

Via email 2/10/12

Comments by the Department of Health (Victoria)

a) Do you agree with the proposed inclusion of at least one educationalist, at least one medical radiation academic, at least one medical radiation practitioner and at least one allied health sciences academic to the Committee?

The inclusion of the above categories of members on the accreditation committee appears reasonable. However, it would be desirable to strengthen input from persons beyond the medical radiation profession by the inclusion of an additional educationalist. This would bring important expertise to the Committee, for example, in the areas of competency based assessment, adult learning and the VET sector.

Expertise from outside the profession, along with rigorous management of conflicts of interest are critical elements to ensure that the Committee adopts a flexible approach that supports new models of medical radiation program delivery and streamlined arrangements for recognition of internationally qualified practitioners.

While we support the capacity to appoint further members to the Committee (in consultation with the Board) as required to assist with increased workloads or to provide alternative members if conflicts of interests arise, care is needed to ensure a balance of views (between the MR profession and beyond it) is brought to the decision-making table.

b) Do you think there should be additional sub-criteria for the selection of the above persons and if so what should they be?

Committee members should be selected on a merit based process based on skills, experience and qualifications.

c) Do you think a board member should be on the Accreditation Committee?

Program accreditation is a core function of the National Board. Overlap in membership between the Board and the Accreditation Committee may be beneficial in streamlining communications and supporting policy deliberations. The critical issue is to ensure that the members of panels appointed to undertake accreditation of individual programs have no vested interests and that the Board observes principles of procedural fairness when taking decisions to approve programs of study and assess overseas trained practitioners.

d) Do you think a community representative should be on the Accreditation Committee?

Not necessary as long as there is a sufficient presence on the Committee of persons who are not from the medical radiation profession and have no vested interests in the profession. In the case of this function, it is the educationalist who brings important expertise and independent views to the deliberations of the committee. As such, it is recommended that the Committee have a minimum of 2 educationalists who are not from the medical radiation profession.

The Board should consider working with other National Boards that operate Accreditation Committees to establish a core group of educationalists to sit on multiple National Board Accreditation Committees. The expertise and cross profession learning that this would bring would enhance the operation of this important function.

e) How many members do you think the Committee should have?

As many or as few as the Board considers necessary to carry out the function effectively, ensuring the Committee reflects a balance of expertise and views, from the profession and beyond it.