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Preface

The National Register of Public Service Interpreters (NRPSI) was set up in 1994 following a Royal Commission which recommended a register of the most highly qualified interpreters be established to protect the public from the consequences of poor and inappropriate interpreting in the public sector. This remains our core purpose.

Furthermore, the reasons for establishing the National Register remain just as relevant today. When an interpreter is working in a public service setting, usually in a potentially life-changing or life-threatening interview situation, they are the only person who understands what both of the other parties are saying. If the professional ability and integrity of the interpreter cannot be relied upon, the potential for abuse of the public’s trust is clear. NRPSI was set up with help from the Home Office and the Nuffield Foundation to ensure those used as interpreters in the public sector are appropriately qualified, have the right levels of experience, and are ready to carry out interpreting assignments.

NRPSI’s core function is to protect the public and the public purse from poor practice in interpreting. The risk and ramifications of not using highly qualified and experienced public service interpreters in the courts, in police interview rooms and in doctors’ consulting rooms, to name but a few of the scenarios in which they should be used, is incalculable. The majority of Registrants are on Full status, qualified to honours degree level (level 6) or above in the skills required to work in a public service setting and in possession of the requisite experience. The Register contains a substantial proportion of the eligible, trained, qualified and regulated interpreters in the UK, albeit the number of Registered Interpreters (also referred to as Registrants) is in decline, largely as a result of the policy of outsourcing the engagement of public service interpreters to agencies and the reduction in terms and conditions this has brought about.

While NRPSI is not a membership organisation, we do have close contacts and an affinity with many language and interpreting membership organisations. Like these types of organisation, we recognise the need to deliver against our objectives for the benefit of our Registrants/members. Doing this is among our highest priorities. We differ from these organisations in as much as, as a Regulator, indeed the Regulator of the public service interpreting profession in the UK, our purpose is to uphold the standards of practice that safeguard the public, the profession of interpreting and the professional status of interpreting.

While our long-term aim is for statutory recognition, the fact NRPSI is a voluntary Regulator says much about the standing and professionalism of those interpreters who choose to register with us and gives a high level of quality assurance to those who engage their professional services.

“NRPSI’s core function is to protect the public and the public purse from poor practice in interpreting.”

Indeed, for NRPSI, ‘quality’ is one of the defining characteristics of the public service interpreting profession. It is the quality of the qualifications and experience of our Registrants and the interpreting services they deliver which sets them apart; they represent the pinnacle of the profession. And, of course, the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct underpinning their professional practice is based on quality and standards.

Given the existence of NRPSI’s independent professional conduct and disciplinary processes, there is no need for privately owned agencies – which, by their very nature, are not free from commercial and other interests – to handle complaints about interpreters, as long as these interpreters are Registrants on the National Register. Indeed, the public interest is better served by such complaints being handled by the Independent Regulator: NRPSI.

I trust you find this Review an illuminating insight into the public service interpreting sector.

Ted Sangster
Chairman

“NRPSI’s core function is to protect the public and the public purse from poor practice in interpreting.”
In today’s globalised yet fractured world, each country affected by mass migration flows, which create culturally, linguistically and ethnically diverse societies, has a growing demand for public service interpreting. This need has never been greater in the UK and yet, paradoxically, the number of trained, qualified, accredited, registered and regulated public service interpreters listed on the National Register is in decline.

This year’s Annual Review, analysing the registration data collected on 31 December 2018, confirms 1,730 accredited, registered and regulated public service interpreters as being on the National Register. Contrast this figure with the 2,392 interpreters who were registered in January 2012, and the drop in the number of Registered Interpreters available to the public services is clear. The reasons for this decline warrant examination.

The dissatisfaction of professional interpreters with the working conditions created by public sector outsourcing is well known. The resultant restrictive terms and lowering engagement fees are driving them away from public service interpreting. At the heart of this challenging environment lies the current attitudes of government, senior civil servants, procurement framework writers, procurement managers and practitioners in the public services, which are focused on cost-saving, as well as the often short-term, profit-driven motives of many of the privately owned language service agencies.

