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PURPOSE AND STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT

This short study aims to inform discussion of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) practices. It is an early step towards the possible formulation of general policy and guidelines for CPD in South Africa’s professional bodies.

The study reflects an initial desk-top investigation of different approaches to CPD. It focuses mainly on formal requirements and the issues they raise.

The document is the product of a partnership between the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and the Financial Planning Institute (FPI). It will be tabled at the FPI convention in June 2015, but will also be distributed to other role-players.
ABSTRACT

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) is a requirement for the maintenance of professional designations. CPD is one of the nine criteria for SAQA recognition of professional bodies. CPD underlies many of the values and principles expressed there.

Yet, while there is widespread agreement that CPD is critical to professions as per the SAQA policy for recognition, there are differences in views about what constitutes adequate CPD, what its objectives are or how it should be structured and exercised by a recognised professional body or, in some cases, a state regulator.

This limited desk-top study seeks to throw light on different approaches and practices relating to basic features and requirements of CPD. Where possible, it unpacks the issues and questions which different approaches raise. The study considers international and South African models for CPD, as well texts from the small body of research literature on the subject. Five examples (international and local) of actual CPD are offered to illustrate different approaches.

Major questions facing professional bodies and regulators when designing and implementing CPD include:
• Is CPD only concerned with keeping up-to-date with specialised developments, or is it about improving all-round performance - or should it even be understood in terms of a vision of lifelong learning?
• Should formal learning (courses, study, reading) only be recognised, or should informal learning (e.g. through problem-solving on the job) count as well - perhaps even as the major component?
• How formally or systematically should CPD be encoded, assessed, graded, authenticated, recorded and recognised? (And how much use is made of RPL practices in this regard?) Should output not be regarded more highly than input in CPD?
• What suits a particular profession best: an open-ended approach respecting the professional autonomy and self-reporting of members, or the meeting of prescribed “objective” targets - or somewhere on a continuum between these?
• What roles should regulators and professional bodies play in demanding, supporting, encouraging and improving CPD?
• Is CPD a strictly-managed requirement of the professional body, or is it voluntary?
• Feasibility: what are the cost and capacity demands of CPD for the professional body regulator, and for individual holders of designations?

The study notes that there is considerable variety in CPD practices and a lack of a common language in describing these. CPD appears to be low-stakes in a majority of professional bodies. RPL is little used. Autonomy level of professionals emerges as a key differentiator between CPD practices.

It is clear that a one-size-fits-all approach is not what is needed nationally. However, a minimum CPD size is a pre-requisite for professional recognition by SAQA for the purposes of the NQF Act, Act 67 of 2008. The study recommends a SAQA reference group for CPD, further research, and the development of a range of best practice models and guidelines supported by a policy document.
1. THE CONTEXT OF THIS STUDY

In 2012 the SAQA Board approved and published the Policy and Criteria for Recognising a Professional Body and Registering a Professional Designation for the Purposes of the National Qualifications Framework Act, Act 67 of 2008. In taking this important step SAQA was complying with its mandate in the NQF Act, Act 67 of 2008, and was informed by extended consultation with professional bodies. Subsequently 69 professional bodies (at the time of this study) have been recognised by SAQA. The policy and criteria are designed with ongoing development and clarification in mind and thus the inclusion of a clause in the policy document for a formal review every five (5) years. SAQA is thus tasked with promoting quality and best practice in CPD.

In this spirit, one of the nine objectives (point ix) of the Policy and Criteria is to “Encourage the development and implementation of continuing professional development”. A body applying to be recognised as a professional body by SAQA is expected to “Set criteria for, promote and monitor continuing professional development (CPD) for its members to meet the relevant professional designation requirements” (point v).

CPD relates to and supports many of the other objectives and requirements of the SAQA Policy and Criteria. CPD should sustain qualities mentioned there, such as: trust (in competence), ethical action, pride in the profession, international leading practice, protection of the public interest, operation in terms of a code of conduct. (See Appendix A for the full objectives and requirements.)

There is widespread recognition of the importance of CPD for the maintenance of professional standards and for the regular renewal of credible membership in registered professions (in other words, Professional Designations). Certain professions have long histories of requiring regular evidence of CPD if members are to retain their Designations within the profession: Financial Services, Banking, Accountancy, Education (Teaching) Law, Medicine and the different branches of Engineering are among these. Some professions have only instituted a requirement for CPD relatively recently.

2. THE IMMEDIATE OCCASION FOR THIS STUDY

The initiative for this study was provided by discussions between the Financial Services Board (FSB) and the Financial Planning Institute (FPI). The particular problem that had arisen was that professionals who were members of more than one professional body could be confused by the different CPD policies and learning requirements of different professional bodies.

In order to work towards best practice policy, the FPI and SAQA set up a joint project. In its first steps the project has focused on a broad view of current practices, both nationally and internationally.

3. KEY QUESTIONS UNDERLYING THE STUDY

The importance of CPD in general is widely accepted. But the initial steps into the present study showed a lack of clarity about the nature of CPD. One area of concern stood out especially: that there is no standardised CPD model across professional bodies in South Africa to inform CPD practices and CPD practice span across a broad spectrum (from informal to formal) in the sample of recognised professional bodies.

Different interpretations of what CPD is and how it could be implemented raised four sets of questions:

3.1. What is the extent of differentiation in CPD models and practices as implemented by recognised professional bodies in South Africa?

3.2. Which CPD theories and/or practices nationally and internationally could inform one or more South African CPD model(s)?

3.3. What is the role of Regulators in governing CPD practices, if any?

3.4. How could SAQA, professional bodies and Regulators cooperate to the benefit of professional practitioners and the broader public?

4. APPROACH TO THE STUDY

The study draws primarily on a desktop exercise. General literature on the subject was surveyed. The SAQA website and websites of each recognised professional body were accessed to retrieve information. Where information was not available the relevant professional body was contacted to obtain information. An interview was held with one Regulator - the Financial Services Board - to obtain insights into their responsibilities for implementing and monitoring CPD practices in their domain.

5. BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The study presents:

- definitions of CPD
- examples of different CPD practices in recognised professional bodies
- the role of Regulators in terms of CPD practices
- international theory/ models, and
- some suggestions on the way forward.

6. DEFINING CPD

In general terms, Continuing Professional Development (CPD) could be described as an activity that develops and maintains the knowledge and skills needed by members of professional bodies to perform competently within their professional environments.

Discussions with many professionals suggest that CPD is seen mainly in terms of keeping up-to-date with new developments
(especially concerning regulatory or technical issues). It is of note that all of the considered definitions below suggest a broader perspective on personal and professional growth.

### FIVE DEFINITIONS OF CPD

The Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) defines CPD as follows: “CPD means the systematic maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills, and the development of personal qualities necessary for the execution of professional and technical duties throughout a person’s engineering career.” (Systematic maintenance refers to training by ECSA approved providers which signals that CPD is understood as a formal training opportunity which excludes ‘natural’ learning experiences (informal learning) as in the international CPD example.)

The FPI defines CPD “as a process of lifelong learning whereby an individual systematically engages in activities that maintain abilities, skills and knowledge required for a professional practice as described and guided by the FPI.” (FPI, n.d.: 4)

David Hayes defines CPD as a “multi-faceted, lifelong experience, which can take place inside or outside the workplace and which often moves beyond the professional and into the realm of personal lives too.” (Hayes (Ed), 2014).

Evans quotes Kennie and Enemark (2008: 117) who define CPD as “the systematic maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and the development of personal qualities necessary for the education of professional and technical duties throughout the practitioner’s life”.

Madden and Mitchell (1993) define CPD as: “The maintenance and enhancement of knowledge, expertise and competence of professionals throughout their careers to a plan formulated with regard to the needs of the professional, the employer, the profession and society.” (Madden and Mitchell, 1993: 12)

These definitions cover some of the most important areas of development through CPD practices:

- (i) maintaining and developing knowledge and competencies throughout a professional career, usually in a systematic manner;
- (ii) planning enhancement of knowledge and competencies; and
- (iii) taking the needs of the professional, employer and society at large into consideration.

### 7. A CONTINUUM OF CPD APPROACHES: INFORMAL TO FORMAL

The above definitions of CPD show many similar orientations. The actual approaches vary widely, however. It is useful to consider the two ends of a continuum on which CPD approaches might be placed.

At the one end of the continuum is an all-inclusive approach to CPD. This includes all natural learning experiences (informal learning), plus those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual or society (Day, 1999).

At the other end of the continuum is a formal training approach which excludes natural learning experiences (informal learning). To overcome the confusion of terminologies in this area (see Table 1), the terms formal and informal CPD practices will be used to categorise CPD practices.

Information on formal and informal CPD practices as presented by 61 of the 69 SAQA recognised professional bodies yielded the following information:

- 5 (9%) indicate recognition of informal CPD practices only
- 18 (29%) indicate recognition of formal CPD practices only
- 38 (62%) indicate recognition of formal and informal CPD practices, which could include pro bono work (community work).

The classification of CPD practices into formal and informal activities has the following inconsistencies:

- Different terminologies are used to describe formal and informal activities, which in itself may be a reflection of the different sectors in which professional bodies operate. For example, the use of the terms verifiable and unverifiable refers to a validation process which could be used to denote both formal and informal activities. Structured activities (courses) and unstructured activities (self-directed) refers to a mode of planning which is built on the assumption that informal or self-directed activities could not be structured. In some cases informal activities could also be structured;
- Some activities, such as attending conferences, are classified by one professional body as formal, but by another as an informal activity which points to a difference in understanding.

Professional bodies use the following terms to describe formal and informal activities in official documentation as available on their web pages (Table 1):
### Table 1: Formal and Informal activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal CPD Activities</th>
<th>Informal CPD Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verifiable CPD</td>
<td>Unverifiable CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifiable CPD</td>
<td>Non-verifiable CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifiable</td>
<td>Self-directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured activities</td>
<td>Unstructured activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited activities</td>
<td>Accredited activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning activity</td>
<td>Learning activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live training events</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD activities</td>
<td>CPD activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured CPD hours</td>
<td>Unstructured CPD hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Normal daily work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active activities</td>
<td>Passive activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured activities</td>
<td>Work-based activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental activities</td>
<td>Work-based activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>Mentorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturing</td>
<td>Lecturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CPD IN SOUTH AFRICAN PROFESSIONAL BODIES

The variety of approaches seen above is expressed in different forms of regulations and requirements for CPD. The focus of this study is on the point system, but the researchers have also considered some other requirements.

To obtain information on what constitutes CPD points as prescribed by professional bodies, a sample of 10 of the 69 SAQA recognised professional bodies - 5 statutory and 5 non-statutory was selected.

Statutory professional bodies are those established through an Act of Parliament, thus legislated, while non-statutory professional bodies are not established through such an Act. A non-statutory professional body would be a public benefit or not-for-profit organization and may have regulatory functions through other pieces of legislation.

With regard to non-statutory professional bodies, the following were found:

- CPD points requirement varies from five points to be obtained over a one year cycle to 65 points to be obtained over a two year cycle;
- A single CPD point could mean one hour or 10 hours;
- CPD is measured in hours, days or in accordance with a Personal Development Plan (PDP). In the last mentioned instance, time is not a factor or indicator of CPD points required;
- The CPD requirements for various registered designations belonging to the same Professional Body do not distinguish between levels of designations and are exactly the same for each designation;
- CPD points are allocated and reportable in terms of formal and informal CPD points.
- CPD points for Ethics are a requirement for all professional bodies which were selected to be part of the sample. A minimum of at least two Ethics CPD points is needed per reporting CPD cycle in most instances;
- The higher the qualification needed for attainment of a designation, the more reliance is placed on the professionalism of the individual member and self-regulation in terms of maintaining CPD records applies. A high premium is placed on trusting the member to upload/record the required CPD for the applicable CPD cycle;
- The lower the qualification needed for attainment of a designation, the more evidence is needed to show compliance with CPD requirements. In some instances a portfolio of evidence must be supplied to show that the CPD requirements were met;
- An annual audit applies to all. In most instances members are randomly selected for an audit of their CPD records for a given CPD cycle. Members, once selected for the audit, must then comply with the CPD requirements within varying periods – from within seven working days, to 30 days and more;
- Non-compliance with CPD requirements leads to disciplinary action as per membership regulations and Codes of Conduct and/or Ethics, or in some instances membership of the Professional Body is suspended;
- Where membership is re-instated following suspension or deregistration, then the requirements for the previous periods’ of CPD could be waived;
- While the Professional Bodies have a CPD policy, implementation and monitoring by professional bodies of CPD varies across the professional bodies’ landscape.

