

**Submission on behalf of the Australian  
and New Zealand Society of Nuclear  
Medicine  
(ANZSNM)**

**Review of Criminal History registration  
standard and English language Skills  
registration standard by Australian Health  
Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA)**



## Introduction:

The ANZSNM is the national professional organization representing professionals from all disciplines involved in the field of Nuclear Medicine. It is the current professional body for Nuclear Medicine Technologists/Scientists in Australia, with approximately 80% of working practitioners being members, and these form the ANZSNMT.

We feel that all healthcare professionals require high technical skills along with suitable English skills and Past History. Our response reflects our ongoing support of patient safety.

## **Response to Review of Criminal History Standard:**

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

From experience it seems to be working well, I have not heard of anyone being harshly treated for minor infringements or any major criminal history being missed.

### **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 board?**

Nothing has come to us.

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

Yes the terminology and explanations make it clear what will be scrutinised in the Criminal History.

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

No changes required.

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

No additions required.

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

As a Society we think this registration standard has as much importance as the Technical based registration standards for patient safety. Please continue to keep us informed if any changes occur to this document.

Our preferred option is to keep current Standard.

## **Response to Review of English Language Standard:**

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

The current standard is working well, we have not received any complaints about difficulties in the process.

### **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? If so, should the recognition of South Africa in the National Board's English language skills registration be phased out over time?**

We think that the English levels should be consistent with Department of Immigration and Citizenship to maintain consistency across the process of entering Australia for work. The boards could look at current and previous South African applicants and ask if they would like to sit the test to judge if South Africa needs to be phased out. Otherwise a decision can be made to line up with Department of Immigration and Citizenship.

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

We have not been approached by any potential registrants who have had difficulties due to the country they are arriving from.

### **4. Do you have any comment about how the board should approach test results that are very close to, but slightly below the current standard?**

In all areas of Health English language skills are very important in receiving information, passing directions and working with others. If a mistake is made it could affect patient safety.

The Boards have two options to approach this.

They can have a hard line stance and not accept any below pass results or they could require the registrant to enrol in a supervised practice period which then would assess how their English skills hold up in a clinical environment. They can be assessed again after a 6 month period when, they should pass what they failed previously.

**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?**

We feel that allowing multiple sittings is fine as long as they set a high level at which needs to be passed. The process outlined in the new standard is ok.

**6. Is the content of draft revised registration standard helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard?**

While being a generic document with the added sections for different boards makes it difficult to work through, once a board specific version of the document is created it is clear.

**7. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the revised draft registration document?**

Nothing needs to be changed.

**8. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the revised draft registration standard?**

Nothing needs to be added.

**9. Do you have any other comments on the revised registration standard?**

Option two is our preferred option.