



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:	Marilyn Zelesco
Organisation Name:	Fiona Stanley Hospital

Your responses to the preliminary consultation questions

1. Does any content need to be added to any of the documents?
<p>1) Inclusion of ultrasound as a standard modality in category three of “Key capabilities” – point C & D. Radiation Therapists often use ultrasound planning for brachytherapy and likewise MITs need to understand the role of all complementary imaging.</p> <p>2) In reference to “Understand imaging and treatment pathways” could a formal reference to the Diagnostic Imaging Pathways (DIP) be included as it is endorsed by a variety of expert groups?</p> <p>3) Under Section 10 – “Perform Ultrasound Imaging’ – comments around the relaying of findings/interpretation need to be addressed – be it verbally or in the form of a worksheet.</p> <p>4) Under Domain 5 – Section 4 – insert comment addressing the safe conduct of US in reference to the high rate of MSK injuries</p>
2. Does any content need to be amended or removed from any of the documents?
<p>Domain 3 – Section 1 – define “Informed Consent” for intimate examinations – sonographic or not in regards to written, verbal etc.</p>
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?
<p>Mostly</p>
4. Do the enabling components sufficiently describe the essential and measurable characteristics of threshold professional capability that are necessary for safe and competent practice?
<p>Mostly</p>

<p>5. Is the language clear and appropriate? Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording?</p>
<p>As above</p>
<p>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?</p>
<p>Not sure.</p>
<p>7. Are there implementation issues the National Board should be aware of?</p>
<p>Unsure – impact on ASAR? We need to be registered otherwise a 2 tier system is developing – those for AMS MITs who are registered and those for AMS who are not.</p>
<p>8. Do you have any other general feedback or comments on the proposed draft revised professional capabilities?</p>

Positive