Public consultation on draft revised registration standards and related guidelines

28 April 2014

Responses to consultation questions

**Please provide your feedback as a Word document (or equivalent)[[1]](#footnote-1) to** [**pharmacyconsultation@ahpra.gov.au**](mailto:pharmacyconsultation@ahpra.gov.au)**by close of business on Monday 30 June 2014.**

Stakeholder Details

*If you wish to include background information about your organisation please provide this as a separate word document (not PDF).*

|  |
| --- |
| **Organisation name** |
|  |
| **Contact information**  *(please include contact person’s name and email address)* |
|  |

Your responses to consultation questions on the draft revised standards and related guidelines

| **Registration standard: Professional indemnity insurance arrangements**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how is the current Professional indemnity insurance (PII) arrangements registration standard working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised Registration standard: PII arrangements helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised Registration standard: PII arrangements? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised Registration standard: PII arrangements? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised Registration standard: PII arrangements? |
|  |

| **Registration standard: Continuing professional development (CPD)**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how is the current CPD registration standard working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised Registration standard: CPD helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised Registration standard: CPD? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised Registration standard: CPD? |
|  |
| 1. Is the proposed requirement for pharmacists to maintain CPD records for a minimum of three years appropriate? Would an alternative period be considered more appropriate, for example five years? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised Registration standard: CPD? |
|  |

| **Guidelines on continuing professional development (CPD)**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how are the current guidelines on CPD working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised guidelines on CPD helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current guidelines? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised guidelines on CPD? |
|  |
| 1. Should the Board change the limitation in relation to the percentage of Group 1 activities that can be claimed as part of the annual CPD credits requirement (now rephrased to state the minimum amount of Group 2 and Group 3 activities to be undertaken by pharmacists)? If so, what should this be changed to and why? |
|  |
| 1. Should the Board introduce a specific minimum requirement for Group 3 activities? If you believe the Board should, what should the minimum amount or proportion be? Please provide further information which explains how this could be achieved by pharmacists in all areas of practice. |
|  |
| 1. Are the definitions for CPD activity groups (Groups 1, 2 and 3) satisfactory? If not, what requires further clarification, and what are your recommendations? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised guidelines on CPD? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised guidelines on CPD? |
|  |

| **Registration standard: Recency of practice (ROP)**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how is the current ROP registration standard working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised Registration standard: ROP helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised Registration standard: ROP? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised Registration standard: ROP? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised Registration standard: ROP? |
|  |

| **Registration standard: Supervised practice arrangements**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how is the current Supervised practice arrangements registration standard working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised Registration standard: Supervised practice arrangements helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised Registration standard: Supervised practice arrangements? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised Registration standard: Supervised practice arrangements? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised Registration standard: Supervised practice arrangements? |
|  |

| **Registration standard: Examinations for eligibility for general registration**  *Please provide your responses to any or all questions in the blank boxes below* |
| --- |
| 1. From your perspective how is the current Examinations for general registration standard working? |
|  |
| 1. Is the content and structure of the draft revised Registration standard: Examinations for eligibility for general registration helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current standard? |
|  |
| 1. Is there any content that needs to be changed or deleted in the draft revised Registration standard: Examinations for eligibility for general registration? |
|  |
| 1. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the draft revised Registration standard: Examinations for eligibility for general registration? |
|  |
| 1. Do you think that the proposed review period of five years, with the option to review earlier if the need arises, is appropriate? |
|  |
| 1. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised Registration standard: Examinations for eligibility for general registration? |
|  |

**Please provide your feedback as a Word document (or equivalent) to** [**pharmacyconsultation@ahpra.gov.au**](mailto:pharmacyconsultation@ahpra.gov.au) **by close of business on Monday 30 June 2014.**

1. You are welcome to supply a PDF file of your feedback in addition to the word (or equivalent) file, however we request that you do supply a text or word file. As part of an effort to meet international website accessibility guidelines, AHPRA and National Boards are striving to publish documents in accessible formats (such as word), in addition to PDFs. More information about this is available at [www.ahpra.gov.au/About-AHPRA/Accessibility.aspx](http://www.ahpra.gov.au/About-AHPRA/Accessibility.aspx). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)