Individuals who do not speak or understand English should not be hindered from accessing public service organisations and need to be provided with effective interpreting services. And the public services need to be protected from poor-quality interpreting services and the ever-present risk of costly miscarriages of justice and medical misdiagnoses that comes with their use. There is a constant clamour for more qualified and experienced interpreters, yet, as mentioned, there are now fewer Registered Interpreters to meet this need. As a public service languages community, we need to explore opportunities to face these challenges and begin to effect positive changes to interpreters’ working conditions and engagement fees, as well as to attitudes towards public service interpreting.

Procurement practices producing cost-savings and meeting supply requirements at the expense of delivering high-quality and effective services should not be seen as successful. No amount of money saved will guarantee the effective, high-quality interpreting needed by judges, barristers, police authorities, doctors or indeed the individual who cannot speak English and needs to communicate, be they a patient, victim, witness or defendant. It is vital that the public sector sets its budgets for interpreting services on the basis of a commitment to principle and law, not on expedient frugality. Such attempts to save money have a negative domino effect.

Making use of linguists with no interpreting qualifications or experience threatens the public and public services. Pseudo-interpreters, bilinguals, and ersatz interpreters with low-grade or no interpreting qualifications and limited public service experience are not acceptable replacements for registered and regulated professionals. Interpreting engagements in the public sector need to be carried out by those who are fit to practise: interpreters with a level 6 Diploma in Police Interpreting (DPI) or a Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (DPSI), with more than 400 hours’ experience and who adhere to the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct.

Yet the UK Government states there is no demand across the entirety of the public sector to mandate the use of accredited, registered and regulated interpreters for all interpreting services.

continued...
The Government also states it does not perceive mandatory registration of interpreters to be a viable option.

Well-trained, qualified and experienced public service interpreters contribute to the safeguarding of human rights. Registrants who voluntarily abide by the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct are inspirational beacons of professionalism in the public services language services landscape.

This year’s Annual Review sounds a clarion call for regulatory status for public service interpreters, and appeals to the Government to make it mandatory for the public sector to use only registered and regulated public service interpreters. While NRPSI regulates those interpreters who display the professional self-regard to be on the National Register, NRPSI is powerless to deal with complaints against unregistered interpreters. Were it statutory for interpreters working in the public sector to be registered and thus regulated, and if it were mandatory for the public services to use only registered and regulated interpreters, then the public and the public purse would be better protected.

Ensuring fair working conditions and engagement fees ought to lure many lapsed Registrants back to the not-for-profit National Register.

Changes to these conditions and fees will also help to attract new talent to the interpreting profession and the National Register, ensuring the availability of registered and regulated public service interpreters to the public services.

Please let us know if you have any queries or suggestions that could be followed up in future Reviews.

Please email any questions or thoughts on this edition of the Annual Review to mike@nrpsi.org.uk.

“This year’s Annual Review sounds a clarion call for regulatory status for public service interpreters, and appeals to the Government to make it mandatory for the public sector to use only registered and regulated public service interpreters.”

Summary

This edition of the Annual Review shows 1,730 Registrants offering 104 different languages, with 15% of Registrants offering more than one language. There are 2,056 language listings in total. An increase in the average number of years Registrants stay on the Register – continuing to be more than 10 years – is also shown. The youngest Registrant is 22 and the oldest is 91 years old (and still working), with the average age being 52.7 years. The Register thus provides users with a selection of highly experienced professionals.

