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Preface

The National Register was set up in 1994 following a Royal Commission that 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. That remains our core purpose.

However, there are other drivers – mainly focused on the needs, aspirations and characteristics of our Registrants – that also frame the National Register of Public Service Interpreters’ (NRPSI’s) actions and priorities.

While NRPSI is not a membership organisation, we do have close contacts and an affinity with many language and interpreting membership organisations. We have in common with these types of organisation the need to recognise that delivering to the requirements of our Registrants/members is among our highest priorities. The subtle difference is that, as a Regulator, indeed the Regulator of the public service interpreting profession, NRPSI’s 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 that we are a voluntary Regulator says a lot 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.

Indeed, ‘quality’ is for NRPSI one of the defining characteristics of the public service interpreting profession. It is the quality of the qualifications and experience of our 1,800+ Registrants and the interpreting services that they deliver that sets them apart; they represent the pinnacle of the profession. And, of course, the NRPSI Code of Conduct that underpins their professional practice is based on quality and standards.

Some of the information contained in this independently collated and analysed review demonstrates this; for example, the qualifications held by our Registrants, the depth of their experience and the outcomes of the workings of the NRPSI Code of Conduct. In addition, there is a range of other interesting, revealing and useful characteristics of the sector that have been gleaned from the information we hold, which is outlined in this, our fifth, Annual Review.

The fact that we have been publishing this for a number of years now provides the additional benefit of identifying trends, as well as reporting on straightforward facts. Maybe it also poses some questions, the answers to which could shed an even greater light on the profession – let us know if you have any such queries or suggestions that could be followed up in the future.

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

The need for public protection

The rationale behind the setting up of NRPSI in 1994 remains very much the same today: when an interpreter is working in a public service setting, usually in a potentially life-changing interview situation, they are the only person who understands what both the other parties are saying.

The potential for abuse of the public’s trust is clear if the professional ability and integrity of the interpreter cannot be relied upon.

NRPSI was set up with help from the Home Office and the Nuffield Foundation to ensure that those used as interpreters were appropriately qualified and ready to carry out an interpreting assignment when required – often at short notice.

NRPSI’s core function is to protect the public from poor practice in interpreting. At the end of 2017, the number of organisations in the UK registered to search the National Register for interpreters had increased by 25% to over 2,500, indicating the continuing demand for professional interpreters.

The principal way we protect the public is by maintaining the National Register. 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. We therefore believe the Register contains a substantial proportion of the eligible interpreters in the UK. The dimensions of the profession are provided in Section 2 Registration Statistics of this Annual Review and were collected on 31 December 2017.

National data show the need for language services. The last Census carried out in 2011 classified 88 main languages, other than English, spoken throughout England and Wales, while 863,000 respondents described their English language skills as ‘non-proficient’. The UK’s Conservative administration maintain their commitment to reducing net immigration to under 100,000 per year while, in September 2017, although net immigration was at its lowest point since early 2014, it still stood at 244,000.

NRPSI encourages Registrants to uphold their standards while registered; for example, we have run Continuing Professional Development days on the Code of Conduct, comprising workshops on ethical challenges faced by interpreters in everyday practice, and in the last year every Registrant has been issued with an encapsulated copy of the ‘Concise Code of Conduct’. Where there are allegations that a Registrant has not followed the NRPSI Code of Conduct, we provide a free professional misconduct process, which, in the most extreme cases of proven misconduct, can lead to suspension or expulsion from the Register. The complaints statistics are provided in Section 3 Professional Standards of this Annual Review and provide analysis of the complaints we have heard in the years 2015–2017.

While NRPSI regulates those interpreters who display the professional self-regard to be on the National Register, we are powerless to deal with complaints against unregistered interpreters. The NRPSI Board has therefore determined that the long-term strategy should be the statutory regulation of the public service interpreting profession. Widespread recognition of the vital role that professional interpreters play in enabling equal access to public services for non-English speakers, and the threat posed by unregulated professionals, needs to be backed up by legislation.

