

## Chartered Scientist Standards Consultation

Please can you complete the below and email back to Amy or Ali by the **30<sup>th</sup> January 2015** at the latest: [A.Pearce@sciencecouncil.org](mailto:A.Pearce@sciencecouncil.org) or [A.Orr@sciencecouncil.org](mailto:A.Orr@sciencecouncil.org) :

### 1. How do you currently use the CSci standards?

- Bench-markers
- Paper based application process
- Paper based and Interview based application process
- On your website
- Workshops
- Other

If other please state:

The application process is generally paper based although interviews can be conducted as an option, typically alongside institute membership applications, in exceptional circumstances.

### 2. Do you use the CSci standards to benchmark any other processes e.g. Specialist registers; Professional Development/Employer Schemes, Degree accreditation etc, and how will the changes affect these processes? Please specify details

The requirements for CSci are considered equivalent to those for successful completion of the NHS Scientist Training Programme (STP), leading to eligibility for registration as a Clinical Scientist with the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC). If a candidate has successfully completed this scheme they are considered eligible for both Full Membership of IPEM and registration with CSci.

The requirements for RSci are considered equivalent to those for registration with the Register of Clinical Technologists (RCT). An individual just meeting the RSci / RCT requirements would also be eligible for Associate Membership of IPEM. However, more experienced clinical technologists may also be eligible for Full Membership of IPEM and also progression to CSci (please see discussion later).

### 3. What are your impressions of the new standards?

The changes emphasise a route of progression in terms of education, experience and responsibility from RSciTech, through RSci and finally to CSci, with CSci being considered the level to which all professional scientists should aspire. This is overwhelming positive in that it increases the relevance of all designations by tying them clearly to career progression. However, the language may be confusing to the traditional IPEM membership base and care will be taken in highlighting the opportunities these changes will bring to our members.

The majority of IPEM members are based in the NHS and are divided into two groups: technologists / dosimetrists and physicists / engineers. Career "progression" from

technologist / dosimetrist to physicist / engineer is relatively uncommon: both groups have strong individual identities and each has a discrete role to play. Indeed, many technologists / dosimetrists would not consider “promotion” to a scientist as progression but rather a fundamental change in direction.

Although IPEM utilises knowledge of established training programmes to assess whether a technologist, technician or physicist is eligible for membership once the common bar has been met all Full Members are considered equal, regardless of professional discipline. This is compatible with the Science Council concept of career progression because an experienced NHS “technologist” or “technician” can still achieve RSci and CSci by meeting the required competencies. This is very much in line with the concept of the NHS healthcare scientist: a “scientist”, including a Chartered Scientist, does not necessarily need to be a physicist. One of IPEM’s challenges will be to encourage eligible technologists to apply for CSci rather than assuming RSci is an intrinsic limit for them.

4. Do you feel that the new standards are applicable to all Scientists working at this level within your membership? Please specify details

Yes – please see comments above.

For NHS members the standards ally very well with those required for HCPC and RCT membership. We are working to demonstrate that the CPD required to maintain HCPC or RCT registration is also sufficient to maintain CSci and RSci registration. This is beneficial because it emphasises the relevance of the standards.

For academic and industry members the standards also represent a tangible framework for career progression via structured CPD.

5. Do the revisions to the standards cause any problems to your mapping processes if applicable? How will the changes affect them?

How will the changes to the standards affect your current mapping processes? (if applicable)

No changes will be required.

6. How will the changes to the standards affect your application processes?

No changes will be required.

7. Would you need to translate the standards into your own format or will you be using the standards as written? Please specify details

No – we already use the standards as written so will just need to update our documentation to match the new standards.

8. If applicable, how did you manage the changes to the Engineering Council Standards or the Society for the Environment practice directions? How long did it take before these new standards were fully integrated and being used?

9. Please can you outline the steps you will need to take in order to implement the new standards?

1. Update internal documentation, especially the forms given to candidates to help them demonstrate they have met the appropriate competences.
2. Ratification by governance structures.
3. Communication with membership.
4. Publication of updated documentation on website.

10. If a time scale of 1 year was scheduled for those submitting under the old process, how would this be managed internally and would that time scale be viable?

There will be little impact to us. It will just be a case of updating the internal documentation and the forms published on our website.

11. What support would you like to see from the Science Council during the implementation period?

1. New marketing literature.
2. Review after one year to reflect on impact and address unexpected issues.

12. Any further comments?

No