Currently (September 2019), the number of registered website users stands at 14,000, which is an increase of 2,000 over the number at the close of 2018.
2. Registration Statistics

In order to be registered, interpreters need to fulfil the registration requirements at their first application with NRPSI and at each subsequent annual renewal. The criteria NRPSI uses are geared towards the specific needs of interpreting in public service environments, with their specialised terminology, high-pressure situations and demanding requirements. Registered public service interpreters require more than just language skills. The criteria vary over time, in response to changing needs. The National Register is not simply a list, but a dynamic repository of skilled professionals who are available to fulfil the needs of the public services; it is also a way of helping interpreters to continuously manage their professional standards.

Number of languages spoken by each person

- 1 language (only), 1,465, 85%
- 2 languages (only), 216, 12%
- 3 languages (only), 38, 2%
- 4 languages (only), 10, 1%
- 5 languages (only), 1, 0%

Most are On Register for one language 85%

15% (265 people) offer two languages or more

3% (49 people) offer three languages or more

2,056 language listings on the Register

1,730 Registrants on the Register

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)

Skills the Registrants offer

2.1 Language expertise

If they have the appropriate expertise and qualifications, interpreters can register for more than one language. The registration criteria apply to each language registered – see Graph 2.10 for qualifications held. The majority of Registrants offer one language, but, because of the 15% who offer two or more languages, there were 2,056 language listings on the Register on 31 December 2018.
2.2 Languages offered

This edition of the Annual Review shows 1,730 Registrants offering a total of 104 languages, 54 of which are registered at Rare Language status – see Graph 2.3 for an explanation of language statuses. The languages available are determined by the language skills of those in the UK who are interested in the profession of interpreting as a career. The most popular languages on the Register are clearly related to demand, which is largely driven by immigrant populations.

### 104 languages On Register

- Albanian
- Amharic
- Arabic
- Armenian (Eastern)
- Azerbaijani
- Azeri
- Bambara
- Bengali
- Bengali
- Bilen
- Basque
- Bengali
- Bilen
- Bari
- Bantu
- Dutch
- Farsi
- Flemish (Dutch)
- French
- Irish
- Georgian
- Greek
- Gujerati
- Hebrew
- Hindi
- Hindi
- Igbo
- Ilocano
- Indonesian
- Italian
- Jamaican Patois
- Japanese
- Korean
- Krio

### 54 registered at Rare Language status

- Kurdish: Bahdini
- Kurdish: Feyli
- Kurdish: Kurmanji
- Kurdish: Sorani
- Kirgiz
- Khmer
- Lingala
- Lithuanian
- Lingua Franca
- Macedonian (Gorani)
- Malay
- Mandarin
- Malagasy
- Malagasy
- Malay
- Manipuri
- Moldovan
- Mongolian
- Moroccan
- Nepali
- Nihang Sarhali
- Pashto
- Pidgin English (Nigerian)
- Pidgin English (West African)
- Portuguese
- Polish
- Punjabi
- Romanian
- Russian
- Serbo-Croatian
- Shona
- Somali
- Somali
- Standard Arabic
- Sudanese Arabic
- Swedish
- Swiss German
- Tagalog
- Tamil
- Telugu
- Thai
- Tigrinya
- Turkish
- Urdu
- Vietnamese
- Wolof
- Yoruba

### 104 different languages currently On Register

### 36 languages are spoken by 10 Registrants or more

### The main languages On Register are:

- **Polish** 13%
- **Urdu** 7%
- **Romanian** 6%
- **Arabic** 6%
- **Spanish** 4%
- **Russian** 4%
- **French** 4%
- **Farsi** 4%
- **Mandarin** 3%
- **Portuguese** 3%

% based on 2,056 language listings On Register

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.3 Language status

An interpreter can register their language on the National Register at one of four statuses: Full, Interim (a), Interim (b) or Rare Language. Full status is for those who meet all the registration criteria. Interim status is for those interpreters who have either achieved the qualification requirements of Full status but have not yet been able to provide the evidence of 400 hours’ work (Interim (a) status), or have met some of the qualification requirements and have provided evidence of more than 400 hours of public sector interpreting work in the UK (Interim (b) status). Those on either Interim statuses are provided with deadlines to meet the requirements for Full status in the language.

