

Respondent

< 19 Anonymous >

26:54
Time to complete

1. Name *

Skye Cappuccio

2. Organisation

Optometry Australia

3. Email address *

[REDACTED]

4. The National Boards and Ahpra publish submissions at their discretion. We generally publish submissions on our websites to encourage discussion and inform the community and stakeholders. Please advise us if you do not want your submission published. *

- Submission can be published
- Submission NOT to be published

5. Do the draft revised regulatory principles reflect the policy directions issued by CoAG Health Council? If not, how could the principles be improved?

Yes, we believe they clearly reflect the policy directions issued by the Council.

6. Do the draft revised regulatory principles support Ahpra and the National Boards regulatory decision-making? If not, how could they be improved?

We believe the principles clearly specify principles relevant to guiding decision making by AHPRA and the National Boards. Further, they are readily understandable and enable consumers and health practitioners to understand the key principles that guide regulatory decision-making.

7. Is the content of the draft revised regulatory principles helpful, clear and relevant?

Yes, in the most part. However, we do note in the revised Principle 6 the sentence "Our responses are designed to not punish practitioners." We believe the phrasing of this sentence could be potentially misleading and confusing and imply that responses are designed to ensure practitioners do not feel punished. We suggest this sentence is re-worded, perhaps as "Our responses are not designed to punish practitioners." This re-wording would make clear that the intent when designing a response isn't to provide punishment to a practitioner.

8. Is there any content that needs to be changed, added or deleted in the draft revised regulatory principles?

Please see response to Q7.

9. Please add any other comments or suggestions for the draft revised regulatory principles.