Hello Chair and Committee

I append here my initial reaction to the information given in the document on examination curriculum. I rarely comment on such national matters, but believe the committee’s work is badly flawed and unbalanced in regard to the curriculum. This needs to be addressed in any review of what is being examined and why. There is no clear rationale given or overview of what psychology is, and in particular no awareness of the breadth of the discipline and profession of psychology. My comments to my colleagues at Bond University on 7th November when I first read through the document were as follows (and I make them available to the Committee to help in deliberations):

"The Psych Board document shows ignorance of almost any of the competencies, assessments, organisational interventions, communication techniques, and other skills of organisational psychologists. This is demonstrated most clearly in the list of assessments that all examinees should be familiar with—almost entirely clinical-- nearest is the reference to vocational assessments (2) and these are woefully inadequate and dated approaches as I see things and compared with what I do and use in my practice. There should be 20 other questionnaires at least that are organisationally based and related to organisational interviews and interviewing, personality and career assessment, organisational leadership and communication, teamwork and facilitation skills in organisations, group dynamics and other intervention techniques such as force-field analysis—and so on—included in the list if a more representative view of the field of psychology is to be portrayed.

I am also aware that this document has very few of the excellent health psychology questionnaires listed. I am sure my Health and Community psychology colleagues will also want to comment on what I think looks like a blinkered awareness of just what is available in psychology practice and the relevance of skills outside Clinical psychology. Clinical psychology is definitely an excellent area well represented here—but there are other areas such as counselling psychology, organisational psychology, health psychology, sports psychology ... which have special assessments and techniques also--- these should not be overlooked in national examining approaches: maybe we need sections in the curriculum that have alternative lists for the different specialities.

I am a full member of the APS Colleges of Clinical Psychology, Counselling Psychology, and Organisational Psychology (and an Associate member of the Health Psychology College), and it disturbs me to see such an imbalance in the emphasis shown in this paper.”

I was encouraged to forward these comments and I want these remarks to be noted. I am happy to provide further comment where this might be helpful.

Dr Richard Edward Hicks FAPS, FBPS, FAIM
Professor of Psychology
Bond University
9th November 2011