



FEEDBACK ON PUBLIC CONSULTATION PAPER 29 – REVISED GUIDELINES FOR SUPERVISORS AND SUPERVISOR TRAINING PROVIDERS

1. Which option do you prefer – the status quo or the (two) new guidelines?

The Department of Education prefers the two new guidelines.

2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of moving from the current guidelines and revocation policies to the draft guidelines?

The combining of BAS categories and associated alignment of eligibility criteria are a welcome move.

The Department of Education currently supports over 90 provisionally registered psychologists. The majority are undertaking the 4+2 internship pathway to general registration, with an increasing number of 5+1 interns.

Board approved supervisors with the Department of Education have historically required 4+2 principal and secondary category approval only. With the employment of 5+1 interns and practicum supervision for 5th year psychology students, school psychologists are required to seek approval under the 5+1 category (and others). This has placed an unnecessary administrative burden on the workforce and the Board and, in some instances, delayed the approval of the intended supervisory arrangement.

Very few Department of Education Board approved supervisors are providing supervision before holding general registration for three years, and the Department considers the benefit of aligning the eligibility criteria to outweigh any potential disadvantage.

3. Are there other specific impacts (positive or negative) from the draft guidelines that need to be considered? This may include impacts from the proposed combining of BAS categories and the associated alignment of the eligibility criteria.

The Department appreciates clarity being provided around the completion of Part 3 of supervisor training and the extension to six months for completion. The flexibility for refresher training to be delivered via videoconference (for approved providers) provides a cost-effective way to deliver training and ensure equity of access.

4. Is the content and structure of the draft guidelines helpful, clear, relevant and workable?

Yes. The Department supports the separation of the current guidelines to two documents, for two different audiences.

5. Is there any content that needs to be added to, deleted from, or changed in the draft guidelines?

No.

6. From your perspective, are there specific issues that are not addressed in this review that should be? This may include impacts on workforce or access to health services.

No.

7. Do you have any other comments on the proposal?

No.