With regard to statutory professional bodies, the following were found:

- The CPD point requirement varies from 25 – 60 over a cycle of 3 – 5 years. In one case one CPD point could equal up to 400 hours;
- Members must show that they have complied with the CPD requirements within the given time frame. If members are not able to show compliance, action is taken in terms of the
regulations, and CPD Policy. Membership may be suspended and designations revoked.

Both statutory and non-statutory professional bodies from the sample have, to varying degrees, the following practices in place:

- Qualifications varying from NQF Level 3 to NQF Level 8 leading to related designations;
- Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) processes, in some instances, which are taken into consideration towards designations. The analysis of 63 professional bodies indicated that four (6%) professional bodies indicated that RPL towards designations are allowed, 29 (46%) indicate that RPL policies are in place but that implementation of this is slow and 30 (48%) do not refer to RPL on their websites, but policies are in place as per the requirements for recognition with SAQA;
- Members are required to have relevant experience ranging from one year (linked to NQF Levels 3-5) to three years (linked to NQF Level 8). One professional body requires 10 years of experience;
- Prospective members of professional bodies must write the Board Examination and be successful in the Assessment and / or submit a portfolio of evidence (this is linked to RPL in some cases) which is assessed to qualify as a member of the professional body.

To maintain designations a member must:

- adhere to Codes of Ethics and/or Conduct;
- ensure that CPD requirements are met; and
- pay annual membership fees.

In most cases non-compliance in meeting the required CPD point requirements lead to action being taken in terms of Membership Regulations, and CPD Policy. Membership may be suspended and designations revoked.

9. THE REGULATOR AND CPD

ALL statutory professional bodies are regulatory bodies, but not all regulatory bodies are statutory bodies. A Regulator could be loosely described as an agency that is tasked by law or regulation to ensure that a sector operates in compliance with laws, regulations, and established rules.

Not all Regulators are required to have CPD for their members. SAQA recognized regulators (statutory professional bodies) are required to have CPD.

A desktop survey provided information on eight Regulators in South Africa. These are discussed in three categories:

- Regulators with established CPD monitoring responsibilities in place;
- Regulators planning to put CPD monitoring responsibilities in place; and
- Regulators with no CPD monitoring responsibilities

Independent Regulatory Board for Auditors (IRBA)

The IRBA is an example of one Regulator with established CPD monitoring responsibilities in place.

The Board is the statutory body controlling that part of the accountancy profession involved with public accountancy in the Republic of South Africa.

It is important to stress that all entrants to the public accountancy profession are subject to consistent requirements. Following qualification, accountants entering public practice are required to register with the Board and are governed by its regulations. Those qualified accountants not in public practice who are members of a provincial society of chartered accountants, are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Board but are subject to the jurisdiction of the South African Institute of Chartered Accountants.

The Board functions in terms of the Public Accountants’ and Auditors’ Act, 1991 (Act 80 of 1991) (previously Act 51 of 1951). Its members are appointed by the Minister of Finance from amongst the State departments, members of the accountancy profession nominated by the provincial societies of chartered accountants and academics nominated by the Committee of University Principals (CUP).

The Board is funded by fees and levies payable by registered accountants and auditors and reports annually to the Minister of Finance, who then tables the report in Parliament.

IRBA’S MISSION:

Basic Purpose
See section 2 of the Auditing profession Act......

IRBA’s tasks:
See sections 4 - 8 of the Auditing Profession Act......

MEASUREMENT OF CPD:

In a rolling three-year period, a Registered Auditor (RA) will be expected to have completed at least 90 hours of verifiable CPD, which includes at least 9 hours of compulsory ethics CPD. In any one year reporting period within the three-year rolling period, the minimum number of CPD hours is twenty (20) including a minimum of two (2) hours of ethics training. The minimum hours required in any one year reporting period will not be reduced if a member reported more than the required hours in the previous year. The onus is on the RA to ensure that the compulsory number of hours per reporting cycle (Rolling three-years) is at least ninety (90) with nine (9) hours in ethics.

1. Higher Education South Africa (HESA)
RECORD KEEPING:

RAs will submit a signed declaration with their annual renewal for registration. An RA’s registration with the IRBA will be dependent upon the member’s declaration which will state that they are fully compliant with the IRBA’s CPD requirements.

MONITORING OF CPD BY IRBA:

The IRBA will randomly monitor the CPD records of all RAs on an annual basis. RAs, who continue to be non-compliant, may have their registration status with the IRBA lapsed. (Further inquiries should seek to understand how IRBA (and other regulators) determine the quality, depth or standard of CPD.)

Financial Services Board (FSB)

The FSB is an example of one Regulator planning to put in place CPD monitoring responsibilities.

The FSB has CPD standard setting responsibilities as promulgated in the FAIS Act and various other sub-ordinate regulations such as Board Notes and FAIS Practice Notes.

The FSB is an independent institution established by statute to oversee the South African Non-Banking Financial Services Industry to protect public interest. (Non-banking financial services include, among others, insurance and investment management.)

The FSB mission is to promote:
• Fair treatment of consumer’s in terms of the financial services and products they are sold.
• Financial soundness of financial institutions.
• Systemic stability of financial services industries.
• The integrity of financial markets and institutions.

