

Sat 8/10/2011

Dear Sirs,

As a long-time member of AACMA, I am writing to express my concern over several of the guidelines proposed by the CMBA.

Firstly, it does not seem to be either fair or appropriate, to impose on Australian-trained practitioners applying for registration under the national scheme, a higher grandparenting standard than that which applied under the Victorian scheme. In particular I'm concerned about the apparent retrospective application of supervised practice clinic hours, which are clearly different from the standards under which I trained.

Secondly, I support the AACMA concern that all government/university-accredited qualifications of at least three years full-time equivalent duration, should be included on the list of courses deemed adequate for grandparenting, and that this include the past advanced diploma and diploma-level courses.

Thirdly, unaccredited programmes that were recognised by AACMA as meeting the requirements for practice, at that time, should also be included on the list of courses deemed adequate for grandparenting, and that this include the past practitioner diploma and unaccredited bachelor programmes.

Finally, the list submitted by the AACMA of Australian Chinese medicine programmes deemed adequate for grandparenting purposes should be included on the CMBA list of courses deemed adequate for grandparenting purposes.

I am deeply concerned if the guidelines should go ahead as they are currently proposed, as a great many of the most experienced, and highly regarded Australian-trained Chinese medicine practitioners would be considered unacceptable for registration. I wonder how our profession would look if such a wealth of knowledge and experience were excluded.

I hope that my thoughts on these vital matters are considered, along with those in a similar position.

Yours sincerely,

Jan Jamieson. AACMA member 681.