the RCT — the Register of Clinical Technologists

52nd Meeting of the RCT Management Panel (RCT MP)
Minutes of the meeting held at IPEM Office in York
Tuesday 6 June 2017

1. Apologies, welcome and introductions

2. Declarations of interest
No declarations were received.

3. Minutes of the 51st RCT Management Panel Meeting (February 2017)
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
In respect of the second assessment of equivalence applications, for quality assurance purposes, this will be an annual occurrence taking place after the annual assessors training day (scheduled for 21 September this year) as this will give newly trained assessors some real practice before assessing new applications.

The panel's lay members' involvement in the meetings was discussed and the role description is to be reviewed.

4.1 Re-joining procedure after a career change
As the purpose of the register is for the protection of the public, any registrant changing their scope of practice must submit a full application, in order to demonstrate that they can apply their knowledge and competence safely in their new area of practice and there would be no concession to the fact that they had previously appeared on the register with their original scope of practice.

5. Policies for approval
5.1 Policy on removal from and restoration to the RCT
An updated policy document was presented for approval. The panel approved the policy with changes as discussed in relation to the definitions of some of the registration status categories . It was confirmed that the relevant webpages on the RCT website would be updated and would clearly show the various registration status categories and their meaning together with the length of time the status would be displayed.

5.2 Policy on naming on the RCT
An amended policy document for approval was presented. The panel approved the policy with no changes.

6. Risk and reports
6.1 Risk register
The panel went through the responses from the PSA that were sought at the previous meeting in that the PSA believed none of the risks specified in the register were likely to be mitigated to the extent that they would/could never occur – for this reason, all risks that currently appear on the register will remain. The PSA suggested an issues log could run alongside the risk register which would identify actual risks that had occurred but the panel agreed that an additional document was not required. In respect of the matrix heading 'headline risk' the PSA concurred that the heading 'headline' could be confused although their understanding of the word in this context was 'overview of risk'. They advised that the heading could be changed to 'outline of risk' or 'overview of risk' to prevent confusion and the panel agreed to change the heading to 'risk' only. There had been a suggestion to add an explanation before the matrix to clarify that the risks contained in the register reflected all possible risks but were not, necessarily, risks at the time. The PSA agreed we could add an explanation to the beginning of the matrix, however, were not agreeable to stating that the risks 'are not, necessarily, actual risks at this time' as the PSA believe all the risks in our matrix are actual risks that could occur. The panel decided not to add an explanation to the matrix. In respect of the first item listed on the risk register the panel requested that the word 'Potential' by adding to the beginning of the sentence stating the risk.

It was confirmed there was nothing to note on the risk register.
6.2 Report on registrant numbers and characteristics
A report was presented on numbers and characteristics. The group noted the figures. An enquiry was made about the reason for the significant increase of registrants (146) in June 2014. A report would be made back to the panel.

7. Disciplinary issues

7.1 Membership of the RCT PCC

A paper was presented and explained the current membership of the PCC. A lot of interest has been received from registrants about joining the PCC following a call to join.

7.2 Disciplinary cases

There were no disciplinary cases to comment on.

8. Membership of the Panel

8.1 Membership of the panel

Confirmation was given that letters had been sent by email to IHEEM and ART requesting confirmation that their representatives could continue in their roles for another term at the expiry of their current term which ends on 1 September 2017. A report will be given to the panel when responses are received. In addition, the assistant registrar confirmed his willingness to remain for a full term of three years from his start date of 1 September 2016 which initially was just to be a temporary one year term for consistency and transition purposes. The panel welcomed this decision. The Registrar confirmed he would keep in touch with any panel members who were struggling to attend due to work commitments and offer support as was required.

9. Professional Standards Authority and Accredited Registers business

9.1 PSA statement on use of AR registrants

A statement was presented from the PSA about the use of registrants on accredited registers. This positive message also ties in with the NHS Employers web-link which was highlighted at the recent Accredited Registers Collaborative meeting in May and which had been circulated to the panel. It was requested that reference to this is included in the next Registrars' Update.

9.2 Update from AR Collaborative meeting

IPEM's Membership & Training Manager attended the meeting on 23 May where the only points to note were the NHS Employers web-link (mentioned in 9.1 above) and the PSA's changes to the accredited registers programme. She confirmed that at the meeting all participants had agreed that they would respond to the PSA's consultation document individually. She provided a draft response to the PSA from the RCT to the panel who confirmed agreement for it to be sent.

9.3 Update on AR landscape and mergers

A paper was presented informing the panel of the landscape in respect of accredited registers and some mergers that had taken place. The possibility of increasing the Scopes of Practice would be a way to increase registrant numbers. There was discussion about assistant practitioners and whether there was a place for them that could be considered. The panel agreed with the recommendations as listed in the paper with additional suggestions of research that could be undertaken.

The panel also requested that a substantial amount of time was given to this subject for discussion at the October meeting and that all panel members should endeavour to attend. It was suggested that the meeting should commence at 10.30am instead of the usual 11.00am.

10. Registration fees

10.1 Registration fees for 2018

A paper was circulated in respect of the options given and other ideas were also considered. The panel agreed to increase the registrant renewal fee to £21 for 2018 but leave the application fees and equivalence fees unchanged, unless these need to increase slightly to balance the budget. There will be an explanation in the autumn Registrar's Update in respect of this.

10.2 Registration fees not paid in 2017 leading to appeals

It was highlighted to the panel about the number of appeals that had been submitted in respect of registrants not paying their registration fees by the deadline of 31 January 2017 who had then been removed from the register. The panel agreed that in instances of factual absence such as long term sickness these appeals be granted by the RCT administration team. Appeals that included more personal explanations would continue to be considered by IT as registrar.

11. Any other business

11.1 Equivalence assessor day
This item had been covered when discussing second assessment of equivalence applications under item 4 above.

11.2 Request to attend and give presentation to technologists at workplace
The Registrar advised the panel he had been asked by a registrant whether he could attend an internal department meeting to give a short presentation on the RCT. He was unable to attend due to distance and use of time however the panel then discussed the possibility of putting together a presentation that could be sent out in response to requests such as this and even uploaded to the RCT website for people to use. The Registrar will put together presentation slides and the format of delivery would be discussed later.

11.3 Department visits for lay members of the RCT PCC.
The panel were asked if they had any colleagues or contacts in a specific geographical location who are RCT registrants and might be willing to take one of the new lay members of the RCT PCC on a departmental visit to help them in their roles. The panel could not confirm any names.

12. Date of next meeting:
Thursday 19 October 2017