

**55<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the RCT Management Panel (RCT MP)  
Minutes of the meeting held at IPEM Office in York  
Wednesday 6 June 2018**

**1. Apologies, welcome and introductions**

**2. Declarations of interest**

No declarations were received.

**3. Minutes of the 54th RCT Management Panel Meeting (13 February 2018)**

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

The actions relating to CPD prompted the Registrar to advise he wished to self-select as the RCT Registrar for CPD audit in 2019 (of his 2018 CPD). He hoped that his submission could be audited ahead of the usual cycle and could then be used as an example for other RCT registrants and to give them confidence in completing their own forms if selected. It was suggested also that the rest of the Management Panel could commit to undergoing a CPD audit in order to lead by example. There was also discussion around a '10 things you didn't know about RCT CPD audits' section which could appear in a Registrar's update and could include messages such as:

- CPD auditors have to self-select for audit within 2 years of joining the CPD Audit Panel
- IPEM/RCT give CPD webinars to provide guidance as to how to complete the audit documentation
- The Management Panel is committed to being audited
- The RCT Registrar has been audited

**4. Matter arising/actions**

*4.1 Update on liaison with ICSIG over potential new Scope of Practice*

There was a meeting held to discuss the potential new Scope of Practice. The recent IPEM committee structure review was discussed and the proposed new ways of working which would take the form of task and finish groups. A proposal was to be put forward at next week's PSC meeting that agreement be given for a task and finish group to be created for the sole purpose of introducing a new Scope of Practice in respect of Clinical Computing.

*4.3 Concerns raised by, Chair of CTETP*

The CTETP Chair had been in touch with the RCT Registrar about a point that had been raised with her such as the RCT equivalence route being an 'easy' way to RCT registration, about the RCT QA process and a suggestion made to her by an RCT assessor that the RCT does not follow its own procedures in respect of scopes of practice and that Engineering Council documents were used at times. The Panel discussed these concerns and provided anecdotal evidence of their own experiences where people had commented along similar lines. The RCT website equivalence FAQs section had already been updated in respect of the length of work experience required as follows:

*It is expected that the equivalence portfolio will be a substantial piece of work and not something which can be written overnight. Applicants will be required to provide evidence, maybe going back several years, to demonstrate that they meet the criteria. As a benchmark, a PTP student will undergo a 3 year academic degree which incorporates 50 weeks of work experience placement, and this is the minimum requirement for registration. If someone has not been in employment for at least this length of time then it is highly unlikely that they will be able to demonstrate to the assessors that they are competent enough to be registered.*

The Panel agreed that this wording was appropriate and this would be added to the RCT application guidance notes to reinforce the message.

In the discussions it was mentioned that the equivalence criteria were likely due for review now the route had been running for a couple of years.

It was advised that the RCT assessor who had made comments about the RCT not following its own procedures has been contacted and this turned out to be a miscommunication. The assessor felt that there was disparity within the

application routes into the RCT but advised she did not say that the RCT was not following procedures or using incorrect documents.

#### *4.4 RCT publicity material*

Background information was given as to how the idea of RCT publicity material had been suggested. Two RCT registrants (senior staff) had advised that they did not promote the RCT to their own staff as they were not aware of all the routes to registration available and felt some staff may not be able to register. An idea was tabled about creating a brochure explaining registration aimed at potential registrants. The Panel asked if this would be of real use considering we have a website and the Registrar's Update communication so what will a brochure do that these other methods of communication can't? The early career conference taking place on 19 July was mentioned and it was suggested that brochures could be prepared inserted into delegate packs so as to reach an audience we may not currently communicate to. The Panel asked what sort of information was held on the NHS Employers website in respect of PSA accredited registers and perhaps the way in was to highlight anything held on that website to the HR departments of NHS Trusts. Another suggestion to tap into potential registrants was for IPEM to identify which NHS departments did not have RCT registrants associated with them. A further suggestion was to contact the Lead Healthcare Scientist at each Trust to promote RCT registration. Other ideas included promotional materials such as lanyards or pens.

#### *4.5 Application for registration following a change of Scope of Practice*

The case of an individual Registrant was discussed and resolved.

