

Nga Kaupapa o te Wa | Top stories in this edition

- [Summary of Auckland Practitioner Evening](#)
- [Letter to Minister Doocey](#)
- [AP Consultation Reminder](#)
- [New Secretariat Operating System Reminder](#)
- [Clarification regarding advice about reviewing reports](#)

No te Taumata | Note from the Chief Executive/Registrar

Tena koutou katoa,

The Board held their meeting in Auckland last month. It was a privilege to engage with a number of practitioners the evening ahead of the meeting. The Board shared updates on its current priorities and regulatory activities with those present. The event provided an opportunity for open discussion, including a Q&A session, which you can read about [below](#).

Following this, the Board Chair and I met with the Psychology Board of Australia in Melbourne. Our respective regulatory work programmes have a number of shared themes, so it was valuable to exchange insights and experiences.

We are aware there has been some confusion regarding the Board's previous advice on Specialist Report Writing as outlined in the last Pānui. We have provided further clarification [in this Pānui](#).

Finally, a reminder that the [consultation](#) for the proposed new role 'AP' remains open until 16 June 2025. We welcome and encourage your feedback.

Ngā mihi,

Vanessa Simpson
Chief Executive/Registrar | Tumuaki/Pouroki

He Purongo Matua | Priority News

Summary of Auckland Practitioner Evening

Board Members Present

Lisa Lawrence	Board Chair, Lay Member
Dr Tania Cargo	Clinical Psychologist
Nalini Meyer	Lay Member
Dr Elizabeth Du Preez	Counselling & Clinical Psychologist
Dr Valerie Tan	Clinical Psychologist
John Eatwell	Organisational Psychologist
Emma Sutich	Clinical Psychologist

Apologies

Dr Ainsleigh Cribb-Su'a	Deputy Chair, Clinical Psychologist
Professor John Bushnell	Board Advisor
Dr Dianne Ball	Lay Member

Secretariat Present

Vanessa Simpson	CE/Registrar
Gina Giannios	Deputy Registrar
Dr Jane Freeman-Brown	Psychology Advisor
Matua Brian Emery	Māori Cultural Advisor

To note – There was no official note taker during the Q and A session, the following is an abridged version based on notes staff recorded afterwards.

Practitioner evenings offer a valuable opportunity for the Board to update psychologists on its role, activities and progress. A welcome outcome of these events is the chance for psychologists, especially those in the same city, to connect and network with each other.

During the session, the Board presented a series of topics before opening the floor for questions and comments. A summary of the questions and board response follows.

Queries were raised about the lack of representation from Educational psychology on the Board and decisions affecting all registered psychologists are made without representation of all scopes. It was also raised that there is a sense of disquiet to have lay members on the regulatory board of the profession.

It was clarified that all Board members are recruited and appointed by the Minister of Health and subsequently there is no control over the scope of psychologist that gets appointed to the Board. The law requires for three lay members as part of a full complement of nine for all health regulators. Lay members on any Board offer a valuable perspective from their individual skill sets and from the perspective of a non-health practitioner and potential consumer of psychological services.

Feedback from those present focused on the impact of the scopes review, with particular concern expressed by those working under contracts with major employers.

The Board reaffirmed its commitment to engage directly with those employers to clarify that no changes to scopes have been made. The Board further advised that over the next two days they would explore options for advancing with cohesion the review of scopes, competencies and accreditation.

It was asked if a copy of the Psychology Scopes Advisory Group (PSAG) project report could be made available.

PSAG were commissioned by the Board to provide a paper providing options and a recommendation for the Board to consider. The report can be found [HERE](#). Those present were advised that this report had been used to deliberate the Board's next steps with this work.

Participants noted a positive increase in communications from the Board and also highlighted the absence of a clear roadmap for the future of psychology overall.

The Board reiterated that Health NZ | Te Whatu Ora are the owners for developing this proposed AP role and subsequently the roadmap for psychology.

There was a question on the lack of response in regard to a letter that was sent to the Chair outlining concerns from the IEDP and ensuring equity in ensuring that one scope of practice doesn't define the parameters and application of the scopes of practice based on specific language and formulation.

The Chair acknowledged that she had the letter and the advice in the letter would be applied at the right juncture, as it was a very relevant and pertinent perspective. She had intended to update the authors once the information had been applied to processes in the future. Subsequent to the evening, the Chair checked her records, and she had acknowledged receipt of it at the time with the sender, it was not outright ignored nor disregarded.

