/s with invitation to London members to offer relevant expertise.	Apprvd	32 votes(23.5%)
CC will agree to set up a liaison group of all branch chairs to incl Scotland & Wales.	Apprvd	24 votes(17.6%)
Ensure branch execs are kept in touch with local CC member SHA activities	Apprvd	27 votes(19.9%)
that branch motions can be presented to CC by non CC members as long as a agreed by the relevant branch exec.	NOT APPROVED	22 votes(16.2%)

Q2. SHA will formally notify all branch chairs of pieces of work for Shadow team/s with invitation to London members to offer relevant expertise. wins with 23.5% of the vote.

136 votes tallied and 12 abstentions from 48 ballots

product by ElectionBuddy, Inc. © 2008–2020

- online all national members	19 votes(44.2%)
- online by branches to feeding into CC	12 votes(27.9%)
- wait until a 'live' SGM meeting can be called with added online connections	1 vote(2.3%)
- not at all	11 votes(25.6%)
- online all national members wins with 44.2% of the vote.	

43 votes tallied and 5 abstentions from 48 ballots

Insufficient support - less than 50%

Q4

AGM options SCORED

SHA should co-opt barred branch delegates and wait until the health crisis has reduced in 2021 before an AGM. [Vote Breakdown](#)

SHA should co opt chairs + branch officer and hold an AGM in 2021

[Vote Breakdown](#) SHA should hold an online AGM asap in 2021

[Vote Breakdown](#) SHA should wait until the health crisis has reduced in 2021 to hold an AGM

[Vote Breakdown](#) SHA should hold an AGM in December 2020

565 votes tallied and 11 abstentions from 48 ballots

SHA should co-opt barred branch delegates & wait until health crisis reduced

[Vote Breakdown](#)

SHA should hold an online AGM asap in 2021

[wn](#)

SHA should co opt chair + branch officer & hold AGM in 2021

[Vote Breakdown](#)

SHA should wait until the health crisis has reduced in 2021 to hold an AGM

[Vote Breakdown](#)

SHA should hold an AGM in December 2020

[Vote Breakdown](#)

565 votes tallied and 11 abstentions from 48 ballots

product by ElectionBuddy, Inc. © 2008–2020

Comments - Total 10.

(Responses and individual clarification in green)

Comment 1

As there is no where else to put comments on the survey generally and on each section, even when invited as in section 1, I am putting them here. (Thankyou – despite attempts to create 4 comments boxes, it would only allow one)

General Comments - The inconsistent use and meaning of "Abstain" will inevitably lead to confused responses and I think may mean that you record them and consider them as rejections of options offered; (yes - please see above) it should be possible to reject the options (including those re AGM - which is a complete mess of a survey question). Some of the options could either be part of a solution, but in themselves won't achieve very much or phrased as injunctions on the SHA Chair (not intended as this) without looking at what the branch itself could do. (London branch continues to send information to national when asked or when clearly necessary. We only sometimes get a reply, but often not even acknowledgement re important queries.)

Section 1 "solving branch disenfranchisement" I would support CC to find an interim solution within the remit of the Constitution until the AGM 2021.

Section 2 "communications" I have keen interest in this topic but that I think the options as they exist here are too one sided and closed, and I have no opportunity to score them e.g. I would show some support for first and second option above as having some merit, they are not sufficient in themselves to achieve good comms to all members (**agreed - but it sets up a useful structure to cover a big gap with national. Beyond that we agree there is room for more innovation.**)

There may be members who have not engaged with their branches for various reasons (shift patterns, being a carer or having a disability), but who have expertise the SHA can use.(**for sure – and we need to find more ways of enabling that**) I would not want the branches to become the sole gatekeeper for involvement (**no - that wouldn't be the case, it needs to be joint working to offset fragmentation and make best use of skills**)

I have been impressed by the SHA Chair's recent emails to members so I think comms may be improving at one level.

Practically, both branches and CC could commit to get short minutes (one side A4) noting decisions made/ motions passed / pieces of work being discussed etc to each other within 5 working days.

