



## Public consultation on draft revised registration standards and relevant guidelines

---

19 May 2014

### Responses to consultation questions

Please provide your feedback as a Word document (not PDF) by email to [podiatryconsultation@ahpra.gov.au](mailto:podiatryconsultation@ahpra.gov.au) by close of business on 14 July 2014.

#### Stakeholder Details

<b>Organisation name</b>
Rolf Scharbillig
<b>Contact information</b> <i>(please include contact person's name and email address)</i>

#### Your responses to the consultation questions

<b>Registration standard: Professional indemnity insurance arrangements</b> <i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>
1. From your perspective how is the current Professional indemnity insurance (PII) arrangements registration standard working?
Working well
2. Is the content and structure of the draft revised registration standard helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current registration standard?
Very similar
3. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised registration standard?
no

<b>Registration standard: Professional indemnity insurance arrangements</b>	
<i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>	
4. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised registration standard?	No
5. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised registration standard?	Easy to understand and contains necessary information
6. Do you think that that the current review period of at least every three years should be maintained or would an alternative period be appropriate e.g. five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises?	5 years to save costs – changes could be made beforehand if significant issues found. This would save time and money for the Boards but still adequately protect the public

<b>Registration standard: Continuing professional development (CPD)</b>	
<i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>	
7. From your perspective how is the current CPD registration standard working?	Well
8. Is the content of the draft revised registration standard helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current registration standard?	Similar
9. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised registration standard?	no
10. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised registration standard?	no
11. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised registration standard?	no
12. Do you think that that the current review period of at least every three years should be maintained or would an alternative period be appropriate e.g. five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises?	5 years to save costs – changes could be made beforehand if significant issues found. This would save time and money for the Boards but still adequately protect the public

<b>Guidelines on continuing professional development (CPD)</b>	
<i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>	
13. From your perspective, how are the current guidelines on CPD working?	well
14. Is the content of the draft revised guidelines helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current guidelines?	Similar – both good
15. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised guidelines?	No
16. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised guidelines?	no
17. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised guidelines?	no

<b>Registration standard: Recency of practice (ROP)</b>	
<i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>	
18. From your perspective how is the current Recency of practice registration standard working?	yes
19. Is the content of the draft revised registration standard helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current registration standard?	Similar – quite clear
20. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised registration standard?	Think there should be a minimum requirement of practice for each year, ie 150 hours per year
21. Do you have any comments on the minimum practice requirements in the draft revised registration standard?	As above

<b>Registration standard: Recency of practice (ROP)</b>	
<i>Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below</i>	
<b>22.</b>	Do you think that the following alternative for minimum hours of practice would be better? (i.e without the option of 150 hours in the 12 month period prior to applying for registration or renewal of registration). Please provide the reason for your answer:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>450 hours of practice in the three year period prior to applying for registration or renewal of registration</i></li> </ul>
	150 hours in each year of the period being examined would be more relevant to recency of practice.
<b>23.</b>	Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised registration standard?
	No
<b>24.</b>	Do you have any other comments on the draft revised registration standard?
	No
<b>25.</b>	Do you think that that the current review period of at least every three years should be maintained or would an alternative period be appropriate e.g. five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises?
	5 years to save costs – changes could be made beforehand if significant issues found. This would save time and money for the Boards but still adequately protect the public
<b>26.</b>	Do you have any comments on the draft <i>Guidelines about recency of practice?</i>
	no

**Please provide your feedback as a Word document (not PDF) by email to [podiatryconsultation@ahpra.gov.au](mailto:podiatryconsultation@ahpra.gov.au) by close of business on 14 July 2014**