The Rare Language status is defined as being for those languages for which there is no public service interpreting qualification available at the time of registration (a certified standard of English is required). Although there are 135 Rare Language entries on the Register, only 38 Registrants have a Rare Language – and no other – registered.

2.4 Rare Language registrations

There are 54 languages recorded at the NRPSI Rare Language status – see Graph 2.2. NRPSI defines a ‘Rare Language’ as one for which there is currently no interpreting qualification available in the UK. Examinations are run on demand, so one year there might be an examination in a particular language and the next year there might not. As a result, it is possible for the same language to be recorded at Full, Interim and Rare Language status for different Registrants, depending on whether an examination for it was available at the time it was last registered. There are 15 languages that were previously available on the Register (the majority at Rare Language status) that are not currently represented.
2.5 Average years On Register and at status

The average years On Register applies to individual Registrants, while the average years for statuses are per language. The average number of years interpreters have been On Register continues to rise – the longest period On Register is 24 years. Those Registrants with a language at one of the Interim statuses are expected to upgrade this to Full status and are provided with deadlines by which to do so, hence the shorter average periods shown for the Interim statuses.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.6 The sex of Registrants

64% of Registrants are women.

2.7 The age of Registrants

To be able to register, interpreters must be at least 18 years old. There is no upper age limit, but Registrants must be physically and mentally fit to practise. The youngest Registrant is 22 and the oldest 91, with the average age on Register being 52.7.
2.8 Nationalities and mother tongues

There are 66 different nationalities represented on the Register (a minority hold dual nationality) and 85 different mother tongues. Most hold British nationality (63%), although English is the mother tongue for only 5%.

The main nationalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main mother tongues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish: Sorani</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.9 Mother tongue differences by sex

Although Graph 2.6 shows that a significant majority of Registrants are women, this is not true of every language, where cultural influences may have a part to play. Public service users may legitimately choose the sex of the interpreter as one of the criteria when selecting which professional to engage for a specific assignment.
Attributes the Registrants hold

2.10 Qualifications by status

The Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (DPSI), awarded by the Institute of Linguists Educational Trust (IoLET), was designed specifically to provide an honours-degree-level qualification (level 6 on the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)) for interpreting in the public services, and was initiated at about the time NRPSI was originally established.

Unsurprisingly, the IoLET DPSI is the most popular qualification held by Registrants, followed by its sister qualification for working with the police: the Diploma in Police Interpreting (formerly the Metropolitan Police Test, or ‘MetTest’). A significant minority of Registrants hold qualifications at level 7 on the QCF, usually Masters of Arts certifications.

The most popular qualification is

IoLET DPSI (77%/45%)

for Full and Interim status languages respectively

IoLET DPSI and DPI breakdown by pathway for Full status languages

IoLET DPSI Law qualifications
1,095 Registrants

IoLET DPI/MetTest qualifications
735 Registrants

IoLET DPSI Health qualifications
164 Registrants

IoLET DPSI Local Government qualifications
142 Registrants

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.11 Number of qualifications held
Registrants must be suitably qualified for each language on their record. Many Registrants have more than one qualification, as shown in this graph. (The English language qualifications required for Rare Language registration are not included in this analysis.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Total individual qualifications</th>
<th>Interpreting qualification</th>
<th>Translation qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 qualification</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 qualifications</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>2,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 qualifications</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 qualifications</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 qualifications</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 qualifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 qualifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.12 Professional association memberships

There are a number of professional membership associations that are relevant to public service interpreters. These associations provide professional support to their members and opportunities for Continuing Professional Development. Those associations with more than five Registrants recording membership are shown. Almost one third (31%) of Registrants reported being a member of a professional association – up slightly from the 29% reported in the last edition. A total of 153 Registrants recorded being members of more than one of the associations.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.13 Security clearances provided

