

## **Review of Criminal History registration standard and English language skills registration standard**

### **SOUTHERN CROSS UNIVERSITY FEEDBACK**

#### **PREAMBLE**

Southern Cross University (SCU) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the Review of Criminal history registration standard and English language skills registration standard Consultation Paper forwarded to us on 25 October 2013.

SCU offers a range of courses that are affected by these standards, including nursing, osteopathy, psychology, occupational therapy, midwifery and podiatry. SCU academic staff involved with the development and delivery of these courses have jointly considered the issues discussed in the consultation paper and provide the below comments on selected questions put for feedback.

#### **SCU FEEDBACK ON CRIMINAL HISTORY REGISTRATION STANDARD**

1. From your perspective, how is the current standard working?

There appear to be no problems with the current standard.

2. Are there any state or territory specific issues or impacts arising from applying the existing standard that you would like to raise with the Boards?

None known.

3. Is the content of the registration standard helpful, clear and relevant?

Yes.

4. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the registration standard?

No.

5. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the registration standard?

No.

6. Do you have any other comments on the registration standard?

Not at this time.

SCU FEEDBACK ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS REGISTRATION STANDARD

2. Should the countries recognised in the standard be consistent with those countries recognised by the Department of Immigration and Citizenship for exemptions from English language testing?

No. Health care workers need a high degree of communication skill to be safe and proficient in their work.

3. Is there any evidence to assist National Boards to assess whether there are any additional countries that should be recognised in their English language skills registration standard?

Not to our knowledge.

4. Do you have comments about how the National Boards should approach test results that are very close to, but slightly below, the current standard?

The standard should be reached for a pass (i.e. a cut off must be clearly delineated). If the candidate does not pass, the test should be taken again.

5. Should National Boards accept results from more than one sitting or is there a better way to address this issue, such as the approaches described above?

More research is required before a definitive solution can be agreed. In the absence of that the IELTS approach of 7 with no category below 6.5 is a suitable compromise.