



## Response template for providing feedback to public consultation on draft proposed professional capabilities

---

The Podiatry Accreditation Committee welcomes your feedback on the draft proposed professional capabilities and the draft proposed accreditation standards.

Please use this response template to respond to the questions on the **draft proposed professional capabilities for podiatrists and podiatric surgeons**.

Please indicate which set of draft proposed professional capabilities you are providing feedback on by placing an 'X' in the box below. Please use a separate response template for each document you are providing feedback on.

Then provide your responses to all or some of the questions in the text boxes on the following pages. You do not need to respond to a question if you have no comment.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| X | Draft proposed threshold professional capabilities for podiatrists |
|   | Draft proposed professional capabilities for podiatric surgeons    |

Please submit your responses to the questions in the template by email to: [accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au](mailto:accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au) using the subject line 'Feedback on draft proposed professional capabilities for podiatrists and podiatric surgeons.'

**Feedback should be provided by Friday 12 March 2021.**

### Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

|                           |                                 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Name:</b>              | Nello Marino                    |
| <b>Organisation Name:</b> | Australian Podiatry Association |

**Your responses to the consultation questions**

|  |
|--|
| <b>1. Does any content need to be added to the draft proposed professional capabilities?</b>   |
|  |
| <b>2. Does any content need to be amended in the draft proposed professional capabilities?</b>   |
|  |
| <b>3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording of the draft proposed professional capabilities?</b>  |
| <b>1. document attachment A1- section 2.2 c) 'be culturally responsive'. Which requires ongoing learning.</b><br><br>It is possible that this could trigger a New Zealand registration model where annual cultural training (3 hours per year) is mandatory for ongoing certificate of registration. (See attached New Zealand standards-page 7 (Appendix 1)). Is this training that might be delivered by external agencies or associations. Is there some potential or requirements to have reciprocal arrangements for registration with New Zealand? |

**Academic marking issue:**

There appears to be a conflict between two standards: standard 1 that insists on 'evidence based practice' and the second standard that refers to responding to patients wishes with regard to pursuing traditional medicine or suitable . This could have impacts on healing of foot ulcers and then amputation while we want to 'reduce the gap' for indigenous and TSI health outcomes. Students are confused enough without being asked the impossible if examiners want to mark harshly.

The two respective statements in the document are reflected below:

**Domain 1.1**

- f. Conduct an appropriate physical examination of the patient and their presenting health issue/s using an evidence-based approach and taking into account relevant contraindications and precautions.

**Domain 2.4**

- c. Consider patient preferences for traditional or alternative treatments when appropriate'.

**C. Are there implementation issues the Accreditation Committee should be aware of?**

**D. Do you have any general feedback on the draft proposed professional capabilities?**