Registrants need to provide evidence of at least one valid security clearance in order to join and remain on the Register. They are often working in security-sensitive environments such as with the police and in courts, and always where a high standard of integrity is essential. Different sectors of the public services require different clearances; for example, those working with vulnerable adults and children may require Enhanced Disclosure, while the police are increasingly standardising their own vetting for non-police personnel (NPPV3). Many Registrants hold more than one clearance for this reason. The Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) took over the activities of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) in 2012 and a DBS is equivalent to a CRB of the same level (e.g. Standard). The DBS Update service enables employers to carry out up-to-date checks online with the permission of the certificate holder. Registrants are increasingly subscribing to this service and providing NRPSI with permission to carry out the check and add it to their record.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
Geographical spread

2.14 Distribution by geographical region

Registrants tend to be found where there is work for them to do; so, naturally, Greater London – with its very large, diverse and fluctuating population – is home to the highest number at 39% of all Registrants.

Almost half of all Registrants are located in Greater London and the South East

A minority (53) are based in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland collectively

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,730)
2.15 Significant geographical concentrations of Registrants

Concentrations of Registrants in eight of the ten ‘core cities’ and other significant centres.

London is the main location, with around a third of interpreters on Register.

Greater Manchester 5% 63
Liverpool 1% 20
Birmingham 3% 59
Coventry 1% 15
Cardiff 1% 16
Bristol 1% 25
London 25% 441
Greater London 39% 670

2.16 Most popular languages registered in major centres

This table shows the top languages registered by interpreters in five major centres in the UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
<th>Leeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish (55)</td>
<td>Urdu (16)</td>
<td>Arabic (12)</td>
<td>Arabic (4)</td>
<td>Arabic (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic (33)</td>
<td>Arabic (7)</td>
<td>Urdu (12)</td>
<td>Farsi (4)</td>
<td>Polish (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish (32)</td>
<td>Mirpuri (7)</td>
<td>Romanian (6)</td>
<td>Slovak (4)</td>
<td>Farsi (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian (31)</td>
<td>Panjabi (7) (Pakistani)</td>
<td>Polish (4)</td>
<td>Hungarian (2)</td>
<td>Bengali (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (25)</td>
<td>Kurdish: Sorani (6)</td>
<td>Turkish (4)</td>
<td>French (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish (23)</td>
<td>Farsi (5)</td>
<td>Bengali (3)</td>
<td>Kurdistan: Bahdini (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Professional Standards

A fundamental part of registration is the requirement for Registrants to commit to following the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct as part of their obligation to uphold professional standards. Registrants reconfirm this commitment at each annual registration. NRPSI provides a free complaints process to the public for anyone who feels that a Registrant has not followed the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct. The Code, the procedures for making a complaint and the complaint form are all available on the NRPSI website.

Following an initial assessment by the Registrar of a submitted complaint, the process comprises two stages: the first is a review of the complaint by the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC), followed, if they see fit, by a referral to the Disciplinary Committee (DC). Registrants who have a sanction applied by the DC may submit an appeal. The following statistics describe the complaints seen by NRPSI and the time taken to deal with them. Apart from Graph 3.1, the statistics relate to complaints over the most recent three calendar years.

Scale of complaints handled by NRPSI

3.1 Complaints to NRPSI 1998–2018

While there has been an increase in complaints in 2018 over 2017, there is a general downward trend over recent years.

The spike in 2008 was due to a number of connected complaints.

NRPSI actively promotes the availability of its professional complaints service.
Analysis of complaints

3.2 Complaints by complainant type 2016–2018

Commercial language agencies and the police are the main users of Registrants and, therefore, are the main sources of complaints. NRPSI will sponsor some complaints itself – for example, breaches of the Code that come to light as part of the registration process.