Summary

This edition of the Annual Review shows 1,807 Registrants offering 103 different languages. With 15% of Registrants offering more than one language, however, there are 2,142 language listings in total. Continued dissatisfaction among professional interpreters with the working conditions offered by government outsourcing has led to a small decline in the number registering, counterbalanced by an increase in the average number of years Registrants stay on the Register – now more than 10 years. The Register thus provides users with a selection of highly experienced professionals.

Stephen Bishop
Executive Director

We welcome comments and feedback from all interested parties. Please email feedback@nrpsi.org.uk.
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 that 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

Most are On Register for one language 85%

15% (273 people) offer two languages or more

3% (52 people) offer three languages or more

2,142 language listings on the Register

1,807 Registrants on the Register

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)

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 2,142 language listings on the Register on 31 December 2017.
2.2 Languages offered
This edition of the Annual Review shows 1,807 Registrants offering a total of 103 languages. Of these, 54 are registered at Rare Language status – see Graph 2.3 and Graph 2.4 for an explanation of this language status.

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. The top 10 most represented languages account for 63% of the interpreters on the Register. Half of the top 10 languages were from EU countries.

103 different languages currently On Register

The main languages On Register are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 languages are spoken by 10 Registrants or more

54 registered at Rare Language status

103 languages On Register

65 languages are spoken by 9 Registrants or fewer

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
2.3 Language status

An interpreter can register their language on the National Register at one of three statuses: Full, Interim 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 Interim status 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 137 Rare Language entries on the Register, only 32 Registrants have a Rare Language – and no other – registered.

2.4 Rare Language registrations

There were 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 were 12 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 23 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 (1,807)
About the interpreters

2.6 The sex of Registrants
A clear majority of Registrants are women.

65% Women (1,167)
35% Men (640)

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)

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 was 26 and the oldest 89, with the average age on Register being 52.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
2.8 Nationalities and mother tongues

There are 65 different nationalities represented on the Register (a minority hold dual nationality) and 82 different mother tongues. Most hold British nationality (62%), 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>62%</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>French</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</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>Russian</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
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. Many Registrants have more than one qualification – see Graph 2.11.

The most popular qualification is IoLET DPSI (77%/52%) for Full and Interim status languages respectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Interim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IoLET DPSI (all pathways)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IoLET DPI/Metropolitan Police Test</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MSc</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPSI PRIDE database, Full (1,897) and Interim (108)

IoLET DPSI and DPI breakdown by pathway for Full status languages

59% IoLET DPSI Law qualifications
1,125 Registrants

41% IoLET DPI/MetTest qualifications
771 Registrants

9% IoLET DPSI Health qualifications
178 Registrants

8% IoLET DPSI Local Government qualifications
148 Registrants

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
2.11 Number of qualifications held
Registrants must be suitably qualified for each language on their record. The English language qualifications required for Rare Language registration are not included in this analysis.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
2.12 Professional association memberships

There are a number of professional membership associations that are relevant to public service interpreters. These associations can provide professional support to their members and opportunities for Continuing Professional Development. Those associations with more than five Registrants recording membership are shown. About a quarter of Registrants reported being a member of a professional association – about the same as reported in the last edition. A total of 149 Registrants recorded being members of more than one of the associations.

NRPSI PRIDE database, On Register (1,807)
2.13 Security clearances provided

Registrants need to provide evidence of at least one valid security clearance in order to register and remain on the Register. They are often working in security-sensitive environments, e.g. 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 Disclosures, 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.
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. Half of the Registrants are based outside of Greater London and South East England.
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.

2.16 Most popular languages registered in major centres

The top languages registered by interpreters in five major centres in the UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London</th>
<th>Birmingham</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
<th>Leeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish (71)</td>
<td>Urdu (13)</td>
<td>Arabic (11)</td>
<td>Arabic (5)</td>
<td>Polish (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish (44)</td>
<td>Kurdish:Sorani (7)</td>
<td>Urdu (11)</td>
<td>Farsi (4)</td>
<td>Arabic (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian (43)</td>
<td>Mirpuri (6)</td>
<td>Romanian (7)</td>
<td>Slovak (3)</td>
<td>Urdu (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic (40)</td>
<td>Arabic (6)</td>
<td>Polish (6)</td>
<td>Polish (2)</td>
<td>Bengali (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu (38)</td>
<td>Polish (6)</td>
<td>Spanish (4)</td>
<td>Russian (2)</td>
<td>Farsi (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (38)</td>
<td>Panjabi (5)</td>
<td>Turkish (4)</td>
<td>Turkish (2)</td>
<td>Kurdish:Bahdini (2)</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 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 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 1998–2017

