Legislative change in Europe:
the implications for training in radiation protection
-Rising to the challenge-

Introduction to the Working Groups

EUTERP Workshop, Athens

How to assess the effectiveness of training?

Workplace indicators, such as monitoring results, should be used to construct a framework for analysing the effectiveness of training.

Should be promoted by Regulatory Authorities, RPEs and professional societies.

There is value in exploring methods by which the quality of training providers can be assessed and recognised.

❑ **Group A**

How to promote and improve stakeholder contributions to training in RP? How to increase awareness and visibility of existing training activities?

Who are the stakeholders?

What can they contribute?

What do the stakeholders expect from the training?

Tools to improve the effectiveness of training

Training should be practical and realistic, including the use of real radiation sources, where appropriate and subject to suitable dose constraints.

On-the-job training is an important component of the training cycle, and should be properly structured and involve suitably trained mentors.

"Train the trainers" is an important concept, and should include information on new training techniques and technologies, and a basic understanding of the European E&T Qualification Frameworks (ECVET, ECTS, EQF, etc.).

❑ **Group B**

What is the value of a Train-the-Trainers approach? In what areas could this be usefully implemented?

Where do you apply TTT?

How successful has it been?

How do we improve the approach?

What is achieved by recognition schemes?

The ENETRAP project should develop guidelines for national and mutual recognition schemes, and consider whether the ECVET concepts are useful in this respect. Schemes should focus on all-round competence rather than academic qualifications.

In turn, Member States should aim to establish clear and transparent national schemes for the recognition of RPE competence, which are then promoted by (for example) HERCA.

A similar formal system of recognition is not considered appropriate for RPOs; however a simpler system for verifying and validating that they have received suitable training should be considered.

Incorporating ALARA culture into training requirements

Although risk is a factor in everyday life, the risks associated with radiation exposure are not readily understood by trainees, and not easily explained by trainers. However, persons can understand the difference between good and bad practice and the impacts in terms of increasing and decreasing the doses received; training should concentrate on practical examples of this.

There is a need to develop education and training in radiation protection for the public, and this should include providing radiation protection information and data on the internet.

❑ **Group C**

Communication and risk perception

How do we communicate risk perception to different groups (workers, managers, public)?

What is the important content?

Is there a role for EUTERP in the public communication of risk?

❑ **Group A**

How to promote and improve stakeholder contributions to training in RP? How to increase awareness and visibility of existing training activities?

❑ **Group B**

What is the value of a Train-the-Trainers approach? In what areas could this be usefully implemented?

❑ **Group C**

Communication and risk perception.