3.3 Complaints by first language registered 2016–2018

Most complaints are not related to linguistic skills, which would be a breach of Code 5.1 – see Graph 3.6.
3.4 Complaints by status of first language registered by Registrant 2016–2018

The proportion of complaints by status can be compared to the representation across the whole Register in Graph 2.3. Note that, in this period, there were few complaints against Registrants whose first language was at Rare Language status.

All Registrants that were complained about had a recognised interpreting qualification.

NRPSI Complaints (post 1 April 11) Database (76)
3.5 Complaints by age of Registrant 2016–2018

The average age of those complained about was 55.71, compared to the average age of all Registrants, which is 52.7. The youngest and oldest age groups (25–34 and 75+) contain the fewest number of Registrants but attract a disproportionately high number of complaints.

3.6 Sections of NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct breached 2016–2018

Where there was a finding against a Registrant, this graph shows which sections of the NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct were found to have been breached. More than one section might be breached in a particular complaint.
Managing the professional complaints process

3.7 Prescribed maximum periods for each stage of the disciplinary process

All complaints follow the NRPSI Disciplinary Framework and Procedures, which are available from the NRPSI website. The Procedures set maximum periods for each step of the process to be completed, as shown opposite. The period to complete a complaint is reduced if the complainant, respondent or NRPSI Panel takes less time to respond. More time is taken if the complainant takes longer to provide evidence, if the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) requires further evidence or clarification, if a Disciplinary Committee (DC) hearing is delayed in order to combine with another case, if holidays or sickness introduce delays, or if there is an adjournment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of weeks</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complaint received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Record created and evidence gathered (1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complaint forwarded to the interpreter for comments to be submitted within 20 working days (4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appeals – interpreter must inform NRPSI of his/her intention to appeal within 15 working days from the notification (3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The appeal is sent to the Chairman, who should make a decision within 15 working days (3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If there is grounds for an appeal, the Appeals Committee should conduct the hearing within 30 working days of the Chairman’s decision (6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Report/decision of the Appeals Committee is sent to the interpreter within 10 working days (2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Case closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: **34 weeks**
3.8 Average time to complete disciplinary cases 2016–2018

The averages show the time to complete all complaints – whether by Registrar or determined by the PCC, the DC, the Chair of the Appeals Committee, or the Appeals Committee – during the periods shown.

3.9 Stages at which complaints were closed 2016–2018

Complaints will progress through the various stages as prescribed in the NRPSI Disciplinary Framework and Procedures Section E. The PCC reviewed 84% of the complaints submitted to NRPSI to determine what action should be taken.
3.10 Outcomes of complaints 2016–2018

There is a range of sanctions available to the PCC and DC if they find against a Registrant. These are described in detail in the NRPSI Disciplinary Framework and Procedures and the Indicative Sanctions Guidance provided to the Panels by NRPSI, both of which are published on the NRPSI website.°}
4. About the Data

In order to use statistical data sensibly, one needs to understand how they were derived. This section provides relevant background on how NRPSI carries out its regulatory role and contains important contextual information for the foregoing data. In the data presented, not all percentages will add up to exactly 100 due to rounding up or down.

Registration

Data originate from information provided by the applicants at the first language application stage, and subsequently at each annual renewal of registration. The data are entered into a purpose-designed database by a dedicated in-house team of Registration Officers. The anonymised data of 31 December 2018 were analysed by an independent specialist in data analysis, John Worthington, to produce the figures published here.

‘Interpreting’ is a specific skill that requires more than simply excellent language skills. To appear on the National Register, interpreters must meet a number of criteria, most notably in interpreting-specific qualifications, experience and security vetting. These are described in detail on the NRPSI website.

Registrants can register each of their languages under a number of statuses: Full, if they meet all the current criteria; or Interim either (a) or (b), if they have some of the required qualifications and relevant experience (Interim (b)) or, alternatively, have an acceptable qualification but do not yet have the required experience (Interim (a)). The Rare Language status is available for those interpreters with a language for which there is not currently a recognised public service interpreting qualification.

