

Reversion of title to 'Regulations for Registration'

1. The Registration Code of Practice has always served as the regulatory instrument for matters related to professional review, registration, and recognition of learning. The title has reverted to 'Regulations for Registration' to align with the Code of Practice for Document Hierarchy & Associated Language adopted by the Engineering Council Board in 2021, which refers to the Regulations for Registration, Regulations for Licensing, and Engineering Council Regulations.

Recognised Standards in the RfR

2. A number of additions and changes have been made to the RfR to enable the use of Recognised Standards. While the definitions of the reference standard (UK-SPEC) and derived standards (as adopted by PEIs) codify existing practice, 'proprietary standards' represent a new category, the first of which would be the UK-SPEC HRB Standard and corresponding section of the Register, as part of the Contextualised Registration project. Two further variants approved by RSC and the Board will be added in due course, relating to standards developed by licensees or other third parties that are mapped as fully or partially meeting UK-SPEC. The key addition introducing the concept of a Recognised Standard is at RfR paragraph 8 (below). Other amendments and additions are clearly marked in the annexed draft.

8 *Where these Regulations refer to UK-SPEC or 'the standard', they shall be taken to refer equally to Recognised Standards derived or developed by licensees or the Engineering Council, including the ICTTech standard.*

Appeals and decision-making

3. It was noted that in some cases where an applicant has not been recommended for registration by an interview panel, a licensee's committee has determined the assessment to be unduly harsh, has not accepted the recommendation and has admitted the applicant to the Register. On its face this contravenes current RCoP paragraph 22, which includes the clause *The Committee shall not award a registration title if the assessors' recommendation is not to do so*; where 'assessors' includes interview assessors.
4. In cases where the committee responsible for registration observes some divergence from standard practice in any part of the professional review process, or is unable to accept the recommendation for any reason, it would be expected to take appropriate action, such as inviting the assessors to clarify or revise the recommendation, or proposing a repeat of that aspect of the professional review (initial assessment or interview where applicable). The following clause has been added to draft regulation 25.

Each Licensee shall have a procedure for the Committee to follow in cases where the decision is not to accept an applicant for registration on the basis of the reports from the Professional Review. The Committee may recommend that the applicant be invited to repeat one or more components of the Professional Review.

5. Applicants for registration are guaranteed a right of appeal against an unsuccessful professional review by current RCoP paragraph 24:

Each Licensee shall have an appeals procedure available to unsuccessful applicants.

Unsuccessful applicants may appeal against the legitimacy of the process followed by the Licensee during Professional Review, but not against the decision itself. Appeals shall be considered by an Appeals Committee composed of registrants who did not materially participate in the appellant's Professional Review.

6. Although not explicit in the regulation, the final decision remains with the registration committee, and there is an expectation the registration committee will have a process in place to respond to the outcome of an appeal. Where an appeal is upheld, this indicates that an aspect of the professional review process has not been carried out correctly, however it does not constitute a re-assessment or new recommendation. Therefore, the following clause has been added to draft regulation 27:

An Appeals Committee may recommend that the applicant be invited to repeat one or more components of the Professional Review, but may not summarily reverse the recommendation of an earlier assessment. The final decision remains with the Registration Committee.

Other changes to the RfR

7. The use of 'full' to indicate a final stage registrant has been changed, in each case, to 'final stage', for consistency with language used elsewhere. [RSC minute 2020/188].
8. The regulations on compensation and condonement have been updated to reflect the changes approved by RSC in October 2021 [RSC minute 2021/228b].
9. Where the Engineering Council, or RSC in particular, is shown as the authorising body for exceptional circumstances in the Regulations, that body is required to 'authorise' rather than 'approve' a decision, in line with the standard terminology used elsewhere in the standard and regulations.
10. Backdating of recognition has been limited to two years and the current recognition period. This is in response to concerns about licensees attempting to backdate recognition by longer periods, and for earlier recognitions.

Extensions to recognition periods of one year were already granted in the regulations. This has been amended, in accordance with RSC direction. The policy permitting PEIs to extend accreditations by one year, once only, without needing RSC approval, was extended into RCoP 4. The regulations should be revised to reflect this when it is next reviewed. In other words, licensees may not extend any recognition by more than one year.