While the general trend over this period shows an increase in complaints, there has been a drop in the last two years and the actual number of complaints is quite small. The spike in 2008 was due to a number of connected complaints. NRPSI actively promotes the availability of its professional complaints service and it is thought that the increasing trend represents increasing confidence, on the part of users, in NRPSI to manage complaints fairly and promptly.
Analysis of complaints

3.2 Complaints by complainant type 2015–2017

Police are the main users of Registrants and, therefore, are the main source of complaints, followed by commercial agencies. 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 2015–2017

Most complaints are not related to linguistic skills, which would be a breach of Code 5.1 – see Graph 3.6. Twenty-three Registrants had other languages registered in addition to their first language registered.
3.4 Complaints by status of first language registered by Registrant 2015–2017

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 no complaints against Registrants whose first language was at Rare Language status. Twenty-three of the Registrants also had at least one other language registered (which may have been at a different status). All Registrants that were complained about had a recognised interpreting qualification.
3.6 Sections of NRPSI Code of Conduct breached 2015–2017
Where there was a finding against a Registrant, this graph shows which sections of the NRPSI Code of Conduct were found to have been breached. More than one section might be breached in a particular complaint.

3.5 Complaints by age of Registrant 2015–2017
The average age of those complained about was 53, compared to the average age of all Registrants, which was 52 (see Graph 2.7). Proportionally more Registrants are complained about in the two age ranges 25–34 and 75+ than in the other age ranges.

Average age per complaint year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPSI Complaints (post 01April11) Database (80)
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>Stage</th>
<th>No. of weeks</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>Professional Conduct Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Complaint with the comments sent to the PCC, which decides within 30 working days (6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disciplinary Committee Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Report to be sent within 5 working days (1 week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appeals – interpreter must inform NRPSI of his/her intention to appeal within 15 working days of the Report (3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Disciplinary Appeals Committee Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Report.decision of the Appeals Committee is sent to the interpreter within 10 working days (2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Case closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>No. of weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If the PCC refers the case to the DC, the hearing must be arranged (1–2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interpreter must be given no less than 30 working days’ notice of the date of the hearing (6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Disciplinary Committee Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Appeal is sent to the Chairman, who makes a decision within 15 working days (3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>If there are 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>16</td>
<td>Case closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total: 34 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.8 Average time to complete disciplinary cases 2015–2017

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 2015–2017

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 2015–2017

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.

NRPSI Complaints (post 01April11) Database (80)
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 2017 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, 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 2017. 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) 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 MoD; 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 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 1998–2017, 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 2015–2017, 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 Conduct breached 2015–2017, ‘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 2015–2017, 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 2015–2017, the ‘Registrar resolved’ category includes cases that were dealt with by voluntary resolution. The referral 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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Links to this report have been sent to senior officials in the relevant government ministerial departments:
Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Department for Work and Pensions
Department of Health
Foreign & Commonwealth Office
Home Office
Ministry of Defence
Ministry of Justice
Northern Ireland Office
Scottish Government
National Assembly for Wales

Other government departments that have been sent links:
Chief Fire and Rescue Adviser
Crown Commercial Service
Crown Prosecution Service
Gangmasters and Labour Abuse Authority
Health and Safety Executive
HM Courts & Tribunals Service
HM Inspectorate of Constabulary
HM Revenue & Customs
Marine Management Organisation
Migration Advisory Committee
National Crime Agency
Nuffield Foundation
Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner
Scottish Procurement
Serious Fraud Office
Police and Crime Commissioners
Directly elected mayors of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough,
Greater Manchester, Liverpool City Region, London, Sheffield City Region, the Tees Valley, the West of England and the West Midlands