

Accredited Registers

Condition Review: Rehabilitation Workers Professional Network (RWPN)

1. Outcome

- 1.1 At the Rehabilitation Workers Professional Network (RWPN)'s initial accreditation, the Professional Standards Authority ('we') issued 12 Conditions on its accreditation, one of which was to be completed by 30 April 2022 (see paragraph 2.2). This report sets out our assessment of the actions taken by the RWPN to satisfy the Condition.
- 1.2 We found that the RWPN had met Condition five.

2. Background

- 2.1 We assess registers against our *Standards for Accredited Registers* ('the Standards')¹. 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 At RWPN's initial accreditation, completed in March 2022, we issued 12 Conditions (a full list is published on the RWPN's [directory page](#)), Condition five had to be implemented by 30 April 2022:
The RWPN should review its register entries for consistency, accuracy and clarity of information.
- 2.3 This report discusses the actions RWPN took to address the Condition, as well as our decision about whether the Condition is met. RWPN's responses to the remaining Conditions will be considered in due course.
- 2.4 We reviewed the following evidence:
 - a) RWPN's reported actions about what it had done to meet Condition five
 - b) The RWPN's [register](#).

3. Concerns leading to the Condition

- 3.1 As part of our assessment of the RWPN we carried out checks on its register. We found that there were gaps in the information presented for the register type (register of Rehabilitation Workers, Register of Habilitation Workers, Dual Registered Rehabilitation/Habilitation) and the country in 16 of the 288 registrants that were listed on the register at the time of the checks. The RWPN reported that this was due to registrants not completing their profiles and noted that they were sending out reminders to all registrants.
- 3.2 We also found that one registrant had 'other' listed under qualifications. The RWPN confirmed that the registrant with 'other' listed as their qualification had completed a recognised course, but it was not listed as an option on the list of qualifications that can be chosen by registrants. There were an additional two

¹ The RWPN were originally assessed against the [Standards for Accredited Registers \(April 2016\)](#)

registrants for whom 'other' was listed as their country of practice. During the site visit the RWPN informed us that this used to refer to overseas registrants, but now only refers to the Channel Islands as overseas members will not appear on the register.

- 3.3 Further details can be found under Standard 10 of the RWPN's initial accreditation outcome.²

4. Assessment of Condition five

- 4.1 The RWPN provided the following response to the Condition on 6 May 2022.

'There should be no gaps in the public-facing register other than where no register is shown for overseas members. We had originally decided not to include overseas members on the register as they would not be covered by the accreditation, but at the request of a couple of them who felt it gave them more recognition than their current country of employment, overseas members are now included; however, they have been written to, to clarify the situation and not been sent the logo to use - there is also a statement on the register page stating that only UK registrants are covered by the PSA accreditation.

There has been a delay in completing all of this information as we have waited for responses from those members who had left gaps in their details when registering (the 'country' field was not originally set up as a required field so some of our oldest members had not selected one.)'

- 4.2 At its initial accreditation we discussed overseas members with the RWPN and confirmed that accreditation applies to UK registrants only and we issued a Recommendation under Standard 1 for them to provide clear information to the public and registrants about this and ensure that the quality mark is used correctly. This will be assessed at the RWPN's next full review. However, in the meantime we noted the positive development that the RWPN's register webpage now contains the following statement 'Our register is accredited by the Professional Standards Authority. (Please note that registrants who are listed as working overseas have met RWPN's requirements to be on our register but are not covered by the accreditation from the Professional Standards Authority.)' making it clear that the overseas registrants are not covered by the programme.

- 4.3 We reviewed the RWPN's register but did not review individual profiles in detail. We noted the following:

- There are four overseas registrants, three of whom have no register noted as advised above, however, one does have a register listed.
- There were three registrants who had blank fields for 'evidence seen'
- There was one registrant who had 'pending/yes' under evidence seen

2

https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.professionalstandards.org.uk%2Fdocs%2Fdefault-source%2F accredited-registers%2Fpanel-decisions%2Frehabilitation-workers-professional-network-accreditation-decision.docx%3Fsfvrsn%3Dad644820_6&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK

- 4.4 We told the RWPN about the above points. RWPN update the register by removing the register name from the overseas registrant's entry and updating the 'evidence seen' field for the three registrants (checked 17 May 2022).
- 4.5 The 'evidence seen' column refers to whether the RWPN has seen evidence required to register. At the site visit as part of the initial assessment RWPN stated that there should not be anyone visible on the register where evidence of qualification has not been seen. During our checks we noted however, that this field included registrants who were denoted as 'pending' and 'no.' The RWPN confirmed that it has changed its practice and that registrants will now be shown as pending for up to one month. If after this time the RWPN has not seen the required evidence, the registrant will be removed from the register. The RWPN will endeavour to contact the registrant using different methods of contact where available to remind them of the need to provide this information before they can be re-instated on the register.
- 4.6 For the registrant who was noted as 'pending/yes' under evidence seen, the RWPN stated that although they had seen evidence of qualification, they were still waiting to see evidence of a name change which is why the entry shows both 'yes' and 'pending.' This could be confusing to someone looking at the register as it appears to be contradictory, and we suggest that the RWPN review its policy for annotating the register while it is waiting to review evidence of a name change.
- 4.7 The 'evidence seen' field has now been updated so all registrants are either 'yes' or 'pending' (checked 17 May 2022).
- 4.8 We also noted that there were six registrants who had listed various combinations of the registers they were on rather than stating 'dual registered.' This is not a public protection issue and should not impact on a member of the public's ability to make an informed choice, it does however go to the consistency point in the Condition. When considering Condition six part b³ the RWPN should ensure that its checks include consistency in the presentation of information as well as accuracy.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The issues highlighted at the initial assessment were around missing country and register information. The RWPN has resolved these issues, and although we noted a small number of errors, (which are now resolved) we suggest that these are unlikely to be a public protection issue. These errors could however impact on a person's ability to make an informed choice, so it is important that the RWPN put in place mechanisms to identify them (Condition six part b).
- 5.2 We therefore found that Condition five has been met but highlight the importance of ensuring that the register remains up to date, accurate and consistent. We will check the accuracy of the register at the RWPN's next review as well as the mechanisms they have put in place to ensure the accuracy of the register.

³ the RWPN should develop quality assurance mechanisms to ensure that the information on the register remains accurate and up to date. This could include for example regular audit of the public register – due April 2023