

62nd meeting of the RCT Management Board
Minutes of the meeting held via video conference
Thursday 1 October 2020

Ref	Detail
1.1	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from six members of the Board. The Registrar then checked the Board's Terms of Reference and confirmed that, with five Registrar, Professional Body and Registrant representatives in attendance, the meeting was quorate.</p>
1.2	<p>Introductions</p> <p>All members of the Board introduced themselves, including what their roles were in relation to the RCT, for the benefit of new members.</p>
2.0	<p>Declaration of interest</p> <p>a) The Registrar declared an interest in the proposal for Item 9, the Bone Densitometry new Scope of Practice.</p>
3.0	<p>Minutes of the last meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting dated 4 June 2020 were discussed and accepted as a true record, with the following Actions noted:</p>
3.1	<p>Actions from the last meeting</p> <p>a) Annual Declaration of Interest form to be sent out It was noted that all Board members have returned their completed forms to the IPEM office and the status of the assessors' forms would be checked.</p> <p>b) Accredited Register Cluster It was noted that there was no update to report on the progress on the cluster of Accredited Registrars comprising of the The Registration Council for Clinical Physiologists (RCCP), the Academy of Health Care Science (AHCS). The IPEM CEO was due to meet the new CEO of the RCCP and an update on restarting the cluster discussions would be circulated to the Board in due course.</p> <p>c) IHEEM Representative It was reported that the IPEM Office had had no further response from IHEEM since its communication back in June that it was reviewing its policy on representatives, and that as far as can be gauged, there would be no opposition to a current representative being given a further term representing them on the Board. Following the meeting, the IPEM Membership Development Manager would contact the Chief Operating Officer at IHEEM for an update.</p> <p>d) British Library request At the June meeting it was mentioned that the British Library had requested access to copies of the RCT website held within the UK web archive. The RCT board approved the request and this was communicated by the IPEM HoOF. The Registrar mentioned that a reference was made to accessing pages from</p>

Ref	Detail
	the RCT website at the British Library in a recent appeal, confirming that this was now in place.
4.0	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>Appointment of IPEM Representative to the RCT The Board noted that a Registrant representative was interested in the vacant IPEM representative position following the former holder being elected to Assistant Registrar, and the IPEM Office would check on the status of any others that might have arrived. Progress on this will be sent to the Board in due course.</p>
5.0	<p>Policies for review/ first approval (standing item)</p> <p>The Registrar mentioned that the only policy due for review before the next Board meeting was the IPEM office's procedure to back-up the RCT website, and as this is chiefly an internal administrative process, this could be undertaken outside of the Board meeting.</p>
6.1	<p>Risk and Reports</p> <p>a) Risk Register The Registrar introduced the Risk Register explaining that no new risks had been brought to his attention by the IPEM CEO, although it was noted that the Covid 19 specific risks brought in at the request of the PSA needed updating. The Board then went through risks A-E and assigned a status, a residual factor and an owner for each. Only one, relating to the risk of RCT registrants not being able to complete their CPD audit for submission by the 4 April deadline, resulted in decreasing factor due to the increased preparedness of registrants now Covid19 measures were firmly in place and people were more generally aware of the situation.</p> <p>The Board agreed the update and the amended Risk Register would be then circulated to Board members.</p> <p>b) Report on Registrant Numbers The Registrar explained that this item was included so that the Board members could ask questions about registrant numbers throughout the year and look at possible trends and generate discussion on how to promote the register. As at previous meetings, the Board discussed how they could improve numbers, including writing to the chief executives of Trusts where numbers were low, to tell them the benefits of their staff being on the register. The IPEM Membership Development Manager asked if more information could be added to the numbers, such as location of registrants. One Board member thought that a breakdown by NHS Trust would be helpful in understanding where there might be a gap in RCT registrants, rather than just geographical location. The Registrar also suggested that IPEM's Workforce and Training team could be called upon to provide more data, and the Membership Development Manager agreed to liaise with colleagues and report on what level of detail could be obtained before adding to the next Board meeting's report. The Assistant Registrar also asked if more information could be given on new registrants' route to entry, and the Membership Development Manager agreed to look at how this could be provided via the Office's CRM.</p>

