

**THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE  
CLINICAL EXCELLENCE AWARDS SCHEME**

**CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE  
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE CLINICAL  
EXCELLENCE AWARDS COMMITTEE**

**2011 Round**

---

**May 2011**



**Headquarters  
Surgeon General**

---

## 1: Introduction

- 1.1** The code of practice for the Ministry of Defence Clinical Excellence Awards Committee (MODCEAC) is based on the code of practice for the NHS Advisory Committee on CEAs (ACCEA) and sets out the role, responsibilities and standards expected of the committee. Members of the committee are expected to comply at all times with the code of practice.

## 2: About the Committee

- 2.1** The MODCEAC is an internal and not a public committee. It has overarching responsibility for the award of MOD Clinical Excellence Awards to ensure that standards of award are maintained. Its terms of reference are:

“To take the final decisions on which Defence Medical Services (DMS) consultants will receive awards and to quality control the process. Awards will reflect individuals’ achievements over and above the standard expected of a consultant in their post. Decisions must reflect significant achievement and be judged against the strict criteria set out in the guidance and rules.”

- 2.2** The MODCEAC’s role is to:

- Approve guidance and rules governing the scheme.
- Make final decisions on the allocation of awards.
- Ensure that the criteria are being fairly applied to ensure equality of opportunity for all applicants
- Quality-assure the process.
- Be consulted on any appeals by unsuccessful applicants should the need arise

## 3: Secretariat

- 3.1** HQ Surgeon General’s office will act as secretariat to the committee and provide general support to the members. It will carry out the following actions:

- Issue all guidance and rules for the MOD CEAs
- Receive and send out completed application forms to the committee for scoring, and schedule the preliminary and final meetings
- Write to current award holders that are due to submit a review form<sup>1</sup>.
- Provide secretariat at meetings, and arrange venues
- Provide travel costs where requested for external members of the committee. No further payments will be made to committee members for attendance at the meetings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although it is made clear to award holders that it is their responsibility to ensure that they apply for a review, not the responsibility of Headquarters Surgeon General

- 3.2** The secretariat contact for 2011 is: Fay Rankine, HQ Surgeon General, Whittington Barracks, Lichfield, WS13 9QY. Tel: 01543 434 232. Email: Fay.Rankine878@mod.uk (external) or [SGSCCorpSvcs-Perspay@mod.uk](mailto:SGSCCorpSvcs-Perspay@mod.uk)

## 4: Media Communications

- 4.1** Media enquiries about the work of MODCEAC should normally be referred to the MOD Press Office. No comment on related Government policy or on party political aspects should be made.

## 5: Confidentiality

- 5.1** Individual applications to MODCEAC will be treated in the strictest confidence. All discussions of the claims of individual consultants to CEAs and of the relative strengths of the claims of different individuals remain strictly confidential to those involved in the process of evaluation and assessment.
- 5.2** Any action notes of meetings shall remain private. All papers should be treated in confidence before and after meetings. If members are unsure about the handling of papers they should consult the Secretariat.
- 5.3** A list of all applications received and considered by the MODCEAC will be held electronically for 5 years.
- 5.4** Feedback to individuals on their application result is informal and can only be obtained through the individual's Medical Director General.
- 5.5** Headquarters Surgeon General complies with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.

## 6: Conflict of Interest

- 6.1** Committee members should declare any personal or business interests that may conflict with their responsibilities as members of MODCEAC.
- 6.2** Any member who has a direct interest in any item under discussion, e.g. a personal or business interest involving an individual nominated for an award, should declare that interest. It is then for the Chairman to decide whether the member should continue to take an active part in the discussions.
- 6.3** Some members may be employed as consultants on related issues by the Government, or by private sector companies. This could be viewed by some as inconsistent with an independent committee. Members are required to advise Headquarters Surgeon General of changes to their interests as they occur. This requirement applies to any personal and business interests that may conflict with the responsibilities as a member

of the committee and places the member under an obligation to declare any such interest at the start of a particular discussion. The Chairman may, if it is considered desirable, ask a member to withdraw for the relevant discussion.

## 7: Appeals process for applicants

**7.1** Any formal complaint about the procedures leading to decisions is taken seriously by HQ Surgeon General.

**7.2** The type of process failure that would give grounds for appeal are:

- that the material duly submitted to support an application (for example citations) was not considered by the committee;
- that extraneous factors were taken into account;
- that there has been unlawful discrimination;
- that the established evaluation processes were not followed;
- there was bias or conflict of interest on the part of the committee.

**7.3** The type of issue that would not give grounds for appeal is:

- to appeal against the fact that the substance of the application was judged insufficiently strong to merit an award in the absence of reason to believe that there were such procedural failings.

**7.4** The appeals process operates as follows:

- Letters are sent to all unsuccessful applicants, advising them that they have the right to appeal, and stating the grounds for appeal
- The applicant then has 4 weeks from the date of the letter to write to the Chair of the MODCEA to present an appeal outlining their reasons for believing the decision-making process was flawed
- All appeals will then be investigated by the Chair in consultation with the Surgeon General, who will assess whether or not the individual's application has been dealt with fairly and in accordance with the rules of the CEA system. If having investigated, they believe there is no case to answer, they will write to the individual to state the appeal has been unsuccessful.
- If, however, they believe there are grounds for looking more closely into a complaint a sub-committee (made up of MODCEAC members) will be asked to come together to assess the appeal and make a decision which they will then report to the individual. The sub-committee will usually proceed on the basis of the paperwork, without hearing oral evidence or representations. However, the chair will consider any written applications for an oral hearing by the individual.

- If the sub-committee decides to uphold the individual's appeal, they will determine what action follows on a case by case basis. If the panel is not able to suggest a specific resolution, the full MODCEAC will be asked to re-assess the individual's application and to take a decision.