

Public consultation on the proposed initial glossary of accreditation terms

April 2023

Response template

This response template is the preferred way to provide your response to the public consultation on the draft proposed **initial glossary of accreditation terms**.

Please provide any feedback in this document, including your responses to all or some of the questions in the text boxes on the following pages. The boxes will expand to accommodate your response. You do not need to respond to a question if you have no comment.

Making a submission

Please complete this response template and send to accreditation.policy@ahpra.gov.au using the subject line '*Feedback – public consultation on glossary of accreditation terms*'. **Submissions are due by COB 23 June 2023.**

Publication of submissions

We publish submissions at our discretion. We generally publish submissions on our [website](#) to encourage discussion and inform the community and stakeholders about consultation responses. Please let us know if you do not want your submission published.

We will not place on our website, 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.

We 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 These submissions will not be published on the website or elsewhere.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. A 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 if you want us to treat all or part of it as confidential.

Published submissions will include the names of the individuals and/or the organisations that made the submission unless confidentiality is expressly requested.

Do you want your responses to be published?

- Yes – Please publish my response with my name
- Yes – Please publish my response but don't publish my name
- No I do not want my responses to be published

Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

Name:	Anton Barnett-Harris, CEO
Organisation Name:	Australian Physiotherapy Council

Your responses to the consultation questions

1. Do you have any comments on the terms and/or meanings in Table 1 of the draft proposed initial glossary?	
<i>Please add your comments to the following table and add a new row for each term you have a comment for.</i>	
Term	Comments or suggested edits
<i>Example: Consumers</i>	<i>Example: suggest embedding 'employer' in the proposed meaning for the term consumers</i>
Clinical placement	<p>The Australian Physiotherapy Council (the Council) recommends the expression “accredited program” within the proposed meaning for this term be replaced with “approved program of study” for consistency with the proposed meaning of other entries e.g., Faculty/academic and other staff. This would also be aligned with the “Approved program” entry in “Table 2: Terms and meanings for information only” provided within the consultation papers. A slight grammatical change is also recommended – a suggested amended proposed meaning is as follows:</p> <p><i>The component of an approved program of study, undertaken with supervision in a clinical environment, which assists students to put theoretical knowledge into practice.</i></p>
Clinical supervisor	<p>The Council proposes that this term be amended to “Clinical placement supervisor” to reflect that this role relates specifically to providing supervision for students completing clinical placements.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the word “doing” within the proposed meaning be altered to “undertaking” or “completing”.</p>
Course accreditation	<p>There appears to be an errant close bracket in the proposed definition after the phrase “self-accrediting provider”. It is advised that this be removed.</p>

Intraprofessional collaboration	It is suggested that the proposed meaning begin from the word “involves.” This is to be consistent with other proposed meanings, which largely do not include the term being defined.
Professional accreditation assessment team	The Council proposes that the alternative terms noted at the beginning of the proposed meaning should instead be included in italics in the “Term” column, in the same way as other entries e.g., Interprofessional education <i>also known as interprofessional learning</i> .
Program monitoring report(s)	Given the removal of the word “(Annual)” from this term following the preliminary consultation, the associated note regarding frequency of reporting is no longer seems pertinent. It is therefore recommended that this be removed. In the event the Accreditation Committee wishes to retain this reference, the Council submits that it would be better positioned after the alternative terms noted.
Social accountability/social responsibility	The formatting of the bullet points within the proposed meaning of this term differs from that used within the entry for “Professional accreditation assessment team”. It is recommended that the formatting of bullet points be consistent throughout the glossary.

<p>Woman-centred practice/care</p>	<p>The Council proposes removing the word “practice” from this term so as to be consistent with the entry “Person-centred care”. Should this suggestion be accepted, it is recommended that the word “practice” within the proposed meaning consequently be amended to “care.”</p> <p>As an alternative to the above, the Accreditation Committee may consider amending the corresponding alternative term noted with the entry “Person-centred care” so that this reads “woman-centred practice/care”.</p>
------------------------------------	---

2. Are there any other terms you believe may be relevant to the areas of the committee’s advice and that you would like to see included in a future version of the glossary?

The Council has no suggestions at this time for any additional terms to be added to a future version of the glossary.

3. Do you have any general comments or other feedback about the draft proposed initial glossary?

The Council would like to compliment the Accreditation Committee on the changes made to the proposed initial glossary of terms following its preliminary consultation on this topic. Contemporisation of a number of terms is especially commended, as this should ensure their longevity. The Council was also pleased with the incorporation of the distinction between course and professional accreditation, and the nomination of one proposed meaning where several had previously been suggested. It is felt that these changes will make the intended meanings of these terms clearer.