At the end of 2012 the FSB suspended the implementation of the CPD requirements in order to review the requirements to ensure that they were still relevant, efficient and effective. The current exemption granted to all providers of financial services in respect of CPD requirements will remain in force until such a time the FSB is able to publish the proposed new CPD requirements.

In an interview with the FSB during the first quarter of 2015, it was indicated that the FSB is currently considering implementation of their CPD monitoring responsibility. The FSB has not yet announced how they will monitor and when they will start with this activity. The FSB is currently actively in consultation via workshops with professional bodies, other industry bodies and SAQA regarding this. It is envisaged that draft regulations and/or a draft CPD model will be available for public comment towards the end of 2015.

Regulators with no CPD monitoring responsibilities

Information on a total of seven (7) Regulators suggests that no role has been taken up in terms of CPD practices in their respective sectors. These Regulators are not SAQA recognised professional bodies and tend to regulate the sector or industry and not necessarily a profession. They may have nothing to do with the maintenance of designations. They are:
• The Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA)
• The National Nuclear Regulator
• The Ports Regulator
• The National Energy Regulator
• The National Credit Regulator
• The South African Diamond Board
• The Medicines Control Council

10. THE VALUE OF CPD PRACTICES

A brief sketch of some key issues relating to broad approaches to CPD, particularly in South Africa has been provided. The picture can now be enriched by looking at what the limited literature on CPD has to offer.

Literature on CPD argues that CPD should not only be viewed in terms of meeting CPD point requirements (which can lead to a trivial compliance or tick-box approach). It should also be viewed in terms of the potentially transforming impact it has on both the professionalism of members and the professional body. Evans and Gbadamosi are critical of a narrow view of CPD: “Professionals have a limited view of CPD—seeing it as training, a means of keeping up-to-date, or a way to build a career”. (Quoted in Friedman and Philips: 2004)

Taylor (1996), Madden and Mitchell (1993) consider that the underlying purpose of CPD is to maintain and continue to develop one’s occupational competence for the sake of maintaining professionalism. A professional should remain alert to new ideas, techniques and developments in their profession. They should therefore update their skills and knowledge through a wide range of activities including but not limited to: reading, attending courses, seminars or conferences, learning and imbibing new technologies, and undertaking similar activities that add value to existing knowledge and competences. Lester (1999) emphasises in his research on CPD that qualifications and development routes should help and empower practitioners rather than categorise or merely certify them. He argues for an ethos of continuing development and extended professionalism, validated through the ability to help and empower the practitioner towards self-realisation and increased professional effectiveness. Such an ethos should assist in further developing independent thought, critical enquiry, reflective practice and creative synthesis – and

2. IRBA: Continuing Professional Development (CPD) policy: see http://www.paab.co.za/dmdocuments/CPD%20Policy%202014.pdf
3. See Board Notice 163 of 2012
should not be moulded merely by content prescribed by the professional body.

In a similar vein, Evans (2008) argues that CPD is also part of lifelong learning; a means of gaining career security; a means of personal development; a means of assuring the public that individual professionals are up-to-date; a method whereby professional associations can verify competence; and a way of providing employers with a competent and adaptable workforce. It would therefore be appropriate to emphasise that CPD is undertaken to maintain and enhance professional competency and the credibility of professional qualifications, with the outcomes being new, re-invigorated knowledge, skills and performance (in Taylor, 1996; Zajkowski, Sampson and Davis, 2007).

The thinking on CPD by scholars frames CPD as a means of promoting learning, development and professionalism among practitioners, as well as a means by which the profession could be seen to be maintaining its standards.

11. INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES

**CPD Approach 1**
**Nigeria**

There are at least 34 professional bodies in Nigeria. To obtain a view of some of the CPD practices in Nigeria, one professional body was selected, namely the Medical and Dental Council (MDC) of Nigeria. This professional body is the regulatory body for the practice of Medicine, Dentistry and Alternative Medicine in Nigeria, established by an Act of Parliament in 1963, and Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 2004.

The MDC describes the purpose of CPD as to improve health care delivery to Nigerians in order to meet up with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of the United Nations as adopted by the Federal Government of Nigeria. CPD aims at empowering Nigerian Physicians and the health sector team to deliver quality service to the communities they serve.

MDC has directed that participation in the continuing professional development programme is a mandatory requirement for license renewal by all doctors. The following groups of doctors who either participate or serve as resource persons in approved CPD programmes qualify for credits when requirements have been met:

- Members who participate fully in any accredited programme, such as workshops, seminars, scientific conferences, update lectures and website learning
- Teachers in accredited medical schools and postgraduate training programmes
- Doctors who are enrolled for postgraduate training programmes
- Doctors attending structured training programmes with evidence of attendance
- Any doctor can participate in any programme of his/her choice or relevant to his/her practice.

The total credit unit to be obtained annually is 20 and a total of 40 units for biannual license renewal. A credit unit is equivalent to one contact hour on any particular subject under qualified and approved guidance.

The provider of such a service should be able to plan and deliver usable knowledge or information on the subject matter within one hour of engagement. This may be in the form of a didactic lecture, tutorial, grand/ward round, clinical meeting, seminar, skills acquisition, practical sessions and workshops. Credits for Journal reviews (journal club), scientific publications, peer review of journal articles, web learning, examinations (examiners) are allocated as determined by the regulating body.

For a practical class or hands-on-skills training, it is recommended that a two hour engagement should constitute one credit unit. In all, the program or subject matter should be appealing, practically-oriented and in a friendly atmosphere so as to encourage users/recipients’ participation.

In any session of CPD activity, monitoring for user-compliance could be ensured by filling an attendance form at the beginning of a programme and collecting such forms at the end of it, or by administering pre- and post tests.

CPD activities have been grouped into seven broad categories. For annual/biannual re-licensing, a doctor must participate and obtain credit units from any three or more of the following groups of activities:

1. Conferences, Seminars and Workshops
2. Grand-round or Clinical meetings
3. Self-learning activities e.g. via online etc.
4. Journal clubs, Research and Publications
5. Courses: Revision and Update courses
6. Miscellaneous: e.g. Accreditors, Examiners, Resource persons etc.
7. Management / ICT, Medical Informatics and Medical Education.

