



**Submission to Consultation Paper on Codes and Guidelines to Psychology  
Board of Australia**

**Roger Dooley** to: natboards

14/04/2010 12:28 PM

**Attention: Psychology Board of Australia**

**Re: Submission to Consultation Paper on Codes and Guidelines**

We note your call for submissions on the Guidelines published in the Consultation Paper currently published on the Psychology Board of Australia website. Our comments are directed at the proposals regarding supervision in the Guidelines on Area of Practice Endorsements.

We understood from the submission to the Ministerial Council dated 22.12.09, that supervision (of probationary registrants) was not to be an endorsed area of practice i.e., given statutory endorsement. However, the reference to supervision transition arrangements is included in the current Consultation Paper under the "Guidelines on Area of Practice Endorsements". Does this indicate a change of intention by the PBA back to the original proposal that supervision of this kind should be an endorsed practice? If so, then you have our support for such a move.

Our opinion is that the supervision of entrants to the profession through the Supervised Practice Program (SPP) is a critical function. This supervision plays a central role in ensuring the standard of practice required for safe and ethical service of the public by psychologists. Hence, we believe that SPP supervision needs to be an endorsed area of practice. Such endorsement would underpin the training and evaluation process of supervisors in order to ensure the appropriately high standards of supervision needed.

In Section 5: Transition Arrangements for All Board-Approved Supervisors it is implied that there would be separate supervisor training programs in the state/territory board jurisdictions after national registration participation day on 01.07.10. This is the conclusion we have reached from reading the section which states that supervisors carrying current endorsement by their state/territory will automatically transition on participation day, and be approved for three years. The document then says that in those 3 years the other state and territory boards will develop appropriate supervisor training programs. Such an arrangement seems contradictory to the intention that there be a National registration of probationary registrants undertaking a common supervised practice program. Why would there not be a common supervisor training program, nationally?

There is already a significant disparity in the standard of training and evaluation of SPP supervisors across the states and territories. We note that the PBA has endorsed the principle of a high standard of training and the necessity of an evaluation component to ensure the quality of supervision. It seems that to have a significant number of states and territories potentially without a high standard program for up to three years is not appropriate given the importance of this activity.

Our recommendation is that there needs to be prepared, urgently, a set of National standards for endorsement as an SPP supervisor and for a universal (National) training and evaluation program to meet those standards.

Prof. Roger Dooley      Dr Analise O'Donovan

For the Supervisor Training and Accreditation Program Consultancy  
to the Psychologists Board of Queensland]