

Regulatory reform –

of allied professions.

The appetite amongst some allied professions to be regulated by the College was unclear. Some allied professional groups could not be described as cohesive and there might be a number of bodies laying claim to representing or accrediting those carrying out the work.

The appropriateness of grandfathering was questionable. Although individuals had a right to a livelihood it was not appropriate to allow unqualified individuals continue to work indefinitely. A transition period where individuals were supported to achieve the necessary standard was supported. It was also recognised that anyone granted grandfather rights would be working under a new structure which would require certain standards, and it was possible to grant time-limited grandfather rights. There were parallels with Official Veterinarians and the drop-off seen across the panels when grandfather rights came to an end.

It could be useful to look at the laboratory animal sector as an example of a very well-regulated area of work.

Action: Secretariat to follow up with Farm Assurance Schemes in relation to requirements for allied professions.

Models of regulation (associate versus accreditation)

The BVA vet-led team working group had, at the time, considered that the accreditation model represented the lower risk of the two options being discussed by the College in relation to cost and the potential for reputational damage by association.

Under the accreditation model there would always be individuals who chose not to join but could still work. This could also act as a disincentive for those favouring greater regulation as they would incur the costs of additional professional recognition whilst competing for clients with un0 G[r]-3(eg)3(ul)6(s)13()-12.04 reWt(g)14()-4(f)-66 0gul o5(r)7().

The rationale for bringing some groups in as Associates under Schedule 3 was recognised.

The shift in thinking at the College had occurred when the EOs and Associates Working Party had recognised that some activities carried out by paraprofessionals were Acts of Veterinary Surgery but were not sufficiently minor to qualify for an EO and that the only option was to bring the group into Schedule 3.

There would inevitably be an upfront cost to putting regulatory structures in place for new Associate groups.

It was unclear whether the set of criteria to be applied when assessing applications for associate status with the RCVS, as identified in the RMPR, had been refined further.

There would likely be a need for a new Schedule 3 under a new VSA in order to progress the regulation of new Associate groups

There was currently no requirement for cattle foot trimmers to be trained or be a member of a particular body. The Cattle Hoof Care Standards Board had positioned itself as a regulator for foot trimmers and aimed to define a robust set of standards for professional cattle foot trimming. Annual subscription fees covered costs. However, without a statutory footing the benefits to animal health and welfare were limited. The National Association of Cattle Foot Trimmers had positioned itself as the representative body for foot trimmers and aimed to increase the credibility and professionalism of foot trimming within the industry. The methods of trimming promoted by the different bodies were sometimes in conflict and there could be animal health and welfare benefit to bringing cattle foot trimmers under the RCVS regulatory umbrella.

There was a public expectation that physiotherapists were qualified. In human healthcare, to practice as a physiotherapist, you must be registered with the Health and Care Professions Council.

The Register of Animal Musculoskeletal Practitioners (RAMP) required members to complete Level 6 training (equivalent to a full-time three-year BSc degree) and complete annual revalidation via CPD. Although registration provided confidence to clients that members were competent, there was no requirement to be registered in order work.

Lay people should not be carrying out equine dental work.

Protection of titles

Statutory protection of titles should ideally come with regulation.

To prevent misuse of titles recognisable titles should be created and protected. There were parallels with Suitably Qualified Persons (SQPs) which was a legal category of professionally qualified person under the Veterinary Medicines Regulations

The lack of protection for the title of veterinary nurse remained an issue with lay people in veterinary practice still describing themselves as nurses. There was a lack of understanding amongst animal owners that only veterinary nurses registered with the College could call themselves Reg-3(aTs1 0 0 1 93l)6(ves Re)terinary nursnat97(Th)4(eq0.000