These activities are further subdivided into core (medically or clinically oriented) and non-core courses (e.g. Management/ICT etc.). A participant has the choice of obtaining the appropriate credit unit requirements from any three or more of the seven broad groups.

The accredited CPD Providers are expected to install internal mechanisms to monitor and evaluate their activities to ensure sustained quality, acceptability, relevance and continued improvement of their programs.

For those attending international conferences and seminars, there will be consideration for accumulating credit units with the proviso that the certificate and the course content of such programs are scrutinized by evaluators.
There are exemptions in terms of credit accumulation for doctors and dentists who are 70 years and above. The same applies to those afflicted by debilitating ill-health for up to six months, who will also be exempted from accumulating CPD credits as long as they show evidence of ill-health during that period.

**CPD Approach 2**

**Evaluation approach**

*Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, UK, Canada and Scotland*

Helena Filipe, Eduardo D Silva, Andries Stulting and Karl Golnik researched CPD practices in the medical profession as performed in several countries, including Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, Canada, and Scotland, to ascertain best CPD practices (Felipe et al, 2014). They differentiate between Continuing Medical Education (CME) and CPD. CME refers to expanding medical knowledge, skills, and attitudes as opposed to CPD, which acknowledges a wide range of competencies needed to practice high quality medicine, including medical, managerial, ethical, social, and personal skills.

They indicated that CPD practices can be conceptually organised around three fundamental questions:

- *What will I learn?*
- *How will I learn?*
- *How well have I learned?*

The relation between these three questions is described as a CPD cycle which describes the three processes:

- **What will I learn?** A learning need is a gap between current personal competencies/ population health status and the desired state. Well-designed educational interventions fill these gaps and remove barriers to enable change in behaviour.

- **How will I learn?** CPD activities should be chosen according to the type of the identified need whether it be knowledge and skills updating, competency assurance, or performance demonstration in practice. CPD activities can assume a variety of formats characterized as practice improvement, independent professional development, or research/self education.

- **How well have I learned?** Assessment closes the CPD cycle and involves two components:
  - Finding opportunities in clinical practice to apply new knowledge and skills.
  - Dissemination of new learning to colleagues at practice settings (e.g., rounds, clinical meetings, and unplanned moments during clinical practice). Portfolios as portable collection of artifacts can also be valuable assessment tools amenable to appraisal discussions and peer review.

The CPD cycle illustrates that CPD should be consistently planned, undertaken, and recorded. CPD should also be assessed. This can take various forms but ideally involves self-assessment, including regular discussions with peers. It may involve a formal examination. Assessment should bring effectiveness to learning and bring about change in behaviour (Felipe et al, 2014: 136).

Experience of CPD best practices leads to several observations:

- Regardless of the selected delivery method or format, interactive practice-based learning formats are the most successful
- Online tools improve research efficiency and social media enhance professional networking opportunities
- CPD credit accumulation, learning portfolios, criterion reference methods, computer diaries, peer review, and chart audits can be used for performance evaluation (Felipe et al, 2014: 138).

**CPD Approach 3**

**Outcomes Approach: International Federation of Accountants – UK, Canada and Australia**

The International Accounting Education Standards Board (IAESB) commissioned research into CPD practices of the Financial Sector in the UK, Ireland, Canada and Australia (IAESB, 2008: 120).

The purpose of their Information Paper is

“...to promote awareness of, and transfer knowledge and information on, education and development issues or practices relating to the accountancy profession.” (IAESB, 2008: iii).

The IAESB research project explored approaches to CPD measurement employed by professional bodies from various sectors in the UK, Ireland, Canada and Australia. A fundamental theme of the research is the debate between input and output-based CPD measurement.
Input-based measurement has recently been brought into question by professional bodies. They recognize that recording the time spent on CPD does not necessarily indicate that anything has been learned, or that CPD will lead to any change in practice. In terms of the need for increased accountability, professional bodies are turning to output-based measurement techniques that can measure exactly what input-based measurement cannot: the impact of CPD on the professionalism of practitioners.

The research found some resistance to the implementation of output-based measures, including perceived cost, and professionals feeling as if they are being “tested.” The aim of this paper is to find out what professional bodies are currently doing in terms of CPD measurement, and to understand the success of different types of systems. This will result in an informed analysis of the arguments for and against input and output-based measurement systems. We discovered that there are many steps along the way to a fully output-based system, and that successful output measurement is not as far out of reach as many professional bodies may suspect (IAESB, 2008: viii).

Interviews were held with representatives from 15 professional bodies, leading to the writing of case studies; these formed the basis of the research. At the heart of this paper is a model of CPD measurement that acts as a template that can be used to illustrate and compare various approaches employed by professional bodies. The model is illustrated by Figure 2 below:

\[Figure 2: Outcomes model\]

\[Diagram of PLANNING, ACTION, REFLECT\]

**Results:** Practice Behavior Knowledge (IAESB, 2008: ix).

Examination of literature about CPD, as well as an evident trend within professional bodies, suggests that modern CPD schemes more often than not employ what is commonly known as the “CPD cycle” to guide members through the cyclic process of CPD; moving through four phases planning, action, results and reflection. The CPD cycle has been used as the basis of the model developed, and our examination of measurement systems will discuss each phase of the cycle individually. The model

- needed to incorporate the vast diversity of sophistication of CPD measurement revealed by the case studies; and
- had to show the different measurement techniques in some sort of hierarchical order for comparison and benchmarking.

