

NRCPD | Practitioners' Forum – Conference Call

Meeting – 14.00 on 9 February 2017 | Minutes

Present

- Gail Dixon (ASLI)
- Vikki Bridson-Vice (VLP)
- Nicole Harrison (AVSTTR)
- Jayne Oakes (Interpreters for deafblind people) – joined 14.30

In attendance

- Alan Peacock (NRCPD)
- Heidi Doyle (NRCPD)

Apologies

- Jeff Brattan-Wilson (RSLT)
- Jean Gough (AVSTTR)

Minutes of 15 September 2016 meeting and matters arising

1. Alan Peacock (AP) gave an update on actions from the meeting on 15 September 2016. The minutes were approved.

NRCPD Status Update

2. AP gave an overview of the changes which had occurred in respect of NRCPD's status. NRCPD was now an independent legal entity, and would be a subsidiary company of Signature until it had built up sufficient reserves to be fully independent. Trustees of the new board had signed up to the new agreement and NRCPD was now registered at Companies House and as a charity. Following the Board meeting on 17 January, we were currently advertising for an Honorary Treasurer (lay member).

Registration Fees

3. AP explained that, during the process of setting NRCPD's first stand alone budget for 2017, a decision had to be made about the level of fees. In order to achieve sufficient reserves to enable the transition to full independence as soon as possible, the fees had to be increased. Vikki Bridson-Vice (VBV) stated that she appreciated the fact that fees had not been increased for some time and that the reasoning behind this was clear. She undertook to feed this back to VLP members.
4. AP went on to give an overview of the NRCPD budget – we now have separate bank accounts, and all registration income is ring fenced for NRCPD use. There is always a risk of receiving a large/ complex complaint, hence the need to ensure that reserves are in place to deal with this should it ever arise.
5. Nicole Harrison (NH) advised that ASTTR members were unhappy regarding the rise but she would feed back the reasoning behind it.
6. AP advised that the differentials between the fees in relation to the different registers would be reviewed during 2017.

Published Information about Complaints

7. AP advised that the Board had agreed that NRCPD could publish information about a complaint anonymously where it had been resolved without the need for a disciplinary hearing. On the rare occasion that a complaint did reach a full hearing of the Complaints Committee, it was agreed that the full details and results would be published on the website. He advised that a new section has been added to the NRCPD website entitled *Complaints Committee Decisions* and the latest hearing is published there.
8. AP had suggested to the board that there should be a section on complaints handling in the annual report, which would explore any recurring themes. This could be useful to profession in terms of general understanding and CPD. Forum members agreed this was useful.

9. AP asked the forum to consider whether there was anything else that could be done in respect of publishing information on complaint handling and to feed back any suggestions/comments to Heidi Doyle (HD).
10. VBV suggested that it would be helpful to gain an understanding of how many complaints are received in total. AP agreed that more statistical information should be made available in the Annual Report – including statistics on those complaints that are not investigated and those that are dealt with internally.

NRCPD TSLI Consultation

11. AP advised that a working group had been convened and that the first meeting had been held on 23 January 2017. VBV is a member of the group and gave positive feedback on the meeting. She stated that it was interesting that there is such disparity in the way trainees are endorsed and supervised; and that once the work is concluded the system had the potential to be more robust 12-18 months down the line.

(there was a pause to allow for Jayne Oakes(JO) to dial in)

12. The working group had reviewed the original recommendations and made suggestions to strengthen them. It would next meet on 22 March.

CPD Procedures

13. AP put the forum members on notice that NRCPD would be seeking formal views from the membership bodies on CPD and the audit process. The responses would then feed into a review of CPD. He requested that if forum members thought that anyone else within their own groups should be included in the consultation, to advise either AP or HD in advance.
14. Gail Dixon (GD) enquired about the details and timetable of this year's audit. AP & HD would be reviewing the process that was carried out last year and taking a view on a timetable and the panel of auditors. GD mentioned that previously some people had complained about the short timeframe given to collate their CPD evidence. AP undertook to take this into consideration; however, he had hoped that practitioners would collate their evidence as they go. Initial letters regarding the audit would be sent soon.

Agency Standards Working Group

15. AP advised that he had discussed this with the NRCPD Chair and, in particular, the resources required for such a project. It had been agreed to revisit this in the second half of the year. We also want to seek the views of agencies and their users. AP asked whether, in the meantime, there was any scope for the membership bodies to approach the agencies separately.
16. GD advised that ASLI does take matters up with agencies, sometimes with just a letter and sometimes via phone call. Any improvements seemed to be short-lived, however, and it was often the case that a further conversation was required with the same agency 3 months later. All members agreed that they experienced similar issues.
17. VBV stated that there are a variety of issues with the agencies, such as the use of unregistered, unqualified persons and lack of payment. A national agency may also operate differently region to region - no set standards within the agencies. Promises by agencies are short-lived. JO added that agencies have no knowledge of what is required and at times they will ask for wrong communication methods.
18. AP stated that it was mentioned to him by NUBSLI that some agencies will just pass the job onto the first interpreter who is available, regardless of the skills required for the assignment. The forum agreed that this happens with some agencies.

Review of NOSI

19. AP hoped that once the steering group had met in March, Instructus would be in a position to deliver their findings. GD expressed a concern that after having done all the work there would be little impact unless it feeds down into university and NVQ courses and into the assessment process.
20. AP stated that the consultancy running the review is experienced in National Occupational Standards but does not necessarily have an in-depth knowledge of the interpreting profession. He understood the concerns expressed and agreed the need to ensure that the findings are filtered down correctly. He asked GD for an update following the working group meeting.

Social Media Policy for Registrants

21. AP reported that a review of the Code of Conduct was planned for the second half of the year, and that a standard about social media would be included as part of the update. It was important to strike the right balance, and not to be overly prescriptive as social media is now a common means of communication. He added that sharing work experiences (CPD) is a good way of gaining peer review but that it was also important to address concerns from forum members and service users.
22. GD suggested that it could be solved by adding the following wording to the Code – *integrity applies in both your personal and professional life*. Registrants could refer to their professional associations for further guidance (ASLI has a policy which is due to be voted on).

Contacting NRCPD – access for Deaf people

23. GD reported that a number of Deaf people had mentioned that there is no facility for a video call to NRCPD and that they have to phone with the aid of an interpreter, or email. AP asked HD to check on current facilities and to add to the minutes.
(see page 6)

NRCPD Annual Report

24. The last report (2014-2015) was published on 1 June 2016. NRCPD's financial year has now been changed – previously it was August to July, and now it is January to December. AP undertook to produce the 2015 – 2016 report as soon as possible.

AOB

25. GD advised that it had been suggested that names of NRCPD supervisors could be listed on website alongside standard advisors. This had also been discussed at the TSLI review group and AP will now look into how this can be displayed on the website (drop down box)

Date of next meeting

26. AP stated that he would like to do alternate face to face and conference call meetings, and members agreed. The next meeting will be face to face. HD to canvas for dates and will find a venue.

Actions

1. Facility for a supervisor list on website (drop down box?)
2. Further statistics on complaints to be incorporated into Annual Report
3. Letter to be issued to forum members requesting formal views on CPD and the audit process.
4. Take a view on timings for the audit process.
5. Review of agencies – for second half of year.
6. Review of the Code of Conduct and to also include a Social Media standard – for second half of the year.
7. To complete Annual Report for 2015 – 2016.
8. Venue to be arranged for next meeting.

Contacting NRCPD

1. Minicom
2. Video calling (on request)
3. Office ipad for facetime (on request)
4. Text - Office mobile
5. Email specific staff member
6. Type talk operators