



Response template for providing feedback to public consultation – draft revised professional capabilities for medical radiation practice

This response template is an optional way to provide your response to the public consultation paper for the **Draft revised professional capabilities for medical radiation practice**. Please provide your responses to any of the questions in the corresponding text boxes; you do not need to answer every question if you have no comment.

Making a submission

Please complete this response template and send to medicalradiationconsultation@ahpra.gov.au, using the subject line '*Feedback on draft revised professional capabilities for medical radiation practice*'.

Submissions are due by midday on Friday 26 April 2019.

Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

Name:	Julie Burberry
Organisation Name:	Queensland University of Technology

Your responses to the preliminary consultation questions

1. Does any content need to be added to any of the documents?
2. Does any content need to be amended or removed from any of the documents?
Domain 2: It is the responsibility of the Radiation Oncologist to obtain informed consent and the responsibility of the radiation therapist to ensure it has been gained prior to a procedure. The wording around responding to a patient's deteriorating condition needs to be clarified. Communication regarding a patient's deteriorating condition to patients, carers or families seems outside the realm of expectations and scope for RTs. If this is the case, what is the expectation from the University perspective in preparation for this.
3. Do the key capabilities sufficiently describe the threshold level of professional capability required to safely and competently practise as a medical radiation practitioner in a range of contexts and situations?
Medicines, needs to be defined.
4. Do the enabling components sufficiently describe the essential and measurable characteristics of threshold professional capability that are necessary for safe and competent practice?
The Public Consultation document (p.6) states a list of the minimum that MRPs must be able to interpret and identify abnormalities. Is the intention that these must now be included within the curriculum? If so, how are currently registered practitioners to be assessed against this? At the Public Consultation meeting, this was inadequately addressed.

5. Is the language clear and appropriate? Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording?

Some wording is unclear and non-specific, I apologise for the lack of detail here but I am aware this is due soon.

6. Are there jurisdiction-specific impacts for practitioners, or governments or other stakeholders that the National Board should be aware of, if these capabilities are adopted?

Unsure why these are based on NZMRTB requirements, when NZ adopted the Professional Capabilities from Australia and we all had some input into the NZ document.

7. Are there implementation issues the National Board should be aware of?

8. Do you have any other general feedback or comments on the proposed draft revised professional capabilities?

Relating to the Public Consultation doc (p.3) where it states that Universities will use the Professional Capabilities for the development of medical radiation practice curricula (learning and assessment) which is correct but unsure how areas that are deemed as Optional key capabilities and enabling components (p.12 Draft document) are to be considered if they are optional. Surely these are either in or out of the curriculum.