50th Meeting of the RCT Management Panel
Summary minutes of the meeting held at IPEM Office in York
Wednesday 12th October 2016

1. **Apologies, welcome and introductions**

2. **Declarations of interest**
   No declarations were received.

3. **Minutes of the 49th RCT Management Panel Meeting (June 2016)**
   The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record.

4. **Matter arising/actions**
   Matters arising and actions had already been completed or were on the agenda for today's meeting.

   Re promotion of the Register, we are hoping to host a joint workshop or conference between IHEEM and IPEM to promote registration and the RCT to technologists.

   A new IHEEM representative, Shaun Lundy, has been recruited to replace him Iain Threlkeld in this position on the Management Panel, now that Iain is Assistant Registrar. This will be formally agreed by the IHEEM Council meeting later in October, and Shaun will attend his first Management Panel meeting in February. Iain will confirm Shaun's formal appointment in due course.

   4.1 Requirement to sample audit assessments for conformity
   The Professional Standards Authority for Health and Social Care (PSA) has asked for details of the audits carried out to look at the consistency of assessments of audits. Revising the Policy on Assessment of Applications to the RCT, the Panel agreed to some minor changes for clarification and operational purposes.

   4.2 PSA re-accreditation
   The annual report from the PSA, was presented to the panel. It sets out the Instructions and Learning Points which were given to the RCT at the time of the original accreditation, and which have been achieved during the Register's first year; and includes one new Instruction and one Learning Point. The Panel congratulated the office team and management on the hard work that had helped to achieve the re-accreditation of the Register and on how well organised the IPEM office processes are.

5. **Policies**
   5.1 Criteria and mechanism for managing registration while investigations ongoing
   This paper was asking the RCT management panel to approve a mechanism through which the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) of the RCT could suspend a Registrant from the Register while the Investigating Panel was carrying out its work, if this was thought necessary to protect the public. It was a policy which the PSA required the RCT to have in place. The panel approved the policy, which will now be sent to the PSA Assured Registers team for information.

   5.2 CPD policy
   This paper reflected the minutes of the last meeting, at which strategies for addressing different scenarios regarding outcomes of CPD audits had been agreed. However, the policy was returned to the panel for review at this meeting.
   The panel discussed the policy, and noted that registrants are reminded twice of the need to submit something, if selected for audit. If they do submit, but the quality is not sufficient, they are automatically reselected for the following year's audit, according to the policy. If their submission, remains inadequate, they are removed from the register. It was agreed that these actions, as currently written in the policy, are appropriate, provided that the communications with registrants are logged on the CRM system – the policy should be amended to say this about communication, but otherwise the policy stands as currently written.
   The panel noted again the need to constantly remind registrants of the policy via the Registrar's Update and other means, and to post it on the website for registrants to read. It was also agreed that the policy should be amended to add information about the composition of the appeals panel, which should comprise one RCT assessor and one IPEM assessor, neither of whom had been involved in the original assessment of the CPD summary.

5.3 Re-applications – level of detail

It was noted that this is covered in the Policy on Removal from and Restoration to the Register which was approved in June 2015. This asks for additional information on the reason for leaving the register, and for re-joining, to ensure that an individual is not hiding any disciplinary proceedings by a period of 'lapse' from the register.

It was noted that a registrant who had lapsed by not paying his fee had had his name removed altogether from the online register, whereas new categories had been created for people subject to disciplinary proceedings, so that their names continue to appear with 'Findings' next to their name.

5.4 Change of Scope of Practice – need for policy

One panel member had been dealing with a query from a registrant who had reported that he was changing from one Scope of Practice to another, so, while he was training for two years in the new area, would not be able to carry out CPD in his former Scope of Practice. The panel was keen that he was not penalised for his honesty, and wondered if the Career Break policy would cover this. This would mean he did not have to leave the register and pay a full assessment fee to re-join once qualified in his new area. However, a 'career break' involves returning to the same area of work, whereas this individual was moving to a new area of work. A 'career change' policy is therefore required.

A Career change paragraph is to be drafted to add to the existing Career break policy before the end of the year.

It was also agreed that we need to add a new category to the registration status column on the online register for 'career break', to recognise those registrants who are not active on the register, but have not been removed.

6. Risk and reports

6.1 Risk register

The risk score of risk 32 'Inappropriate expansion of technologists' roles' has been lowered, following the discussion at the last meeting.

6.2 Report on registrant numbers and characteristics

There has been a downward trend year on year in numbers on the register, notwithstanding the increase in year since February 2016. There are 2661 on the register at present, but this is down 148 since this time last year. The register has lost approximately 5% per year for the last two years, mostly due to demographics: many technologists are aged over 50, and moving towards retirement.

6.3 Financial situation and future fee structure

Although the fee increase in 2016 was the first for 16 years, it was deemed more sensible to increase fees gradually. The panel agreed to increase the renewal fee to £18 per year for 2017. The panel decided not to increase the application fee.

7. Disciplinary issues

7.1 Disciplinary cases

There were no disciplinary cases to comment on.

7.2. Lay people on the PCC

It was noted that the PCC needs more lay people to ensure that they can be involved not only in chairing the fitness to practice panels, as at present, but in the investigatory panels too, as recommended by the PSA. More lay members will be recruited to make this possible.

8. Membership of the Panel

8.1 Retirement of the Registrar

Andy Mosson, the Registrar informed the panel of his intention to retire as Registrar of the RCT with effect from this meeting. The ToRs of the panel say that the Registrar must be a member of one of the professional bodies involved in running the Register, and is elected by the panel from amongst its members; and also that the quorum for a panel meeting is five, so the current meeting is quorate. However, all members of the panel should have the opportunity to vote.

Andy had offered to stand for election as Assistant Registrar to provide continuity and provide 'memory' to the panel, if Iain was elected as Registrar.

It was noted and agreed that:

- Iain Threlkeld, the current Assistant Registrar, is willing to stand as Registrar
- Andy Mosson, the outgoing Registrar, is willing to stand as Assistant Registrar
- An email will be sent to the whole panel to ask if any other eligible member wishes to stand for election to the post of Registrar, and if so, will arrange a ballot of all members of the panel. If not, the election of Iain Threlkeld as Registrar will be confirmed
- This will be done within a relatively short timescale (two weeks) to avoid a long vacancy in the role of Registrar
- After the vote, the decision will be formally recorded at the next meeting in February

8.2   Replacement of IHEEM representative

Following Iain Threlkeld's election as Assistant Registrar at the June meeting of the panel, a new representative of IHEEM was required to fill his place. Shaun Lundy is willing to take on this role. His appointment needs to be formally confirmed by the IHEEM Council on 27 October, after which this will be notified to IPEM, and he will attend the February meeting as the second IHEEM rep.

9. **Use of RCT post-nominal by registrants**

It has not proved feasible to provide a certification make using the RCT logo. The panel agreed that the post-nominal letters offered to registrants should be 'RCT' and that they should be made aware of this as soon as possible via the Registrar's Update.

10. **Any other business**

10.1 The retirement of the Registrar

The panel formally voted to thank Andy Mosson for his service to the RCT.

11. **Dates of next meetings:**
Weds 8 February 2017
Tuesday 6 June 2017
Thurs 19 October 2017