

NRPSI REVIEW

Post Review Sub-Committee

Notes of meeting held 8th February 2010

Present: Brooke Townsley (chair)
Tony Bell
John Hammond
Willie Makin
Alan Thompson
Zuzana Windle

Apologies: Keith Moffitt

Please find below a record of the main points discussed at the sub-committee meeting held on the date shown above, indicating the current trends in the sub-committee's thinking. This summary was confirmed at the following meeting on 22 February.

The main heads of discussion during the meeting were as follows:

1. Establishment of the National Register as a regulatory body (non-statutory). We agreed to recommend a model based on two sorts of bodies, each carrying out discrete functions, namely
 - a) a regulator
 - b) a membership organisation or organisations

The functions of the Regulator should be

1. to set entry standards to the profession leading to inclusion on the Regulator's List
2. to establish which educational/training qualifications grant entry on the list
3. to establish what requirements should be in place in terms of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and/or continuing practice for continued registration on the list
4. to promulgate a Code of Conduct for registrants and to promulgate and administer the linked Disciplinary Procedures
5. to liaise with examination bodies and membership bodies and the public on matters linked to the working of the regulator

It was also noted that the recommendations contained in the White Paper, referred to extensively in the Review document, were accepted as such but not seen as mandatory.

2. It was agreed that an eventual objective could be that the regulatory body should have an expanded jurisdiction, i.e. that it should cover not just Public Service Interpreters but also provide regulation for other language

professionals. This may lead to economies of scale, with more favourable funding implications.

It was recognised that this should be an element in the structural planning, but that it should not get in the way of the immediate objectives.

3. Re: the constitution of the regulatory body, it was agreed that, in line with the recommendations of the White Paper and the NRPSI Review, we should recommend that the governing body of the Regulator contain a majority of lay members and a minority of professional members. It was agreed that, taking eventual achievement of statutory protection of title for the profession as an ultimate aim, it would be beneficial to establish the professional regulator now in a form that would facilitate achievement of this in the future.

It was agreed that the governing board of the Regulator should consist of 11 persons, 6 of whom would be lay appointees, 5 of whom would be elected from the profession.

Discussion then moved on to the matter of where the central list of registered professionals would reside and how it would be administered. The model that the sub-committee agreed to recommend is as follows:

the Regulator should maintain a full list of registrants who are cleared to practise, according to the Regulator's professional criteria
the Regulator should maintain and make available a public access register of the names, language(s) offered and professional specialisation (s) only of the registrants on the list. This list (*hereafter 'the Regulator's List'*) would be available free of charge to the public without restriction. Its function would be to allow a potential user of an individual linguist (interpreter, translator or otherwise) to confirm whether or not that individual has been cleared to practise according to the professional criteria promulgated by the Regulator
further personal details of registrants, such as location, contact details, availability, should be made available to the membership body or bodies referred to at 1b above (subject to the consent of the registrants on the Regulator's List, in line with DPA regulations). This data should not be made publicly available through the Regulator or on the Regulator's List
using this further level of personal detail provided by the Regulator, the membership body or bodies should maintain their '*Membership Lists*' – with a 'find an interpreter' function included. The possibility of a membership body also providing a call centre function was raised
liability for management of membership lists will lie with the membership organisations
joining a membership organisation that receives data from the Regulator and that holds and maintains a membership list would not be compulsory. However, inclusion on a membership list, and the ability to benefit from the provisions made by the membership body holding a membership list, would inevitably be contingent on membership of that body

4. It was decided that the Appointments Commission should be contacted with a view to establishing whether it can help with the appointment of lay members of the regulatory body.

5. Following the request made at the Forum on 30 January for a declaration of sub-committee members' relevant interests, it was agreed to provide the same without delay. All sub-committee members would disclose any external activities or involvements that they feel might be considered or perceived as prejudicial to their work on the sub-committee.

(N.B. at the first meeting of the sub-committee on 08/02/2010 the Chair invited all sub-committee members present to declare any external activities they thought the sub-committee should be aware of, which they did. This request included the Chair. All sub-committee members will complete the Declaration of Interests form used by Council of the CIOL. Completed forms will be lodged with the CIOL.)

6. The question of confidentiality of sub-committee discussions was raised. It was agreed that a communiqué outlining the discussions in each meeting would be prepared and published on the NRPSI/CIOL websites following each sub-committee meeting. Preparation of the communiqué falls to the Chair.

7. The suggestion from the Forum that an Internet discussion forum be established was revisited. It was agreed to recommend that the NRPSI should set up a forum; the remit of this forum is to host discussion of the ideas under discussion in the sub-committee. It was agreed that it would have to be moderated and that a moderator from without the existing committees or processes should be sought. (Chair to contact an individual suggested for this role).

(N.B. since the 08/02/2010 meeting a moderator for the proposed Internet discussion forum external to the sub-committee or the CIOL/NRPSI has been approached and has agreed in principle to moderate the group. The technical arrangements to establish the group are due for completion as soon as possible).

8. The issue of access to the National Register by agencies was discussed, specifically in relation to the transition of the existing NRPSI to its eventual new form. It was agreed to recommend the following to Council of the CIOL and the NRPSI board:

1. that the existing NRPSI should carry out a consultation exercise with NRPSI registrants. The purpose of this consultation will be to ask Registrants whether they believe agencies should be allowed access to the NRPSI list

2. the NRPSI will collate the responses. The responses to the consultation exercise will be passed to all existing subscribers

3. existing subscribers, including public services that are currently using agencies to supply their interpreting needs, will thus be made aware of the current climate of opinion of NRPSI registrants on this issue, as indicated by the consultation results. This will enable those subscribers to plan for all possible eventualities when the new NRPSI regulator comes into existence

The purpose of the consultation on access to the NRPSI list by agencies is to facilitate a smooth transition to the new regulatory arrangements.

9. It was agreed that the sub-committee should seek a meeting with the head of the Better Trials Unit of the OCJR as soon as practicable.