



Policy on Fitness to Practise finalised

The Board has now finalised its Policy on Fitness to Practise, and would like to thank all stakeholders for their submissions. The Board was pleased that 169 registered psychologists chose to make submissions, and that the vast majority of respondents considered the policy to fair, reasonable and clear. Notwithstanding this support, the Board has carefully reviewed the feedback to identify any thematic concerns, and has addressed these where appropriate.

The table below sets out the themes that were identified, and the Board's response to those themes in terms of amendments to the policy.

Issue	Board response
Lack of clarity about the conditions required for notifying.	Additional information added to clarify that a notifier must both believe that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• there is a health condition; and <ul style="list-style-type: none">• that condition is affecting the psychologist's fitness to practise.
Concern that the policy stigmatises mental illness	This was the view of a very small minority; however it is one that the Board is keen to provide reassurance on. An example has been added (in conjunction with the amendment above) to clarify that it is not necessary to notify of a person who is living with a health condition that is well-managed and not affecting their ability to function safely as a psychologist . The Board will consider providing de-identified examples as case-studies in its future newsletters, to provide the profession with visibility about how it deals with fitness cases. Clearly, this would need to be carefully managed to ensure the privacy of all parties involved.
Concern that there is too much focus on public health and safety and not enough focus on the well-being of the psychologist.	<u>No change</u> . The Board is a statutory authority that exists for the protection of public health and safety. It considers (and notes that for the most part, respondents agreed) that its policy reflects its intent to work collaboratively with the affected psychologist, and with compassion for that psychologist's situation. Even so, the Board must be prepared to make difficult decisions that may impact on an unwell psychologist if it is in the public's interest to do so.

Again, thank you to all who engaged with the consultation. Your feedback is valued and contributes to better policies.

John Bushnell
Chair