

Mon 10/10/2011

To whom it may concern

Re: Proposed Registration Standards Consultation Paper & Addendum to Chinese Medicine Draft Standards Consultation Paper

I write in support of the positions taken by the AACMA in regards to the for mentioned papers.

I am in support of the initiativeve to undertake national registration.

In the papers released for feedback there are a number of issues raised in the papers that if implemented as is - that will have serious ramifications for practitioners of Chinese Medicine.

In 2004 I enrolled in The Sydney Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine.( SITCM ) SITCM is an accredited educational institution and historically had lead and indeed initiated a number of other TCM institutions such as UTS and University of Western Sydney and whilst I was a student at SITCM it was undertaking the delivery of and teaching of Chinese Herbal Medicine and Acupuncture to University of Western Sydney students.

For a number of years we sat together learning about Chinese Medicine. I undertook the Advanced Diploma course that was accredited and I was accepted into the AACMA due to my professional credentials. I travelled to China and undertook a clinical internship at an accredited TCM University Hospital. My intership lasted over three months and was full time.

I had previously obtained a degree qualification from Sydney University but choose when deciding to undertake TCM that I would go with a private highly respected and accredited tertiary educational institution. This was done because I wanted a different style of educational delivery to the one I had at Sydney University . I was a mature age student and did not want to be in a big campus with many students. I wanted a more intimate educational environment and as SITCM was government accredited, I was confident and assured my credentials had currency in the market place.

During those four years of study, I undertook more courses than required for the Advanced Diploma because SITCM course was moving for accreditation as a degree course. Accreditation did not occur - yet myself and some fellow class mates undertook extra courses in this time.

In 2007 I returned from my clinical internship in China and received my Advanced Diploma in Acupuncture and Chinese Herbal Medicine from SITCM and by August of that year was accepted into the AACMA after proof of qualifications , clinical internship and PL Insurance was undertaken.

I have since opened my own clinical practice and undertaken Professional Development CPE courses as demanded by my professional association the AACMA and taken out full PL insurance yearly.

Upon reading the draft papers I now find that my qualifications are compromised but my fellow students that I studied with from the University of Western Sydney are, and that the rules to assess my credentials are higher than those for my peers in Victoria as well.

I ask that you look at the disparity in the registration standards across Australia.

I ask that you look at those students like myself who choose government accredited learning intuitions to undertake their professional qualifications - that you are now retrospectively negating.

A significant amount of money and time went into achieving those qualifications based on the governments own accreditation criteria at the time and the peak professional associations accreditation process and standards.

In summary I note that there is a discrepancy in the draft grandparenting standards -

I note that unaccredited programs in the draft standards paper that have been accredited by the AACMA as meeting the requirements of the time should be included in the list of courses deemed adequate for grandparenting, and that this include the past practitioner diploma and unaccredited bachelor programs.

Thank you for your consideration

Tim Wilson