

**51st Meeting of the RCT Management Panel (RCT MP)
Minutes of the meeting held at IPEM Office in York
Wednesday 8 February 2017**

1. Apologies, welcome and introductions

2. Declarations of interest

No declarations were received.

3. Minutes of the 50th RCT Management Panel Meeting (October 2016)

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record. Completed actions have been removed from the log.

4. Matter arising/actions

The RCT MP is still interested in the idea of a joint workshop or conference between IHEEM and IPEM to promote registration and the RCT to technologists.

4.1 Confirmation of the election of the Registrar and Assistant Registrar

The email correspondence regarding the election of the Registrar and Assistant Registrar to all members of the RCT MP was circulated and the positions confirmed.

4.2 Selection of three equivalence applications from 2016 for second assessment

The RCT MP had agreed at the last meeting to quality assure a minimum of 3 equivalence applications per year by way of a second assessment. The 'Policy on Assessment of Applications to the RCT' was updated to reflect this. It was confirmed that in 2016 there were 4 equivalence applications received in total meaning that 75% of applications, for 2016, would be required to undergo a second assessment. The PSA will be contacted for guidance on numbers/percentages.

4.3 Introduction of 'lapsed' category to registration status

The paper was discussed and agreed. There was discussion around the length of time someone would remain on the register marked as 'lapsed' for non-payment of registration fees. Clarification would be sought based on the times specified for other 'sanctions' and PSA will be contacted for guidance.

The possibility was raised of a reduced registration fee for RCT registrants paying by direct debit to encourage this method of payment. It was advised that registration fees are set to cover running costs (such as the recently advised increase in re-accreditation fees by the PSA) and a forecast of registrant numbers to ensure the register remains financially stable.

5. Policies

5.1 P&P Manual – RCT Section

It was noted there are currently 18 policies and procedures in Volume 1 of the IPEM Manual. After discussion the group agreed that the review period would be increased from 2 years to 3 years. This would allow review of 6 policies per year (2 policies per meeting). If, however, there was new legislation or requests from the PSA to consider then the relevant policies and procedures would be reviewed at that time.

6. Risk and reports

6.1 Risk register

The panel are not aware of any risks that had changed or any new ones that had been highlighted. The format and wording of the risk register was discussed and requests were made to consider clarifying some areas.

6.2 Report on registrant numbers and characteristics

The RCT MP discussed the low numbers in the age brackets covering RCT registrants in their 20s. It was felt, primarily, this was due to the requirement for registrants to either have a degree or a certain number of years' experience which wouldn't be achievable by people in their low 20s. There was a reference back to the joint IHEEM and IPEM workshop or conference which would promote registration and the RCT. There was a suggestion that those starting out their

careers or on apprenticeships could be encouraged to aim for RCT registration. Is this something that we could incorporate into the Healthcare Science week in March? There is a British Nuclear Medicine Society AGM in May – is this somewhere that that RCT can be promoted in order to increase registrant numbers? A letter to the appropriate head of departments could also be sent to highlight the RCT.

7. Disciplinary issues

7.1 Disciplinary cases

There were no disciplinary cases to comment on.

8. Membership of the Panel

8.1 Confirmation of 2nd IHEEM representative

As part of agenda item 1, the Registrar confirmed Shaun Lundy as the second IHEEM representative to the RCT MP.

8.2 Check on terms of office ending in 2017

It was noted that one of the ART named representatives and one of the IHEEM named representatives are due to come to the end of their three year term of office on the RCT MP in September 2017. It was agreed that it would be good practice to formally write to professional bodies asking if the current representative is still suitable to continue.

The Registrar informed the RCT MP that one of the lay members had discussed with him the fact that he felt, as a lay member, he was unable to bring much expertise or input to the group. The lay member mentioned that the meeting was quite job and policy specific for which he couldn't contribute. It was suggested a re-ordering of the agenda items so that job and policy specific items were covered after lunch so lay members could come for the morning part of the meeting where they would have value, stay for lunch and then leave before the other items were covered. It was also highlighted that the other RCT MP lay member had been unable to attend meetings for some time although was kept informed of agenda items, papers and minutes via email.

9. CPD audit results 2016 (for 2015 CPD)

The contents of the CPD audit results report were discussed and clarifications around processes and expectations given. It was confirmed that the report for 2017 (i.e. covering 2016 CPD) would be available prior to the October meeting of the RCT MP each year going forward.

10. Any other business

10.1 Equivalence assessor training day to be organised?

A previous equivalence assessor training day was discussed with a view to holding another one. It was felt the pool of equivalence assessors needed to be increased with, ideally, at least 2 assessors for each Scope of Practice. New assessors could attend the training and for existing assessors it would be the opportunity for a refresher.

10.2 Review of equivalence criteria following NSHS publication of updated PTP curriculum

The National School of Healthcare Science has published an updated Practitioner Training Programme curriculum and, as the RCT equivalence criteria are mapped against it, the panel discussed whether there were enough changes to warrant a change to our documentation. The main changes were highlighted in the document appendices and the panel agreed there was not enough difference in respect of Medical Physics to require amendment. There was additional discussion around Engineering. Initially, it was felt the revision and amendment of our guidance notes would be more appropriate than changing our equivalence criteria to help clarify the matter for applicants. It was agreed that the Scopes of Practice did not need amending. The panel were aware of a Volume 3 P&P Manual held by IPPEM which contained 'working documents' that supported the Volume 1 policies and procedures themselves and requested that these be revised. They were advised that Volume 1 was the priority for revision of documents and that the Membership and Training Department were working through other areas within the Manual (not just the RCT) however RCT working documents would be revised as soon as practicable. After further discussion the panel decided that the NSHCS updates to the PTP curriculum did not, at this time, warrant a review of the guidance notes and that these would be revised at the point they were due unless there were any other changes to consider.

10.3 RCT AR Collaborative Protocol

A paper was circulated with the Accredited Registers' Collaborative protocol document with a request to agree to sign up to the protocol. The panel agreed with the request and the Registrar confirmed his electronic signature could be used for the protocol.

10.4 PSA AR conference – 8 May 2017

It was highlighted to the panel the PSA's annual conference taking place in May. There will be 3 places available should anyone of the RCT MP wish to attend. The panel asked to be kept informed when further details, such as a final agenda showing the content of the conference, were available.

10.5 PSA AR communications plan 2017

The PSA's communications plan for 2017 in respect of accredited registers was highlighted for information.

10.6 PSA AR letter regarding increased fees

The PSA's letter regarding an increase to the annual re-accreditation fees was highlighted. This increase would need to be factored in to discussions around the RCT registration fee for 2018.

10.7 PSA AR Collaborative correspondence January 2017

A letter sent by the ARC to the PSA following their January meeting together with the PSA's response was highlighted to the panel. The main point to note was that the ARC had requested consideration of the re-accreditation process not being an annual process and the PSA had responded that the re-accreditation process would be reviewed in due course.

10.8 Registrars Update

A suggestion was made that tied in with the notification of increased PSA fees that a separate registrar's update for the second half of the year could be circulated with a focus on finances in respect of registration fees. The update could include brief details on 'what do I get for my fee' or 'where does my fee go' – a breakdown of what the fee is spent on (PSA re-accreditation, administration of register, etc) to show transparency.

10.9 Scopes of Practice

A request had been received in respect of the RCT MP giving consideration to an additional Scope of Practice in respect of Clinical Computing. This was already being discussed by CTETP and the appropriate SIG, but confirmation was required by these groups that it would be something that the RCT MP was open to before they spent too much time preparing it.

11. Dates of next meetings:

Tuesday 6 June 2017

Thursday 19 October 2017