

## **NRCPD Practitioners' Forum**

### **Meeting – 14.00 on 2 May 2017 Minutes**

#### **Present**

- Gail Dixon (ASLI)
- Dave Wycherley (VLP)
- Nicole Harrison (BIVR)
- Jayne Oakes (Interpreters for deafblind people)
- Jean Gough (AVSTTR)
- Eileen Bainbridge (Notetaker)

#### **In attendance**

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

#### **Apologies**

- Jeff Brattan-Wilson (RSLT)

### **Minutes of 9 February 2017 meeting and matters arising**

1. The differentials on registration fees were queried. Alan Peacock (AP) advised that the work on reviewing the registration fees structure would be carried out later in the year. He provided an update on the actions from the meeting on 9 February 2017: the audit process timeframe for submission of CPD had been extended to eight weeks; he had written to forum members at the end of April seeking views and comments on the CPD and audit process; and a supervisor list on the website would be considered once the recommendations on TSLI standards had been agreed by the NRCPD Board.
2. The minutes were approved.

## **NRCPD TSLI Standards**

3. AP gave an update on the work of the TSLI standards review group. The group had met for the second and final time on 22 March, and had agreed the recommendations which will go to the NRCPD board meeting in July. If agreed, they will be published and communicated to stakeholders. In the meantime they have been circulated for comments.
4. Dave Wycherley (DW) queried whether the minimum standards to become a TSLI had been addressed by the TSLI review group. Varying standards were discussed and members agreed that there were different standards between course providers. AP added that NRCPD takes the view that the endorser must be satisfied that the trainee meets the criteria.
5. Eileen Bainbridge (EB) queried whether there are criteria to be met in order to become an endorser. AP stated that NRCPD expects endorsers to be qualified assessors but would look into this.

## **Review of NOSI**

6. AP updated members on progress: the NOS working group had drafted the revised standards, which now include new standards around preparation for assignments, technology and written translations. The Steering committee had reviewed the draft and approved it subject to some minor amendments. The consultants were now working on a survey to accompany the draft standards which will be sent to NRCPD registrants and other stakeholders to seek their views. Following the survey, further amendments might be made if considered appropriate. It was hoped that the review would be concluded in July.
7. EB queried whether there would be, in due course, standards for all categories of registered communication professionals. AP advised that there are generic NOS standards which cover a range of professions; and whilst it would be ideal to have specific standards in place for all, there were significant resource and cost implications.

Gail Dixon (GD) added that, having been a participant in the process as a Steering group member, she was confident in the document that has been produced. The challenge would be explaining to the profession what it means, and how it can be effective.

### **CPD Audit**

8. AP advised the dates scheduled for the audit (8-9 June) and asked if anyone had any feedback on the revised timeframes, whereby the deadline for submission of CPD evidence had been extended to six weeks. Forum members had received no complaints or concerns regarding this and regarded it as a positive step.
9. DW queried the letter which had been sent on 27 April regarding the CPD scheme and the audit process. AP stated that NRCPD was seeking views from professional associations and other stakeholders with a view to reviewing and improving the scheme. All comments were requested in writing. Professional bodies are to seek the views of their members and feed back.

### **NRCPD External Representations**

10. AP updated members on NRCPD's external representation. He stated that one of NRCPD's key objectives is to raise awareness of its purpose among the professions, the public, and appropriate organisations, such as those representing the D/deaf and deafblind communities; and to promote the importance and value of regulation and the use of registered practitioners. He asked forum members if they could alert their networks of this, and stated he would be happy to present to/ meet with appropriate organisations and groups.

### **Complaints process including causes for concern**

11. GD advised that she has received a number of enquiries from her members regarding how complaints are dealt with by NRCPD, and how many concerns need to be made about a registered practitioner before escalation to a formal complaint. AP explained the NRCPD process, and advised that if a number of concerns were received from a number of sources NRCPD would review and escalate it if it was in the public interest to do so. NRCPD (Registrar) has the authority to take any complaint forward. In

respect of formal complaints, all parties are made aware that the process is open and transparent.

12. EB suggested that for people to feel comfortable the complaints process should allow for complainants to remain anonymous. AP did not agree with this; however he undertook to take concerns around anonymity to the NRCPD board.
13. Members discussed issues around DBS and whether it is monitored by NRCPD during a CPD audit. AP advised that it would be appropriate for this suggestion to be included in the CPD review feedback.

### **Responsibilities of the NRCPD to registrants**

14. This was raised by GD. AP gave a summary of what he saw as NRCPD's responsibilities:
  - the contract with all registered practitioners, which is renewed annually on payment of the registration fee, sets out what NRCPD will do and what it expects from registrants;
  - NRCPD will keep data confidential in accordance with its published Privacy Policy;
  - NRCPD will publish registrant details online if they opt for this;
  - a responsibility to ensure registrants are kept up-to-date with NRCPD developments;
  - to ensure any complaints are dealt with fairly, transparently, impartially and within the rules of the agreed complaints process.
15. Members asked if NRCPD could publish statistics relating to complaints/ concerns raised. AP agreed that NRCPD would be publishing statistics which would include the source of complaints, and whether the persons complained of were trainees /non trainees. He would also look at identifying common themes for personal development and training possibilities.

### **Replacement cards**

16. GD queried the context of the 'replacement registration card' email and stated that members thought the charge was excessive. AP advised that most replacement card requests were as a result of registrants failing to notify NRCPD of a change of address, hence the reminder in the monthly newsletter. Forum members generally felt that the £25 charge for a replacement card was reasonable.

### **Community engagement**

17. GD advised that there is an opportunity for AP to go to Manchester to speak with the Deaf community. She also suggested that NRCPD's social media presence had reduced. AP advised that NRCPD is aware of the gap and is trying to address this.

### **AOB**

18. GD advised that Jeff Brattan-Wilson had asked her to raise the issue of unqualified translators being used on the Signature website. AP confirmed that had been raised with Signature; and he had been assured that it had been discussed by Signature's Senior Management Team which had taken the comments into account. He suggested that they write to Signature directly highlighting their concerns.
19. Jean Gough (JG) commented that AVSTTR have been in contact with Kimberly Curry (Signature) regarding a possible route to registration and are now looking for an update. AP advised to email Kimberly directly and to copy in Heidi.
20. EB asked if there was another upgrade course planned for Notetakers (14 members of ANP are still registered under the old CACDP qualification). She also asked whether other routes to registration were being considered. AP suggested that, in respect of routes to registration this should be set out in an email to NRCPD, which could then be discussed with Signature.
21. Jayne Oakes (JO) stated that there are people on the register for Deafblind interpreters who have different levels of qualifications, which has caused confusion in respect of tenders and procurement exercises. AP advised JO to write to NRCPD formally about this.

### **Date of next meeting**

22. Conference call on Tuesday 25 July 2017 @ 10:00