The full definitions of each status are on the NRPSI website under Qualifications and Experience Criteria for Entry. NRPSI requires registration to be renewed on an annual basis.

In Graph 2.5, Average years On Register and at status, NRPSI used the creation date of the records for each person still on the Register at 31 December 2018. This does not allow for those who may not have renewed for a period before returning to the Register.

In Graph 2.8, Nationalities and mother tongues, applicants provided evidence to conform to the registration requirements under the ‘Identity and the Entitlement to Work’ criteria. NRPSI will not necessarily be informed if a Registrant has dual nationality or changes nationality following registration.

In Graph 2.10, Qualifications by status, note that the Metropolitan Police Test was replaced by IoLET in 2014 with the DPI, which is Ofqual recognised.

The DPI is recognised by NRPSI as meeting the qualification criteria. The IoLET DPSI Law figure includes English, Northern Irish and Scottish Law variants.

In Graph 2.11, Number of qualifications held, for those at Rare Language status without a qualification, a band score of 7.0 is required as evidence of English to International English Language Testing System (IELTS) standard.

These English language qualifications are not included in the data. Those on Interim (b) status may hold ‘partial qualifications’ – for example, units of the IoLET DPSI, which are not included in the totals of qualifications.

In Graph 2.12, Professional association memberships, Registrants’ provision of information on their memberships is voluntary. If submitted, evidence of continuing membership of the relevant professional association is required. The associations are the Chartered Institute of Linguists (CIOL), the Association of Police and Court Interpreters (APCI), the Institute of Translation and Interpreting (ITI), the Society of Official Metropolitan Interpreters UK (SOMI), and the International Association of Professional Translators and Interpreters (IAPTI).
In Graph 2.13, Security clearances provided, clearances recorded as ‘Police Clearance’ include NPPV2 and NPPV3 clearances; clearances recorded as ‘Counter Terrorist Check’ include those produced by the police, Home Office and Ministry of Justice; clearances recorded as ‘Security Check’ include those produced by the police, Home Office and MoD.

In Graph 2.15, Significant geographical concentrations of Registrants, London and Greater London are defined by their postcodes. Other cities are defined by the town/city field in the registration database. The ‘core cities’ represent the councils of England’s eight largest city economies outside London (Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham and Sheffield), and then Cardiff and Glasgow.

Professional Standards

The casework involved in the complaints process is managed by the Professional Standards Manager using a separate database from the registration database. The Professional Standards Manager produces reports as required by the Registrar or the NRPSI Board. Complaints are allocated to the calendar year that the complaint was first received by NRPSI.

In Graph 3.1, Complaints to NRPSI 1998–2018, the data points from 1998–2010 are reproduced with the kind permission of the Chartered Institute of Linguists.

In Graph 3.3, Complaints by first language registered 2016–2018, the first language is the language the Registrant initially registered. As Graph 2.1 shows, 15% of Registrants also register a second language or more.

In Graph 3.6, Sections of NRPSI Code of Professional Conduct breached 2016–2018, ‘Other’ includes where there was only one instance of a transgression against a Code. The full Code is available on the NRPSI website.

In Graph 3.8, Average time to complete disciplinary cases 2016–2018, the period in weeks was calculated using www.timeanddate.com; the figures were automatically rounded up or down. The end date used in these analyses was the case closing date.

In Graph 3.10, Outcomes of complaints 2016–2018, the ‘Registrar resolved’ category includes cases that were dealt with by voluntary resolution. The referrals to the Appeals Committee shown in Graph 3.9 resulted in the original outcome being confirmed.

Feedback

NRPSI aims to make the Annual Review compliant with the UK Statistics Authority Code of Practice for Official Statistics. If you feel we have not achieved this, please provide examples of the departure from good practice to feedback@nrpsi.org.uk. Other opportunities for feedback are provided on the copyright page of this publication.
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