IAESB/IFAC developed a method of “scoring” the measurement techniques according to the accuracy of their detection of the impact of CPD on the professional. To help understand this system, they developed the concept “professional development value” (PDV) which represents the impact of CPD on the professional development of an individual as defined by the stated purpose of CPD. IAESB/IFAC assessed how well the measurement technique of each professional body was able to identify the occurrence of PDV due to CPD, and further, the accuracy with which it could distinguish between higher or lower PDVs. Input measures can only [at best] demonstrate that something was done, but the value or impact of that activity cannot be detected. Input measurement is obviously at the low end of the scale, but there is a range in the ability of output measures to perform this function. For example, a simple output measurement at the results phase of the CPD cycle is self-assessment against learning objectives simply stating whether or not they have been met. This measurement system can detect only low, or rather, generic PDV, that is, that there has been some impact or value. But it does not reveal what kind or how much impact it has had, how well it has improved practice or specifically how and to what extent it has had an impact on clients; furthermore it does not identify any unexpected results beyond those stated in the learning objectives. (IAESB, 2008: x).

Three professional body profiles were identified:

- **Profile one,** “Supporting the Reflective Practitioner” generally placed a strong emphasis on the reflection and planning phases of the cycle, showing less accuracy when measuring the results. This profile represents a liberal attitude towards what contributes to CPD. They tended to focus on the personal and professional development of individual professionals (IAESB, 2008: xi).

- **Profile two,** “Planning for Professional Development Value” emphasized planning, with various PDV measurement levels at the reflection and results phases, generally measuring the action phase by inputs. A non-regulatory approach is followed by giving individuals the responsibility and autonomy to self-assess their CPD against a developed and guided plan (IAESB, 2008: xii).

- **Profile three,** “Measuring Results” contrasted with the first two by placing the emphasis, on the results phase of the CPD cycle. Notably, all the cases included in this profile were from the medical sector and hence had a high level of responsibility regarding the competence of practitioners and the public interest (IAESB, 2008: xiii).

The majority of case study organizations had positive experiences with output-based measurement systems. One
consequence of moving from a rigid input-based scheme towards outputs was that professional bodies were able to give autonomy back to their members by not controlling access to CPD activities. They did not have to tell individuals what to learn or what would be useful for them; it was now up to the individual to show that there were useful outputs from the CPD which they chose for themselves (IAESB, 2008: xiv).

As the outcomes model requires a level of professionalism and autonomy, it links well with the next approach, the model of autonomy.

**CPD Approach 4**

**Level of autonomy**

If the role of CPD is to promote professionalism and the profession, the CPD model should be sensitive to both the professional and the profession. The CPD model as developed by Aileen Kennedy (nd) has the potential to serve this purpose.

It is accepted that CPD models could not be one-size-fits-all but will vary from context to context. Aileen Kennedy, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow presents in a paper (Kennedy, nd) CPD types that relate to context. From the Scottish context, she considered individual practices of CPD on which she built a framework of nine CPD types. Kennedy considered the circumstances in which each of the nine types of CPD might be adopted, and explored the form(s) of knowledge that can be developed through a particular practice. She also examined the power relationships inherent in the individual types and explored the extent to which CPD is perceived and promoted either as an individual endeavour related to context. From the Scottish context, she considered individual practices of CPD on which she built a framework of nine CPD types. Kennedy considered the circumstances in which each of the nine types of CPD might be adopted, and explored the form(s) of knowledge that can be developed through a particular practice. She also examined the power relationships inherent in the individual types and explored the extent to which CPD is perceived and promoted either as an individual endeavour related to accountability, or as a collaborative endeavour which supports what she calls transformative practice. The nine types are:

- **The training type**
  This type of CPD supports a skills-based, technocratic view of teaching whereby CPD provides members with the opportunity to update their skills in order to be able to demonstrate their competence. This type of practice supports a high degree of central control, often included in quality assurance practices where the focus is firmly on coherence and standardisation.

  Kennedy argues that the training type fails to impact on the manner in which new knowledge is used in practice. The training type provides an effective way for dominant stakeholders to control and limit the agenda, and places members in a passive role as recipients of specific knowledge.

- **The award-bearing type**
  The award-bearing type of CPD is described as relying on the completion of award-bearing programmes of study – usually, but not exclusively, validated by universities. This external validation can be viewed as a mark of quality assurance and adding credibility to the CPD processes.

However, Kennedy indicates that in education discourses in Scotland an emphasis is placed on professional action, which is not always supportive of what is perceived to be ‘academic’ as opposed to ‘practical’. There is therefore pressure for award-bearing courses to be focused on classroom practice.

- **The deficit type**
  Professional development can be designed specifically to address a perceived deficit in member performance. Kennedy (nd) refers to Rhodes and Beneicke (2003) who pointed out that CPD in terms of performance management can be viewed as a means of raising standards or as an element of intervention to exact greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.

  Kennedy (nd) alerts us to the fact that the deficit type attributes blame for perceived under-performance on individuals but fails to take due cognisance of collective responsibility.

- **The cascade type**
  The cascade type involves individual members attending ‘training events’ and then cascading, or disseminating, information to colleagues. It is commonly employed in situations where resources are limited.

  Kennedy (nd) alerts to the study done by Solomon and Tresman in 1999 who suggest that one of the drawbacks of this type of practice is that what is passed on in the cascading process is generally skills-focused, sometimes knowledge-focused, but rarely focused on values. She argues that the cascade type supports a technicist view of teaching and learning, where skills and knowledge are given priority over attitudes and values.

- **The standards-based type**
  Kennedy indicates that the standards-based type promotes the use of standards to scaffold professional development and to provide a common language, thereby enabling greater dialogue between members. She argues however that these advantages must be tempered by acknowledgement of the potential for standards to narrow conceptions of teaching and learning, or to render it unnecessary for members to consider alternative conceptions other than those promoted by the standards.

- **The coaching/mentoring type**
  The coaching/mentoring type covers a variety of CPD practices which are based on a range of philosophical premises. However, the defining characteristic of this type of practice is the importance of the one-to-one relationship, generally between two members, which is designed to support CPD. Both coaching and mentoring share this characteristic, although most attempts to distinguish between the two suggest that coaching is more skills based and that mentoring involves an element of ‘counselling and..."
professional friendship’ (following Rhodes and Beneicke, 2002, p. 301). Mentoring also often implies a relationship where one partner is novice and the other more experienced.

Regardless of the fundamental purpose of the coaching/mentoring type as mutually supportive and challenging or hierarchical and assessment driven, the quality of interpersonal relationships is crucial. In order for the coaching/mentoring type of CPD to be successful, participants must have well-developed interpersonal communication skills.

