

Accredited Registers Programme

Accreditation Panel's Decision

Application for renewal from: The Register of Clinical Technologists (the RCT)
Panel meeting: 16 October 2017 (**accreditation renewed**)
Accreditation valid from: 7 September 2017 – 7 September 2018

The [Professional Standards Authority](#) accredits registers of people working in a variety of health and social care occupations not regulated by law. To be accredited, organisations holding such registers must prove that they meet our demanding [Standards for Accredited Registers](#) (the Standards). Accreditation is reviewed every twelve months.

The Accreditation Panel reviewed the accreditation of the register held by the RCT. Panel members reviewed the annual review application form, an updated risk matrix, and a summary report from the Accreditation team. The Panel had to review the RCT's compliance with the Standards and decide whether or not to **renew accreditation, renew accreditation with conditions, suspend accreditation** or **remove accreditation**. The Panel could make recommendations in the form of:

- **Conditions** – changes that must be made to maintain accreditation. If Conditions are not met within the timeframe specified, accreditation may be removed.
- **Instructions** – actions that would improve practice but do not affect compliance with the Standards and that the Panel requires to be implemented and be satisfied of appropriate implementation within a given timeframe
- **Learning Points** – actions that would benefit the operation of the register, the implementation of which would be verified during the annual review of accreditation.

The Panel considered the range of options available to it when making its decision.

The Panel noted the assessment carried out by the Accreditation team for the annual review included:

- Documentary review (annual review form, query sheet response and risk matrix)
- Due Diligence checks and Patient/Service User journey

There were no declarations of interest from members of the Panel. A summary of matters considered by the Panel is set out in the Annex. The summary is not intended to reflect all of the matters discussed by the Panel, but to record those that were most important in forming its decision.

Outcome

The Panel was satisfied that the RCT continued to meet the Standards for Accredited Registers. The Panel decided to **renew accreditation**. The renewed accreditation is valid from 7 September 2017 to 7 September 2018.

Conditions, Instructions and Learning Points

The Panel provided the following **Learning Point** to be verified at the next annual review of accreditation:

1. The RCT is to consider how it can increase registrants' engagement with its CPD processes.
2. The RCT is to consider how it can improve the accessibility of the Fitness to Practise Procedure, for example, by providing definitions of terms such as 'findings' in its glossary.

The Panel confirmed that no Conditions or Instructions would be issued as a result of the annual review of accreditation.

Annex – Accreditation Panel’s Decision – application for renewal of accreditation

Organisation: The Register of Clinical Technologists (the RCT)	Outcome:
Accreditation Period: 7 September 2016 – 7 September 2017	Accreditation Renewed
Update on Conditions issued in the previous year	
There were no Conditions issued as part of the last annual review.	
Update on Instructions issued in the previous year	
<p>The Panel provided the following Instruction to be implemented by the timeframe specified below or, if not specified below, by annual review of accreditation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RCT is to provide an update on the progress of its Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programme at the following annual review. <p>The RCT’s CPD processes are modelled on those of the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). The RCT has conducted audits on CPD completed by registrants since 2015 and has been developing its process following lessons learned at each audit, for example providing guidance for people practicing more ‘technically focused’ disciplines on ‘reflective learning’. At the previous annual review the Panel noted that there was a high number of failed audit responses (23 of 52) and that the RCT was updating its policy to reflect the compliance action that will be taken should RCT registrants fail to meet its standards. That Panel noted actions the RCT was taking to assist registrants to improve CPD submissions, and provided the above instruction.</p> <p>The RCT provided the outcomes of its most recent audit and stated that of 63 registrants 27 passed, 20 did not pass and 16 did not submit returns. The team asked the RCT to provide an update on actions taken on the registrants who did not pass, and who failed to submit returns. The RCT confirmed that:</p> <p>‘Those registrants who did not pass were advised accordingly, given feedback and asked to resubmit their Summary of CPD Activity form within 28 days. Those who provided a resubmission within the</p>	<p>The Panel agreed this instruction had been met.</p> <p>The Panel noted the positive action taken by the RCT to promote and police its CPD policies, however expressed concern that many registrants still did not submit CPD as required by the RCT.</p> <p>The Panel issued a Learning Point for the RCT to consider how it can increase registrants’ engagement with its CPD processes.</p>

<p>timescale all passed the re-audit. Those who did not provide a resubmission had their registration status on the RCT Register amended to 'Suspension of registration (CPD failure)' whilst those who did not respond to the original request to submit a Summary of CPD Activity were removed completely from the RCT Register as this was prior to the 'Policy on Removal From and Restoration To the RCT' which did not, at that time, provide for the 'suspension' status in respect of CPD failure.'</p>	
<p>Update on Learning Points issued in the previous year</p>	
<p>The Panel provided the following Learning Point to be revisited at the annual review of accreditation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The RCT to consider how it can improve the accessibility of the Fitness to Practise Procedure, for example, by providing definitions of terms such as 'findings' in its glossary. <p>At the previous annual review, the RCT had updated its Fitness to Practise procedure. The team had reviewed and considered that it could be made more accessible to those wishing to raise concerns or make complaints as suggested in the Learning Point. The team noted that some changes highlighted by the RCT had been made prior to the conclusion of the previous annual review.</p> <p>The team noted that the currently published procedure uses some terminology that may not be easily understood by those wishing to raise concerns, and that it could benefit from providing terms such as 'findings' in its glossary, or in separate guidance that could be provided alongside the formal procedure. As part of its assessment (as discussed further under Standard 11) the team noted that RCT's <i>How to complain</i> web page states that the RCT will offer help and support to those wishing to raise concerns throughout its processes</p> <p>The team noted that the RCT's new <i>Registration status explained</i> page could assist registrants and service users to understand terms, such as its <i>Fitness to practise findings</i> page which lists the outcomes of complaints procedures.</p>	<p>The Panel noted that information provided by RCT appeared to refer to work carried out at the previous annual review.</p> <p>The Panel considered that RCT's Fitness to Practise procedure was not plain English and therefore re-issued the Learning Point.</p>

