



## Shared code of conduct: public consultation

### Introduction

The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Practice, Chinese Medicine, Chiropractic, Dental, Medical Radiation Practice, Occupational Therapy, Optometry, Osteopathy, Paramedicine, Pharmacy, Physiotherapy and Podiatry Boards of Australia (National Boards) have a shared code of conduct (shared code), most in the same form and some with minor variations.

The National Boards and the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (Ahpra) are seeking feedback about a proposed revised shared code (revised shared code).

**Please ensure you have read the public consultation papers before answering this survey, as the questions are specific to the revised shared code.**

## Publication of responses

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.

We will not place on our websites, or make available to the public, submissions that contain offensive or defamatory comments or which are outside the scope of the subject of the consultation. Before publication, we may remove personally identifying information from submissions, including contact details.

The National Boards and Ahpra can accept submissions made in confidence. These submissions will not be published on the website or elsewhere. Submissions may be confidential because they include personal experiences or other sensitive information. Any request for access to a confidential submission will be determined in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 1982 (Cth), which has provisions designed to protect personal information and information given in confidence. Please let us know if you do not want us to publish your submission or want us to treat all or part of it as confidential.

**Published submissions will include the names (if provided) of the individuals and/or the organisations that made the response unless confidentiality is requested.**

Please select the box below if you do not want your responses to be published.

Please do not publish my responses

## About your responses

Are you responding on behalf of an organisation?

- Yes  
 No

Please provide the name of the organisation.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Which of the following best describes your organisation?

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Please describe your organisation.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

## Your contact details

First name:

William

Last name:

Larkin

Email address:

[REDACTED]

Which of the following best describes you?

- I am a health practitioner  
 I am a member of the community  
 I am an employer (of health practitioners)  
 Other

Please describe.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

Which of the following health profession/s are you registered in, in Australia?  
You may select more than one answer.

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Practice
- Chinese Medicine
- Chiropractic
- Dental
- Medical
- Medical Radiation Practice
- Midwifery
- Nursing
- Occupational Therapy
- Optometry
- Osteopathy
- Paramedicine
- Pharmacy
- Physiotherapy
- Podiatry
- Psychology
- Other

Please describe.

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

The following questions will help us to gather information about the revised shared Code of conduct.

Please ensure you have read the public consultation papers before responding, as the questions are specific to the revised shared code.

The revised shared code includes high-level principles to provide more guidance to practitioners especially when specific issues are not addressed in the content of the code.

**Are shorter, more concise principles that support the detail in the revised shared Code preferable or are longer, more comprehensive principles a better option? Why?**

Because the longer more comprehensive are better understood.

In the revised shared code, the term 'patient' is used to refer to a person receiving healthcare and is defined as including patients, clients, consumers, families, carers, groups and/or communities'. This is proposed in order to improve readability of the code and to support consistency for the public.

**Do you support the use of the term 'patient' as defined for the revised shared code or do you think another term should be used, for example 'client' or 'consumer'? Why or why not?**

I think consumer covers all classes of clients to a pharmacy better.

The revised shared code includes amended and expanded content on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health and cultural safety that uses the agreed definition of cultural safety for use within the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme. (Section 2 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health and cultural safety).

**Is this content on cultural safety clear? Why or why not?**

I think that it is clear

Sections 3.1 Respectful and culturally safe practice, 4.1 Partnership, 4.9 Professional boundaries and 5.3 Bullying and harassment include guidance about respectful professional practice and patient safety.

**Does this content clearly set the expectation that practitioners must contribute to a culture of respect and safety for all? e.g. women, those with a disability, religious groups, ethnic groups.**

I think that it does clearly set out the expectations about respectful professional practice and safety.

Statements about bullying and harassment have been included in the revised shared code (Section 5.3 Bullying and harassment).

**Do these statements make the National Boards'/Ahpra's role clear? Why or why not?**

Yes

The revised shared code explains the potential risks and issues of practitioners providing care to people with whom they have a close personal relationship (Section 4.8 Personal relationships).

**Is this section clear? Why or why not?**

I think it is clear. When a practitioner deliberately sets out to harm a person whom is in a close personal relationship they would ignore the Code of Conduct for their own evil ends.

**Is the language and structure of the revised shared code helpful, clear and relevant? Why or why not?**

yes

**The aim is that the revised shared code is clear, relevant and helpful. Do you have any comments on the content of the revised shared code?**

YES. The Pharmacy Board Code of Conduct incorporating the Code of Ethics is discriminatory to those who have a conscientious objection to supplying abortion products , the morning after pill and euthanasia ..The Code of ethics acknowledges that a Pharmacist has a right to a conscientious objection to supplying these products ,then obliges them to refer the person requesting these products to a Pharmacy where they can obtain them.. This is a denial of their conscientious objection and is discriminatory. I submit that this clause requiring a pharmacist to refer the customer to a pharmacy who will supply the medicine be removed from the Code of ethics and that their conscientious objection be upheld.