Ref	Detail
7.0	<p>Public safety considerations</p> <p>Although no board members again had anything to report under this item, it was agreed that this should continue to be a Standing Item.</p>
8.0	<p>Fitness to practice issues</p> <p>a) Fitness to practice cases It was reported that there was nothing new to add to the Board meeting.</p> <p>b) PCC meeting and training It was reported that there had been no update following the last PCC meeting, and details about the training element that had been timetabled for discussion would then be reported back to the Board in due course.</p> <p>c) PCC Membership An update on the PCC Term of Office for its members would be circulated to the Board in due course.</p>
9.0	<p>New scope of practice documentation to review: Bone densitometry DXA</p> <p>As mentioned at the beginning of the meeting the Assistant Registrar had been present at the two Task & Finish meetings, comprising of key DXA practitioners and two other Board members.</p> <p>Ahead of the meeting, the Assistant Registrar had sent to Board members a documentation pack consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope of Practice • Indicative Curriculum (Primary Route) • Equivalence Criteria (Equivalence Route) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance Notes ○ Evidence Matrix <p>These were all discussed by the Board, and it was mentioned that the Indicative Curriculum was based on the post graduate training course from the Royal Osteoporosis Society (ROS), being the only course being offered and therefore the de-facto standard in the UK. It was remarked that as this was set by the ROS provision would be made to review this every two years to ensure any changes made by them would still be in line with RCT requirements. As with the PTP, the RCT and IPEM would not have any input in any future changes to the course, but the ROS have been very supportive so far and would help if the IPEM sought to take the Indicative Curriculum to an educational awarding body to develop into a PTP degree.</p> <p>The Registrar thought that more important and potentially challenging was how the Equivalence Route was mapped across to the scope of practice and the curriculum, and this area has been looked at in detail by the Task & Finish group. The Registrar was assured by the presence of Board members on the Task & Finish group that this detailed process had been completed satisfactorily.</p> <p>The Registrar remarked that this was likely to follow a similar course to the draft Clinical Computing scope of practice – after a Task & Finish group had produced a draft scope, indicative curriculum and equivalence route, criteria and guidance notes for applicants, then all this would be tested through the participation of volunteers in a pilot scheme. It was hoped that volunteers for the DXA scope would be easier to find than for the Clinical Computing pilot, and asked that the Assistant Registrar check that someone appropriate would be available to go through the process and report back, and that the Bone Densitometry scope would be the first new scope of practice for the RCT.</p> <p>Therefore, although the Board are impressed with the work done so far, the result of the pilot stage would be key to deciding if the scope would go live. The Registrar stated that the result of the pilot stage could be developed into an exemplar benchmark and published on the RCT website in order to encourage registrants.</p> <p>The Board confirmed they were in agreement with this course of action.</p>

Ref	Detail
	<p>The Assistant Registrar remarked that the group should be pleased with the quick progress made and was worthy of gratitude. The Registrar agreed to send an email of thanks on behalf of the Board, and the Assistant Registrar would contact the group to confirm that the Board had agreed the next stage for the new scope of practice.</p>
10.0	<p>Professional Standards Authority and Accredited Registers Collaborative business</p> <p>The IPEM Membership Development Manager stated that there was nothing to report back on this at present, a meeting with the PSA was timetabled for mid-November.</p>
11.0	<p>Dual Membership discount – IPEM and RCT</p> <p>The Registrar mentioned that there had been an enquiry put forward by the IPEM HoOF about the possibility of a discount in RCT registration fees for current IPEM members, in much the same way that members of the Institute of Physics (IOP) and IPEM benefit from a joint discount. However, the RCT sets its own fees to cover its own costs, based on anticipated numbers of registrants, the cost of PSA accreditation taken into account and with VAT excluded, there is no room for manoeuvre on fees. A Board member pointed out that there was no comparison between the dual membership of two professional bodies, IOP and IPEM, and the relationship between a professional body and a register. For example, there was no discount for being an IPEM member and HCPC registered.</p> <p>Therefore, the Board agreed that no dual IPEM and RCT discount could be offered, unless IPEM would be prepared to offer a reduction in subscription to RCT registrants – though this was recognised that that would be for IPEM to look at and therefore outside the remit of the Board.</p> <p>The Registrar mentioned that promotion of the IPEM Communities of Interest platform and how to access this in the RCT Registrar’s Update, could be an initiative that would be beneficial to IPEM members who were also RCT registered. The Membership Development Manager agreed to add this to the draft content of the next update, and to update the IPEM HoOF that the Board could not offer a discount due to the unique way the RCT was funded.</p>
12.0	<p>Transition of Sonographers’ register from PVRs to RCT</p> <p>Following the draft of the PSA’s Notification of Change brought about after the decision by the Society and College of Radiographers (SCoR) to close the Public Voluntary Register of Sonographers (PVRs) back in 2019, the Board decided at its last meeting to set up a Task & Finish group to develop the detail for the new Scope of Practice for the RCT to cover sonographers in time for the proposed transfer on 1 March 2021.</p> <p>The Task & Finish met regularly to map across the entry standards to ensure consistency, and is comprised of the RCT Registrar, RCT Assistant Registrar, and from the SCoR two Professional Officers (Ultrasound).</p> <p>The IPEM HoOF had confirmed with the Director of the Professional Standards Council (PSC) that this Task & Finish group did not need any financial approval from IPEM, since all the meetings are being held virtually, and since this is a continuation of a project started in 2019, approval in principle was not required from the PSC.</p> <p>SM mentioned that the PSA had received responses to their queries regarding the draft Notification of Change and that this was now with the Moderator – an outcome was due back with IPEM soon, and the IPEM Membership Development Manager would update the Board when PSA confirmation was in place.</p>
13.0	<p>Any other business</p>

Ref	Detail
	<p>The IPEM Membership Development Manager sought clarification on the procedure of circulating the RCT Registrar's Update and its frequency. The Registrar explained that topics of interest were sent to him by the IPEM office and then content was developed, with the update being sent out usually 2 months after the previous Board meeting. The next update would focus on the important message of registrants moving to a direct debit plan for the payment of their renewal fees, as well as a CPD audit update and clear information on how RCT fees were spent. As mentioned, the Update would also promote access to the IPEM's Communities of Interest platform.</p> <p>No other business was mentioned by Board members, and IT closed the meeting thanking all members for their time.</p>
14.0	Dates, time and locations of next meetings
	<p>TBC – 2021 meetings due in late February, early June and early to mid-October. The IPEM Office would send around Doodle Polls for meetings.</p>