Standard 1: holds a voluntary register for people in health and/or social care occupations	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.</p> <p>The RCT advised that at May 2017 the number of RCT registrants totalled 2,495, down from 2,654 at the previous annual review. The team noted RCT's consideration of this reduction under Standard 4.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 2: committed to protecting the public and promoting public confidence	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year. The RCT highlighted its work to promote the register in hospital departments.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 3: risks	
<p>As stated in the annual form, the team checked that the RCT continues to review its risk matrix at Management Panel meetings, demonstrating it is being used as a live tool to record and manage risks.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 4: Financial sustainability	
<p>The RCT states it has increased its renewal fees by 50p this year, bringing the registration fee to £18.</p> <p>The RCT register is maintained by one of its three member professional bodies: the Institute of Physics and Engineering in Medicine (IPEM). As part of its due diligence the Accreditation team reviewed IPEM's most recent Companies House and Charity Commission records and noted that RCT as part of IPEM appears to continue to be financially sustainable.</p> <p>The team noted actions by the RCT, in its Management Panel minutes, that many registrants were approaching retirement which is resulting in a decline of registrant numbers. The RCT Management Panel had considered how it could encourage newly qualified practitioners or those in training to aim for registration with RCT.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.

<p>Standard 5: capacity to inspire confidence</p>	
<p>The RCT advised that its Professional Conduct Committee has been ‘refreshed’ with eight new registrant members and two experienced lay members.</p> <p>The RCT highlighted it has ‘<i>made significant changes to the RCT website to assist with communication and reputation</i>’ and that ‘<i>policies and procedures are now reviewed on a rotating basis at each Management Panel meeting</i>’ to check whether they require updating.</p> <p>Summary minutes of RCT Management Panel meetings are available to download from the RCT website. The team also noted that IPEM’s <i>Report of the Trustees & Directors and Financial Statements</i>, available from Companies House and the Charity Commission, contains detailed information about the work of that organisation and a summary of work relating to the RCT.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>
<p>Standard 6: knowledge base</p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>
<p>Standard 7: governance</p>	
<p>The RCT advised a new Registrar has been elected with the former Registrar elected as Assistant Registrar to provide support and continuity. The RCT Management Panel contains members of RCT’s three professional bodies (IPEM, The Association of Renal Technologists’ (ART) and The Institute of Healthcare Engineering and Estate Management (IHEEM)). One new member from IHEEM has been elected. Information on the Management Panel is published on the RCT website.</p> <p>The RCT advised that it has re-organised its website. As part of its assessment the team conducted a service-user journey and provided some minor suggestions for corrections or updates.</p>	<p>The Panel found this Standard was met.</p>

Standard 8: setting standards for registrants	
There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 9: education and training	
The RCT reported that it has admitted new registrants to the register through its equivalence route of entry, which launched in May 2016. The team checked the RCT's methods of assurance of its processes, including how it checks for conflicts of interest within previous assessments.	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 10: the register	
<p>The RCT advised it has introduced its 'lapsed' 'registration category to reflect the position of registrants who had not paid their annual registration renewal fee for the current year. This, and other statuses, including 'Suspension of registration (CPD failure)' are explained on the RCT's <i>Registration status explained</i> web page.</p> <p>The RCT has added a new column to its published register, registrants' Scope of Practice, to support those using the register to make informed decisions. The RCT consulted with the team to check whether a Notification of Change would be necessary before making this modification.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.
Standard 11: complaints and concerns	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported or noted since last year.</p> <p>This year the team is focusing on complaints handling both against registrants and against the organisation. The team reviewed the RCT's complaints policies and interviewed the RCT's Membership & Training Manager, and Professional Conduct Committee Secretary (IPEM's Chief Executive). The RCT advised that it aims to resolve concerns quickly and informally where possible. Where this is not possible, cases would be considered through RCT's Fitness to Practise Procedure. The team noted that support will be provided to those wishing to make complaints.</p>	The Panel found this Standard was met.

<p>The RCT runs training for its Professional Conduct Committee, including lay members, annually.</p> <p>The RCT confirmed that it had developed its relationships with employers such as the NHS, ensuring that both employers and service users were aware of the RCT and its complaints processes.</p> <p>The RCT confirmed that its Investigation Panel will determine whether interim suspensions should be applied to protect the public where necessary.</p> <p>The RCT has provided a link to its policy for managing complaints against itself, which was published on the IPEM website, to the RCT's <i>How to complain</i> page.</p>	
<p>Share Your Experience and concerns about the Accredited Register received in the previous year of accreditation</p>	
<p>The Accreditation team received one response from the Registration Council for Clinical Physiologists, expressing its support for the RCT. The team did not receive any concerns about the RCT within the previous year of accreditation.</p>	
<p>Equality duty under the Equality Act 2010</p>	
<p>The Panel must consider the Authority's equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 when considering an application for renewal of accreditation.</p>	<p>The Panel had regard to its duty under the Equality Act 2010 when considering this application for renewal of accreditation.</p>
<p>Impact Assessment</p>	
<p>There have been no significant changes reported since last year.</p>	<p>The Panel noted and took account of the impact of its decision to renew accreditation.</p>