**Do you have any other feedback about the revised shared code?**

no

The National Boards are also interested in your views on the following questions about the potential impacts of the proposed revisions to the shared Code of conduct.

**Would the proposed changes to the revised shared Code result in any adverse cost implications for practitioners, patients/clients/consumers or other stakeholders? If yes, please describe.**

No

**Would the proposed changes to the revised shared Code result in any potential negative or unintended effects? If so, please describe them.**

I do not think that there would be any negative effects .The Pharmacist who declines to supply products for which they have a conscientious objection would do so in a courteous and respectful manner.

**Would the proposed changes to the revised shared Code result in any potential negative or unintended effects for vulnerable members of the community? If so, please describe them.**

I do not think that they would.

**Would the proposed changes to the revised shared Code result in any potential negative or unintended effects for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples? If so, please describe them.**

I have had very little contact with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders so am not sure how they would be affected.

The next two questions are about the Chiropractic Board and its changes to the revised shared code of conduct. They are not relevant to all stakeholders but you are welcome to give feedback if you are interested.

Do you wish to read the questions and provide feedback about the Chiropractic version of the revised shared code?

- No  
 Yes

The Chiropractic Board's (the Board) [current code of conduct](#) is common to many of the National Boards with the exception that the Board's current code of conduct has minor edits, extra content in its Appendices and additional content relating to modalities.

Many of these expectations relating to the Appendices are referred to more broadly in the revised shared code and/or are largely replicated in other relevant board documents such as the recently revised [Guidelines for advertising a regulated health service](#) (Appendix 1) and the [FAQ: chiropractic diagnostic imaging](#) (Appendix 2). It is proposed that the appendices and section on modalities be removed and additional guidance on these areas be presented in additional guidelines or similar.

**Noting that the principles and expectations in the current appendices and modalities section are addressed broadly in the revised shared code and other relevant documents do you think it is necessary to keep the additional information in the Appendices and modalities section? Why or why not?**

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

**If you think keeping the extra information is necessary, do you support that the information be presented as a guideline, or similar, rather than as an appendix to the revised shared code? Why or why not?**

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

The next question is about the Medical Radiation Practice Board and its current version of the revised shared code of conduct. It is not relevant to all stakeholders but you are welcome to give provide feedback if you are interested. Do you wish to read the questions and provide feedback about the Medical Radiation Practice version of the revised shared code?

- No  
 Yes

The Medical Radiation Practice Board's (the Board) [current code of conduct](#) is common to many of the National Boards with the exception that the Board's current code has extra content in its Appendix A. Appendix A includes expectations specific to medical radiation practitioners about providing good care, effective communication and radiation protection. Many of these expectations are referred to in the [Professional capabilities for medical radiation practice](#) (the capabilities), which set out the minimum skills and professional attributes needed for safe, independent practice in diagnostic radiography, nuclear medicine technology and radiation therapy. The Board is proposing to remove Appendix A from the revised code as the content duplicates content included in other documents such as the capabilities.

**Do you think the extra information in Appendix A should be presented in a guideline or similar, noting that the expectations specific to medical radiation practitioners are referred to in the capabilities? Why or why not?**

*This question was not displayed to the respondent.*

## **Thank you!**

Thank you for participating in the public consultation.

Your answers will be used by the National Boards and Ahpra to improve the proposed revised shared Code of conduct.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [AHPRA.Consultation](#)  
**Subject:** A submission on a revised code of conduct for Pharmacists.  
**Date:** Tuesday, 18 May 2021 2:42:25 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I submit that a Pharmacist who has a conscientious objection to supplying medicines for abortion, the morning after pill, Contraceptive medicines, euthanasia medicines and gender altering medicines should be able to decline supplying these medicines without having to refer the person requesting them to another Pharmacy who will supply these medicines.

The Code of Ethics for Pharmacists appears to require a Pharmacist who has a conscientious objection to supplying the above mentioned medicines to refer the person requesting them to another Pharmacy who will supply these medicines.

Care Principle 2, page 12 states :-  
(h)

“informs the patient when exercising the right to decline provision of certain forms of health care based on the Pharmacist’s conscientious objection”, and in such circumstances, appropriately facilitates continuity of care for the patient.”

This is a contradiction to the Code of Conduct which states  
Page 9, 2.4, (g)

“not allowing moral or religious views to deny patients or clients access to healthcare, recognising that practitioners are free to decline to provide or participate in that care personally”

I submit that all ambiguity about declining to supply certain medicines be removed so that it is clear that the Pharmacist does not have to refer the person on to a pharmacy who will supply these medicines.

Mr W B Larkin MPS PhC  
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10