(**a good idea - though given we are voluntary, 7 days should be fine**)

PLEASE NOTE I AM REJECTING ALL THE OTHER OPTIONS IN THIS SECTION AT THE PRESENT

Section 3 "Call for an SGM" I am not sure in what circumstances I would have supported this route as a method for resolving any dispute, and is particularly inappropriate during the current pandemic. (**This was called for by several members and so needed to be included.**

Said measure has not been supported by 50%+ respondents)

Section 4 AGM This section is incoherent. The rubric says "Please choose in order of preference - leaving out those you reject. But when you come to submit it says "Please give a score to every option". Two options include actions I have rejected in Section 1 - so if I score, I am showing some level of support. But more importantly I am tempted to put Abstain, as I am sure many other people will have been. NOT because I am neutral on this topic, but because I think this is so poorly designed. (**we take on board difficulties this has caused for some respondents because of the Electionbuddy model which only became apparent after it was set up - at 3.30 am after doing battle with it for several hrs to hit the deadline! – ie. being forced to click all 5, but we intended it only as a gauge of opinion, not as an absolute planner as it is not up to the branch to set this in stone. However we are entitled to ask for opinion. Next time we do a survey, with more time to explore options it would not include said annoying glitch**).

Comment 2

I wish to abstain from the 3rd option (**noted**)

Comment 3

I have had to tick abstain to be able to write in this box. The communication from Jean to me as a member, has been excellent. Further buraucratism of processes,) outside those in the consitution (**this is about inclusivity and engagement – which is absolutely not unconstitutional**), will be counter productive.(**but we do need the branches to be linked into national – not currently the case at present, other than member lists**).

The CC need to concentrate on sorting out the legacy mess left by the previous incumbents. General Comments Being forced to score all option or none is a design fault which will inevitably skew the result. As this is the only free text box I would like to record my dismay that you have circulated this survey at this time. For the London branch to set itself at odds with the CC and national officers who are only, after all, trying to re-align the SHA with its constitution, is daft and smacks of sour grapes by the old guard who seem hell bent on factionalism and internal wrangling. (we have always taken every care to run London branch in a constructive way – we did not ask for this current situation which was foisted upon us out of the blue and which to be absolutely honest, after fairly exhausting Covid duties March > July we have had to spend the whole summer trying to deal with. We would much rather focus on policy.).

The inconsistency in the 'abstain' box's meaning makes it hard to record one's opinion accurately. I suggest that you ask Brian to get his tame lawyer to propose a lawful way forward that enables our delegates to participate. Pretending that the constitution can be ignored (as per a number of the boxes in this survey) is foolish in the extreme and would, if pursued, bring our branch into disrepute.

NB. The survey really is not about 'setting ourselves at odds with CC' – who also have varying views. The Chair asked us for our views. It surely cannot be that branches are to have absolutely no say in the running of our organisation? Our previous relationship has suddenly been severed and we need to work out how to move forward from that – and the SHA Chair specifically asked us for suggestions by 3/9/20 and two of his own suggestions have been included in the survey as well as those from wider membership.

The survey is the only means we have of doing that collectively within a short timescale. None of the suggestions are unconstitutional - CC has the power to co opt; the communications section is within the power of the CC to grant; the only variable is in the possible impact of the Covid pandemic on the AGM and how to address that and whether the AGM is brought back into 2020 (as 2019 AGM happened in 2020) has been suggested by quite a number of members, so needed to be explored and the CC has the power to set the date of the AGM – which, as per any voluntary body - is not absolutely bound by a 12 month rule (usually a 14m flexibility). The key thing is (as we have seen!) ensuring adequate notification to branches. The SGM had already been requested and suggested again to us last week, and is within the constitution, so also needed to be addressed in this context. All points raised have been made by members and everyone has been invited to comment and contribute further thoughts. That really is the point of consultation. You'll note that all points – positive and negative - are being fairly shared.