The Board was asked who the final decisions regarding the proposed AP role rests with.

The Board advised that they have responsibility for the title of this proposed role. The Board also advised that they are required to determine their position on the scope definition and competencies once the formal consultation process is complete.

Letter to Minister Doocey

The NZPB operates under the statutory framework of the Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act (2003), which mandates strict compliance with regulatory requirements in the development of scopes of practice, competencies and prescribed qualifications. These compliance obligations, in association with the proposed 'AP' role, have been outlined to Minister Doocey and can be read in more detail [HERE](#).

AP Consultation Reminder

This serves as a reminder of the ongoing consultation for the AP scope and competencies. Health New Zealand | Te Whatu Ora (Health NZ) have been leading a project for a new scope within the wider psychology profession as part of their [Mental Health and Addiction Workforce Plan 2024-2027](#). This project has seen Health NZ commission the New Zealand Psychologists Board (NZPB) to write a scope, title, competencies and supervision requirements for a proposed new role. Additionally, the University of Canterbury (UC) and Auckland University of Technology (AUT) have commenced work on developing training programmes that will be later presented for accreditation consideration by the NZPB, should the proposal be accepted. (Based on the outcome of the initial consultation and resulting Board decision, it is intended that further consultation regarding prescribed qualifications would be undertaken if required).

The consultation for the draft scope and competencies remains open until 16 June 2025 and interested parties are invited and reminded to ensure that they share their feedback and opinions on the work and scope before the closing date.

Full information including background to the project and a link to the full consultation document and survey can be found [HERE](#).

He Aha Nga Mea Hou? | What's New?

Reminder - New Secretariat Operating System

A reminder that our Secretariat | Tari Hekeretari will transition to a new operating system in the coming month.

This is a major change, and our team will require time to adapt, which may impact our usual delivery times. We will prioritise high-risk regulatory matters, including immediate actions to safeguard the public, as well as urgent registration applications.

There should be no impact to the user experience of Practitioner Portal, which will continue to operate as usual.

We will keep the sector informed about any potential go-live dates. If you have any questions regarding this transition, please feel free to email projects@nzpb.org.nz.

I Patai Mai Koe | You Asked

Clarification of Advice about Reviewing Reports

The April Pānui included advice about the importance of reviewing reports with clients. The Board received some feedback expressing concern about aspects of this advice in relation to reports requested by the Family Court. In response we would like to offer some clarification.

In referring to the possibility of providing parties with a written summary for review, this was not intended to mean that the report itself is provided, nor that the psychologist should spend additional time producing a summary of the report for this purpose. Our intention was that an excerpt of factual components of the report, predominantly biographical details, could be provided for fact-checking. We acknowledge that a lack of clarity has created concern here and apologise for this.

The idea of providing a written summary was an example of possible ways in which the client can feel consulted about factual information provided during interview. It is our understanding that this is a practice assumed by some experienced Specialist Report Writers. Fact checking can of course also occur during the interview itself, and will be supported by diligent notetaking, as well as noting the source of the information.

The advice provided in the April Pānui follows complaints to the Board about factual inaccuracies in reports, for example about personal health or biographical information of an individual. The rationale for fact checking is to reduce the possibility of confusion or distress at a later date, if clients believe they have been misrepresented in their stated information. This would therefore reduce the likelihood of this type of complaint. If a dispute about factual information cannot be resolved, this can be noted in the report. We acknowledge that reports written for the Family Court are subject to a form of “fact checking” by cross examination in the Family Court, but we do not consider this is the forum where the accuracy of personal biographical details pre-dating the relationship in dispute and known only by that party would be established.

There are obligations under Health Information Privacy Code to correct health information – it is better to ensure the information in a report is correct before it is finalised and submitted. If a client subsequently brings an error to the psychologist’s attention they are obliged to either correct the information in the report or attach a correction to the report. These obligations apply to reports submitted to the Family Court.

The Board's advice was not suggesting that Specialist Report Writers prepare a summary or overview of the report itself, however the use of the words "written summary" in the newsletter was perhaps not explicit enough with regards to what was being suggested.

He Hui-a-Poari-a-te-Marama | Dates of next Board Meeting

11th-12th June

13th-14th August

Be Involved | Opportunities

For opportunities to be involved with our mahi and other projects in the sector, please click [HERE](#). Your engagement helps shape the future of psychology in Aotearoa.