• The community of practice type
There is a clear relationship between communities of practice and the mutually supportive and challenging form of the coaching/mentoring type discussed above. Kennedy refers to Wenger (1998) who contends that learning within communities involves three essential processes: evolving forms of mutual engagement; understanding and tuning [their] enterprise; and developing [their] repertoire, styles and discourses. Central to Wenger’s thesis is a social theory of learning, recognising that learning within a community of practice happens as a result of that community and its interactions, and not merely as a result of planned learning episodes, such as courses.

Kennedy (nd) argues that depending on the role played by the individual as a member of the community, learning within such a community could be either a positive and proactive experience or a passive experience where the collective wisdom of dominant members of the group shapes other individuals’ understanding of the community and its roles.

In following Boreham, Kennedy makes explicit the added value of learning in communities, viewing the existence of individual knowledge and the combinations of several individuals’ knowledge through practice, as a powerful site for the creation of new knowledge.

• The action research type
Advocates of the action research type (Kennedy following Burbank and Kauchack, 2003; Weiner, 2002) tend to suggest that it has a greater impact on practice when it is shared in communities of practice, although collaboration of the nature found in a community of practice is not a prerequisite of the action research type of practice.

Kennedy alerts to the possibility that the action research type could provide an alternative to the passive role imposed on members in traditional types of CPD. This action research type encourages members to view research as a process as opposed to merely a product of someone else’s endeavours. It is a means of limiting dependency on externally produced research, instead shifting the balance of power towards members themselves through their identification and implementation of relevant research activities.

• The transformative type
Kennedy (nd) argues that the transformative type is closely related to the communities of practice type of CPD, but with an important difference. The transformative type takes ‘enquiry’ as the uniting characteristic as opposed to ‘practice’ in the communities of practice type of CPD. It signals a much more proactive and conscious approach than is the case in communities of practice. By stimulating debate among the various stakeholders in the profession, it might lead to transformative practices.

Kennedy (nd) indicates that the nine types within this approach are not stand alone versions, but could be grouped according to purpose and level of professional autonomy (Table 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Level of autonomy approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model of CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The award-bearing type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deficit type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cascade type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standards-based type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coaching/mentoring type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community of practice type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The action research type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transformative type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kennedy (nd), 17) – changes by LN)

The increasing capacity for professional autonomy emphasises the importance of encouraging professionalism as well as protecting the profession. The nine types of CPD describe the role a CPD model could play in encouraging (and regulating) professionals to update knowledge and skills to ensure they practice effectively their profession on a continuous basis. It allows for a growth path in professionalism to the point of professional autonomy where regulation is performed on a trust basis. This model consisting of nine CPD types seems to be useful to differentiate between levels of membership link to levels of professionalism achieved. The highest level of professionalism could be a contribution to the community of professionals through debates, and creating new knowledge through action research – mentoring and coaching other members of the professional body. In this way senior professionals take co-responsibility for enhancement and protection of the credibility of the profession.
CPD Approach 5
Highly specified use of points (SACE)

The South African Council for Educators (SACE) is the professional council for educators, which aims to enhance the status of the teaching profession through appropriate Registration, management of Professional Development and inculcation of a Code of Ethics for all educators. SACE registers all educators, ensures that all educators conduct themselves professionally, and manages a system for the promotion of continuing professional development of all teachers in South Africa.

SACE introduced the Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) system which promotes and recognises teachers’ professional development. The CPTD system promotes and recognises activities that will carry points:

- Teachers’ own individual efforts to improve themselves as professionals.
- Teachers’ school-based professional development.
- Teachers’ participation in SACE endorsed learning programmes offered by accredited institutions of learning.

Teachers will accumulate points to a minimum of 150 points in a three year period after which the points accumulated will be reset to zero. Teachers accumulate points in three types of professional development activities:

- Type 1: Activities initiated by the teacher. Activities such as own reading and attending meetings need to add value to the teaching practice.
- Type 2: Activities initiated by the school. Workshops and projects need to contribute to the professional development of a teacher.
- Type 3: Activities initiated externally. Courses and workshops need to contribute to the knowledge and professional development of teachers.

The above three types of CPD activities are divided into categories with allocated point value to each category, described in Table 4 right.

Table 4: Point categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>POINTS IN THREE YEAR PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in electronic media educational activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attending educational meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring and coaching</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational project</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal study</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short courses</td>
<td>15 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full qualification</td>
<td>30 - 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SACE Professional Development Points System represents a move away from the general CPD point system by introducing a qualitative element into the quantitative requirements. Points are not allocated in terms of hours spent on development (quantitative), but rather - in principle - on improvement of the quality of teaching (qualitative).
12. SUMMARY

The landscape of recognised professional bodies in South Africa is characterised by different approaches. The different approaches noticed at professional bodies, Regulators and CPD models are summarised here:

• First, CPD practices differ to a large extent between professional bodies: 62% of professional bodies have introduced a system whereby a combination of formal and informal CPD practices are recognised, 29% recognise formal CPD only and 9% recognise informal CPD activities only. The differentiation in CPD model is further complicated by a lack of common language used to describe what practices are regarded as formal and informal;

• Second, CPD practices show no uniformity across professional bodies in terms of a points system: required number of points and hours per point differ between professional bodies;

• Third, it seems the majority of Regulators do not include regulation of professionals in terms of CPD;

• Fourth, the analysis of 63 professional bodies indicated that four (6%) professional bodies indicated that RPL towards designations are being implemented, 29 (46%) indicate that whilst RPL is provided for in policy, implementation is a challenge and 30 (48%) have no reference to RPL on their websites although policies are in place as a criterion for their recognition with SAQA;

• Fifth, international and national CPD models could potentially inform CPD practices by differentiating between autonomy levels of professionals – the greater the autonomy, the greater the responsibility towards the profession; and allocating points to specific activities without relating points to hours (moving from a quantitative to a qualitative CPD approach).

13. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

• Further research be undertaken to broaden and deepen understanding of CPD practices;

• Best practice CPD models are developed to create a coherent and standardised approach to CPD across professional bodies;

• A CPD policy document is developed to guide CPD practices across professional bodies;

• SAQA establishes a CPD Reference Group to develop a CPD Guidelines for SAQA recognised professional bodies as part of the Policy and Criteria document.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Policy and Criteria for Recognising a Professional Bodies

The National Qualifications Framework Act, Act 67 of 2008 ('NQF Act') stipulates that SAQA is mandated to further develop the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and requires of SAQA to develop and implement policy and criteria for recognising a professional body and registering a professional designation. The Policy and Criteria for Recognising a Professional Body and Registering a Professional Designation for the purposes of the NQF was published in November 2012. To date a total of 69 professional bodies have been recognised by SAQA.

The objectives of the policy and criteria are to:

i. Advance the objectives of the NQF.
ii. Promote public understanding of, and trust in, professions through the establishment of a nationally regulated system for the recognition of professional bodies and for the registration of professional designations.
iii. Encourage social responsibility and accountability within the professions relating to professional services communities and individuals.
iv. Promote pride in association for all professions, including traditional trades and occupations.
v. Promote the protection of the public by professional bodies from malpractice related to the fulfilment of the professional duties and responsibilities of professionals registered with them.
vi. Encourage international leading practice and the raising of esteem for all professions in South Africa.
vii. Facilitate access to, and analysis of, data related to professions, including traditional trades and occupations, for the purposes and use as prescribed by the NQF Act.
viii. Support the development of a national career advice system.
ix. Encourage the development and implementation of continuing professional development.

A body applying to be recognised as a professional body by SAQA shall:

i. Be a legally constituted entity with the necessary human and financial resources to undertake its functions, governed either by a statute, charter or a constitution and be compliant with and adhere to good corporate governance practices.
ii. Protect the public interest in relation to services provided by its members and the associated risks.
iii. Develop, award, monitor and revoke its professional designations in terms of its own rules, legislation and/or international conventions.
iv. Submit a list of members in a form acceptable to SAQA.
v. Set criteria for, promote and monitor continuing professional development (CPD) for its members to meet the relevant professional designation requirements.
vi. Publish a code of conduct and operate a mechanism for the reporting and investigating of members who are alleged to have contravened the code.
vii. Not apply unfair exclusionary practices in terms of membership admission to the body or when recognising education or training providers.
viii. Make career advice related information available to SAQA. SAQA, 2012:

From the above quoted Policy and Criteria documents it is furthermore evident that a Professional Body, whether Statutory or Non-Statutory is inter alia:

• Encouraged to develop and implement Continuing Professional Development (CPD).
• Shall set criteria for, promote and monitor CPD for its members to meet the relevant professional designation requirements.
• Include adherence to a Code of Professional Ethics and/or Conduct.

Apart from the SAQA Policy and Criteria for Recognising a Professional Body and Registering a Professional Designation, other legislation has a role to play such as industry specific legislation (the Financial Advisory and Intermediary Services Act 37 of 2002 for the Financial Services Industry as currently regulated by the Financial Services Board (FSB)). These requirements need to be considered to determine the impact the Regulator has on professional bodies and their practices.

Apart from recognition criteria and legislative requirements, it should be considered whether or not a Regulator recognises CPD points/ hours obtained to satisfy the SAQA requirement for professional bodies.
Appendix B: Detail about the background and origins of the present study

Amendments to the Financial Advisory and Intermediary Services Act 37 of 2002 (FAIS Act)\(^4\) sparked discussions between the Financial Planning Institute (FPI) and the Financial Services Board (FSB). Amongst issues raised in these discussions was for members belonging to more than one professional body to potentially be confused as each professional body had its own Continuing Professional Development (CPD) policy with different CPD learning requirements. The South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) who, under the NQF Act, is required to recognise professional bodies and register professional designations has a particular interest in promoting quality and best practice in CPD.

As all three organisations intersected around good CPD practices, discussions highlighted the need to investigate the current CPD practices and to make proposals regarding best practices of CPD both nationally and internationally. The discussions between SAQA and FPI led to a decision to embark on a joint project to survey the current CPD practices of SAQA recognised professional bodies. The aim was to better understand current CPD practices and to find the best way forward to promote best CPD practices amongst those professional bodies in the financial sector as well as seeking synergy with the requirements of the financial sector regulators.

The survey into CPD practices was undertaken by SAQA and FPI during 2014 and 2015. The survey aimed to gather information on CPD practices nationally as practised by SAQA recognised statutory and non-statutory professional bodies. It also aimed to consider international CPD model(s) to benchmark South African CPD practices. The survey was conducted against the background of professional body requirements in both the NQF Act 67 of 2008 and the Policy and Criteria for Recognising a Professional Body and Registering a Professional Designation for the purposes of the NQF.

A point of departure for the survey was to gather information on one international and one South African CPD practice. The international CPD example is described by Christopher Day (1999), emeritus professor in Education (University of Nottingham) who suggests an all-inclusive model of CPD. According to Day, CPD can be taken to relate to all ‘natural’ learning experiences (informal learning)\(^5\), plus those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual or society (Day, 1999).

An example of a South African CPD model is formulated by the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) showing a different understanding of CPD:

“CPD means the systematic maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills, and the development of personal qualities necessary for the execution of professional and technical duties throughout a person’s engineering career.”

Systematic maintenance refers to training by ECSA approved providers which signals that CPD is understood as a formal training\(^6\) opportunity which excludes ‘natural’ learning experiences (informal learning) as in the international CPD example.

This point of departure indicated two possible CPD practices: first, recognition of both formal and informal activities; and second recognition of formal activities only.

---

4. Via the Financial Services Laws General Amendment Act 65 of 2013
5. Informal learning is learning that occurs in an organised and structured education and training environment and that is explicitly designated as such (NQFpedia)
6. Formal learning is learning that results from daily activities related to paid or unpaid work, family or community life, or leisure (NQFpedia)
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