Comment 4

This section I find confusing, how can you rank these options. It can't just be either or? What I would like to see is some clarity on what are the options as per the constitution. It seems to me a number of the options in this questionnaire such as in section 4 are outside the constitution. I would have thought we should aim to have the AGM March 2021 which would be in line with the Constitution and would hopefully be better in terms of the pandemic. (under charity/vol sector law, the national AGM could move through dint of circumstance without being unconstitutional – the key thing is that branches are given due notice in writing and there is full discussion re said schedule) Maybe on this specific question the simplest approach is for communications to come from the CC Chair direct to members. (that should definitely have happened - we are also trying to ensure that branches are effectively looped in unless we float off to do our own thing outside of the main organisation – events both internal and international this year have shown exactly how vital it is for SHA to have consistent and coherent communications with all branches).

Comment 5

I am unpersuaded communication from national to branch chairs is as poor as described. Re Section 4, not clear how 'abstain' is being interpreted. I think an AGM should be held in March 2021 as required in the constitution. This appears not to be an option ([see 2021](#)) 'Survey' is poorly designed. ([please see option for online 2021](#)). [Given more time we will explore other survey tools – incl for affordability.](#)

[Please also see our examples above* of where communication from national has fallen down and needs fixing if the organisation is not to continue in a fragmented and chaotic way - much of this is historic, not just recent.](#)

Comment 6

These are not the options as I see them. The chair is doing his best to communicate and has some excellent initiatives around the questions of Race, while also seeking to forge links with the Shadow Cabinet. ([NB. London Exec is 75% BAME and is not aware of this work](#))

Comment 7 I have a very long involvement with the SHA - indeed, I am so old ([we do want to be open to all ages!](#)) , I was active in it when it was the SMA. I have therefore watched recent events with a heavy heart. Just when we MOST need an active, thoughtful SHA, it has been rent by an external agenda which appears to focus on everything but health. ([It is indeed – but there are long standing issues which really must be addressed – and we would definitely not have chosen this time to do so, but timing has suddenly been foisted upon us.](#))

I am afraid your “survey”(which is not the most scientific I have ever seen!) hardly helps. Please can we put aside all this dispute and leave it to the elected SHA Officers to sort out, and can we stop trying to draw members into ever more arguments rather than encouraging them to get active in the serious health agenda? ([Cheap & speedy option as it had to be - we really do hope it will help to move things on and enable us to get back to our usual policy work](#))

If you do report the “results” of your survey to anyone, please include me as a respondent saying I do not accept its validity, nor the options offered, and what my reply is : please leave the elected Officers to carry out their responsibilities as laid down in the rules, and that local groups should now concentrate on the vital health agenda, and assisting the Labour Party on this subject. ([Please be reassured - we are endeavouring to continue with policy work etc as well](#))

Comment 8

I would favour temporarily co-opting the branch chairs and another officer onto CC.

We need a period of stability – when the bike starts to wobble, the only thing for it is to pedal harder or the wheels may come off! ([we are definitely pedaling very hard!](#))

Comment 9

I'm keen that we move forward which I know you are too!

Q1 Given CC already voted not to retrospectively waiver the constitution regarding election of delegates I'd be keen on considering other ways all branches can input into CC and for CC to co-opt as many delegates as possible as allowed by the constitution. I personally think it's important to prioritise those branches that currently have no representation on CC (branch or nationally elected), even though I realise this would definitely rule out my re-instatement as a delegate!

Thankyou for thinking of branches left without any CC members.

Q2 Regarding communication it's clear there is room for improvement! As you said it's important that those with particular expertise can input into work streams. Obviously this involves branches (and individual members without a branch) being aware of what's going on. But also that the Officers are aware of individuals' specialist areas. So it may be that a survey of members would be useful too in addition to updates on what work is ongoing or in the pipeline.

A great idea to do a skills share. We have quite a number of members whose specialisms/skills we don't know .

Q 3 Personally I'm not keen on having an SGM at all. Regardless of the fact I think it would be very unpleasant and not necessarily help resolve the issues at hand, I am also unclear how it could be held online under the current constitution and obviously I can't support having an "in person" meeting at this time. (we are definitely all online for the foreseeable!)