### **5. Policies for review/first approval**

#### *5.1 Policy on EDI*

There was discussion around the wording of the EDI Policy which had been revised since the last meeting to mirror the IPEM EDI Policy. The IPEM EDI Policy had been approved by the IPEM Trustees at their April 2018 meeting. It was confirmed that, in order to mirror the IPEM EDI Policy, reference to gender specific terms would remain rather than changing to gender neutral terms. In addition, the very last sentence of the policy was discussed in respect of reference to employing organisations being the ones to deal with any complaints about members of the RCT Management Panel who are not registrants or about RCT administration staff. It was felt that the policy should not refer to the employing organisation but, rather, simply to the complaints procedure.

#### *5.2 Policy on RCT Reporting in Safeguarding Cases*

The Panel approved the suggested changes to this Policy.

#### *5.3 Policy on Health and Conduct Declarations*

The Panel approved the suggested changes to this Policy.

#### *5.4 Policy on International Applications*

The Panel discussed the revised policy and had some queries regarding the English language proficiency section and the Translation section. It was advised that the policy had originally been drafted using HCPC advice for international applications. It was agreed current HCPC wording should be checked and the policy amended if necessary to mirror the HCPC wording.

### **6. Risk and reports**

#### *6.1 Risk register*

The risk register was reviewed and updated.

#### *6.2 Report on registrant numbers and characteristics*

The report of registrant numbers and characteristics was provided.

### **7. Fitness to practise issues**

#### *7.1 Fitness to practise cases*

It was confirmed that the FtP case had completed in May by way of a consensual disposal. The outcome of the case can be found on the RCT 'Fitness to Practise – Findings' webpage. Other registers had been checked for the amount of information given in respect of a FtP case and there are broad variations. It was decided to provide minimal information in respect of the allegations and the Panel confirmed they were happy with this.

## **8. Professional Standards Authority and Accredited Registers Collaborative business**

A paper was provided following a meeting in March and particular points to note were highlighted. The Panel was also advised that the invitation to apply for re-accreditation with the PSA had been received and was currently being worked on with a submission deadline of 7 July.

## **9. CPD Audit**

### *9.1 CPD audit results received to date*

A paper was provided giving an update on the CPD audit process and results received so far to date.

The Panel were asked for ways that registrants could be engaged further in respect of CPD. The Panel referred back to the earlier discussions that included the Registrar self-selecting for audit ahead of the next cycle. A LinkedIn page was suggested for RCT registrants as a way of better engaging and this would be looked into as IPEM does have its own LinkedIn page run by the Communications department.

The PSA had commented in communications that the Panel may wish to consider adding the high number of failures at CPD audit to the risk register together with suggestions for controls to deal with this and the Panel agreed with this.

### *9.1 Matter of resignation when in CPD audit process*

An individual Registrant's case was discussed and resolved.

## **10. Registration fees 2019**

A paper was presented on the proposed renewal fees that would be required for 2019. The Panel agreed to the amounts as set out in the paper and it was advised that the amounts would be rounded down as necessary.

## **11. Any other business**

### *11.1 IPEM committee structure review*

Further comments were added to the earlier discussion regarding this at point 4.1 a suggestion to rename the RCT Management Panel the RCT Board to better reflect the level of responsibility the members of the Panel undertake. It may also be a way to distinguish the RCT as having its own board rather than being a Panel of IPEM in the eyes of some registrants who think IPEM and the RCT are one and the same. The Panel agreed to the name change which would take effect in September at the beginning of the next corporate year.

### *11.2 IPEM no longer accepting cheques*

The Panel were informed that due to increased processing costs, IPEM would no longer be accepting cheques as payment from 1 July 2018. Very few registrants pay their application fee or renewal fee by cheque so this shouldn't affect too many registrants. Any references to cheques in guidance notes, P&Ps or on the RCT website will need to be updated accordingly.

### *11.3 Terms of office of RCT Management Panel members*

The issue of current terms of office of Panel members was raised as one panel member believed they had fulfilled their 3 year term. This would be checked and advised accordingly.

### *11.4 Attendance at this meeting as CPD*

Everyone was reminded that they should include attendance at this meeting as part of their ongoing CPD.

## **12. Date of next meeting:**

Thursday 18 October 2018