

## Accredited Registers

### Condition Review: The Register of Clinical Technologists (RCT)

Date: July 2025

#### 1. Outcome

- 1.1 At the Register of Clinical Technologist's (RCT) full renewal assessment<sup>1</sup>, the Professional Standards Authority ('we') issued nine Conditions on its accreditation, which were due to be completed by 31 January 2025.
- 1.2 We undertook an assessment of actions taken by the RCT to meet these conditions by 31 January 2025, and found that while they had met some, five conditions remained outstanding and were subsequently reissued. Of those, condition four and six were re-issued with a one-month deadline<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.3 This report sets out our assessment of the actions taken by the RCT to satisfy Conditions Four and Six.
- 1.4 We found that the RCT had met Conditions Four and Six.

#### 2. Background

- 2.1 We assess registers against our *Standards for Accredited Registers* ('the Standards')<sup>3</sup>. Where a Register has not met a Standard, we can issue Conditions. A Condition sets out the requirements and the timeframe that a Register must meet.
- 2.2 When we assessed if the RCT had completed actions to meet conditions which were issued at their full renewal assessment, we found that five conditions remained outstanding. Conditions Four (previously condition seven) and Six (previously condition nine), were re-issued with a one-month deadline.

##### Condition Four

The RCT should develop a business continuity plan.

##### Condition Six

The RCT should review the content of its website to make sure that key information is up to date and accurate. Information about sonography should be integrated into the main webpages. This should include clearer information for the public about sonography, to support informed choice. Information about the benefits and limitations of the roles registered should be included.

---

<sup>1</sup>

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Accreditation%20renewal%20report%20-%20Standards%202-8%20Register%20of%20Clinical%20Technologists%20May%202024.pdf>

<sup>2</sup>

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Condition%20Review%20Report%20RCT%20March%202025.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/publications/standards-accredited-registers?sfvrsn=e2577e20\\_8](https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/publications/standards-accredited-registers?sfvrsn=e2577e20_8)

- 2.3 This report discusses the actions the RCT took to address the Condition, as well as our decision about whether the Condition is met. RCT's responses to the remaining Conditions will be considered in due course.
- 2.4 We reviewed the following evidence:
  - a) RCT's reported actions about what it had done to meet Condition Four and Six.
  - b) A review of the RCT's website.

### **3. Concerns leading to the Condition**

#### **Condition Four**

- 3.1 We did not see evidence of the RCT's business continuity plan while completing our full renewal assessment, which is one of our minimum requirements for registration. As such, a condition was issued.
- 3.2 When we assessed this condition in January 2025, the RCT told us that while they did not have their own business continuity plan, the IPEM business continuity plan includes the RCT, and was due for review. The RCT later told us that a RCT-specific business continuity plan was being prepared, and would be forwarded once completed. We did not receive this before completion of the assessment. As such, the Accreditation Panel reissued the condition for one month.
- 3.3 Further details can be found under page 8 of the RCT's January Condition Review Report<sup>4</sup>.

#### **Condition Six**

- 3.4 During our full renewal assessment, we identified a number of areas on the RCT's website where their information appeared to be out of date. For example, they had published two different versions of the same Scope of Practice documents in different areas of their website; we considered this to be confusing and potentially misleading. As such, a condition was issued.
- 3.5 We assessed how the RCT met this condition in January 2025, and continued to identify outdated and conflicting information published on the RCT's website. Later in the assessment process, the RCT told us they had launched a new website which took a considerable amount of effort, and following the successful publication of this, they would be undertaking a programme of reviewing and updating information published on their website.
- 3.6 Given what the RCT told us, we reissued the condition for one month, to allow them to implement the changes required, as stipulated by the condition.
- 3.7 Further details can be found under page 8 of the RCT's January Condition Review Report<sup>4</sup>.

---

4

<https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Condition%20Review%20Report%20RCT%20March%202025.pdf>

#### **4. Assessment of Condition Four**

- 4.1 The RCT provided its response to the Condition on 15 May 2025 by providing us with a copy of their Business Continuity Plan.
- 4.2 We noted positively, that the plan included a review date set for five months' time, which we consider a significant improvement from the previous 18-month review period. We are pleased to see that the RCT has reconsidered the frequency of reviews and hope this more regular review schedule continues.
- 4.3 The RCT has provided us with a copy of their business continuity plan, thereby fulfilling the requirements of the condition.
- 4.4 We therefore consider Condition Four to be met.

#### **5. Assessment of Condition Six**

- 5.1 The RCT told us that they have removed the 'Sonography Applications' page on the website and have instead integrated all the information relating to sonography and sonography applications into other relevant pages on the website. For equivalence applications, they have created an 'Equivalence for Sonography' webpage which aligns with all other equivalence pages.
- 5.2 The RCT also reported to us that they have ensured there are no broken links and that all documents which are published on the website are the most recent and up-to-date versions. We have reviewed the RCT's website and can confirm these changes have taken place.
- 5.3 In relation to the requirement of the condition to list benefits and limitations of roles registered, the RCT told us they have added text to the 'About Clinical Technologists' Page<sup>5</sup>. On this page, the RCT have included a statement that advises the public to get in contact with the RCT if they would like to know the benefits and limitations of a specific scope of practice. The RCT advised they took this approach, as given the large number of scopes and differences within the benefits and limitations for these, it would be confusing to publish such a large amount of information for a public facing website.
- 5.4 We acknowledge that the RCT were required to list benefits and limitations of roles registered, however, are satisfied with the approach they have taken as we consider this to be proportionate. RCT practitioners often work within multi-disciplinary teams, and services provided are determined by medical necessity rather than by patient choice. As such, we are satisfied that the RCT's approach to managing this part of the condition is satisfactory.
- 5.5 The RCT have undertaken necessary updates to their website which were required as part of the condition. We have confirmed via our own checks of their website that information publishes is up-to-date and accurate. The RCT have also integrated information about sonography into their main webpages. While the RCT have not explicitly published information pertaining to the benefits and limitations of roles, as we have analysed above, we are satisfied that their approach is proportionate, and further, they have provided details on how to get

---

<sup>5</sup> [About Clinical Technologists](#)

in contact with the Registrar if further information about the benefits and limitations is required.

5.6 As such, we consider Condition Six to be met.

## **6. Conclusion**

6.1 The RCT have provided clear evidence of adherence to the requirements of the conditions.

6.2 As a result we have therefore found that Conditions Four and Six have been met.