Q4 My feeling is we should prioritise making sure the next AGM in 2021 isn't as problematic as 2020 rather than trying to squeeze 2AGMs into the next six months which would have massive potential for confusion! I'd rather we focussed on making sure Branches and members have a clear timetable and guidance about when AGMs should be held and reminding members to ensure they are not in arrears (my misdemeanour!).

We agree not good to have 2 AGMs in 6m and of the need for a clear timetable!

I'm sure others may be of a different view on the particulars but hope everyone is keen to reach a resolution on this. I'm incredibly keen for the SHA nationally to be running effectively so it is once again able to influence and support the shadow health team and Keir as the Leader of the Labour Party! (We absolutely agree – we need to sor this out. Thankyou)

COMMENTS END

Many thanks to all

Conclusion

Many thanks to all who have contributed to this necessarily fast track exercise – we realise for some of you it has been contentious – and that is unfortunate, but democracy is important, especially given the way in which it is under great threat from the current UK and US governments. We don't need to mimic them from inside the Labour Party.

It is the long term ethos of London branch that we make every endeavour to bring people together and to listen to collective voices in order to build sustainable policy recommendations in a constructive and generally convivial and respectful way. You'll note that all points – both positive and negative - are being fairly and openly shared.

We had enough engagement to draw specific conclusions and from which to make useful recommendations & requests. If we include the urgent branch meeting, the online survey and numerous emails, we are pleased and somewhat surprised, that overall, and more so than policy discussions, we have had the highest % engagement with the membership since the branch was re-launched in 2014. Most of this has been very constructive.

The overall findings from this exercise are useful in terms of gauging opinion and garnering suggestions – which is exactly what this was always about. Consultation should be a positive thing. All recommendations emergent are in line with the SHA Constitution.

Thankyou for your constructive suggestions, especially those with regard to improving intra national-branch communications – including those now without any CC members. We know there is much more that needs to be done in this regard.

We understand some of the frustration with the Electionbuddy format. Two of the Exec have previously produced very detailed research programmes – including for national use - and given more time and a budget we could have done this in a far more detailed & sophisticated way, but with a very short turnaround to set it up & no funding, (resulting in 3.30 am wrestling with temperamental Electionbuddy to get it out in time!) we did our best with what we had (even if it ditched 3 of our comments boxes and didn't allow opt outs in Q4, which sought to focus on the issues surrounding AGM timing and planning for another in the context of the pandemic). Please be assured, as explained in the comments responses, the tables attached are still of use in a fully constitutional way. This was not about overriding Central Council, but offering our opinion based on our experience this year & the need for branches to get sufficient notice in writing.

Funds are an issue for the branch. We are also concerned that as the situation currently stands, funds paid by London members may not now benefit the branch/region in any way other than (hopefully !) paying our Labour affiliation fee. Has there been any consideration about the implications of these recent actions for the finances of branches - especially in the light of the current difficulties with the bank account etc? We would normally expect to be in the loop about this with SHA national, but being cut out of CC, we are not - which is a worry.

As for us being the 'old guard' - this did make us chuckle! Please note, we are the youngest, most diverse Exec group the SHA has probably ever had. For the sake of its future, this organisation needs to stop losing younger people as has been happening too often and in particular keep BAME people on board. There was also a long period when many women left or stopped being active in the organisation because of an inappropriate internal culture. So for the future good - please don't shut us out.

If there is no movement from Officers and Central Council in response to these sensible & constructive requests, then London branch will continue with our strong tradition of policy work - as the current pressing issues clearly demand - but forced to be more separate from national until anything more constructive emerges.

These are all very important points which fairly need to be addressed. We hope that the findings from this very intensive piece of work will be listened to and taken seriously. Only by working together can we fully hold the Tory government to account and support our own elected representatives in doing that – as well as planning for an effective Labour government and supporting the wider Labour public sector.

Sapere aude.



LONDON EXEC 3.8.20.

Jos Bell, Chair with Cllr Dr Aysha Raza, Cllr Sina Lari, Dr Sonia Adesara.

3.9.20.