

about the social/emotional aspects of care. An open discussion is then led by a facilitator where attendees are encouraged to reflect and share their thoughts on the story and share any similar experiences.³

Schwartz Rounds have previously been found to increase compassionate patient care and empathy, improve organizational/institutional culture and teamwork/staff relations. Schwartz Rounds have been found to assist to normalize/validate emotional reactions and eradicate the stigma of emotional responses within healthcare settings, lower levels of work-related stress and isolation and improve the psychological well-being of staff including renewed energy about their work.^{1,3,4}

While Schwartz Rounds have been widely introduced/evaluated in the US and UK, their adoption into Australian settings is still in its infancy. There has been no research to date examining the efficacy and sustainability of Schwartz Rounds in an Australian setting where the cultural context and systemic challenges may be different to that of North American or UK settings. Therefore, there is a potential role for psychiatrists, especially liaison teams, to lead here in drawing attention to compassion and driving the change. Additionally, this will help fulfil the educational function of mental health liaison teams and lead to greater impact than classroom approaches alone. Finally, Schwartz Rounds can assist in improving staff wellbeing and organizational culture in hospitals in the context of COVID-19 related repercussions.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflict of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the content and writing of the paper.

ORCID iDs

Christy Hogan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7325-9695>

Andrew Teodorczuk  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0802-718X>

Jonathan Munro  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6948-5689>

References

1. Adamson K, Searl N, Sengsavang S, et al. Caring for the healthcare professional: a description of the schwartz

rounds™ implementation. *J Health Organ Manag* 2018; 32: 402–415.


2. Teodorczuk A, Thomson R, Chan K, et al. When I say...resilience. *Med Educ* 2017; 51: 1206–1208.
3. Robert G, Philippou J, Leamy M, et al. Exploring the adoption of schwartz center rounds as an organisational innovation to improve staff well-being in England, 2009–2015. *BMJ Open*. 2017; 7: e014326.
4. Lown BA and Manning CF. The schwartz center rounds: evaluation of an interdisciplinary approach to enhancing patient-centered communication, teamwork, and provider support. *Acad Med* 2010; 85: 1073–1081.

Dr Christy Hogan  Brisbane, QLD

Prof Andrew Teodorczuk  Brisbane, QLD

Dr Georgia Hunt Brisbane, QLD

Dr Paul Pun Brisbane, QLD

Dr Jonathan Munro  Brisbane, QLD

Dr Tatjana Ewais Brisbane, QLD

DOI: 10.1177/10398562211038915

In defence of the Royal College

Dear Sir,

In their recent opinion piece, Kealy-Bateman et al.¹ advocated for removing the prefix ‘Royal’ from the College’s name. Their argument was predicated on the assertion that this term had negative connotations. I wish to provide an alternate viewpoint.

That Australia and New Zealand share head of state is arguably the primary formal political link between the two nations represented in our College. It seems to me the Royal prefix should be taken to signify what it was intended to mark – formal recognition from the current head of state regarding the fine work the College has done and continues to do for the mental healthcare of the citizens of both countries.

Why would the College or its members seek to reject this prominent

endorsement? The Royal prefix brings with it gravitas that holds currency with both the media and wider public. Rightly or wrongly, removing it is likely to be interpreted as a demotion (similar to what has occurred with the move from Queen’s Council to Senior Counsel in the legal profession). Eliminating the Royal prefix may in fact diminish the reputation of the College and weaken its advocacy efforts.

The authors question whether “a multicultural and trauma-informed college [can] be Royal?”; suggesting that the term ‘Royal’ is synonymous with the values of colonialism. However, it is contradictory to argue that community attitudes have evolved since the Royal prefix was sought in the 1970s, but that the institution of a constitutional monarchy has not modernised since 1788. Indeed, the current monarch, Queen Elizabeth II, has been instrumental in overseeing the formation of the Commonwealth of Nations as a replacement for the old and problematic Empire. The Commonwealth’s Charter states that its purpose is to bring peace and prosperity to all, whilst celebrating the diversity of cultures.² Symbolism is not static across time.

Each country within the Commonwealth must grapple with the devastating impact of colonisation on First Nations people. It is imperative the College continues to address this legacy of health inequity, systemic disadvantage and institutional racism through clinical care, education and advocacy. It is difficult to see how renaming the organisation would lead to meaningful progress in these important endeavours; nor is it clear how retaining the current name would prevent such work.

Rather than being disadvantageous, Royal endorsement can hold opportunity to be a part of the change for good. In society more broadly, the profile of the Royal Family has been used to advance many important social causes and multiple current Royals are patrons of charitable organisations related to mental health. As the Queen’s representative, Australian and New

Zealand Governors-General performed the role of patron for the College over many years following it first being granted the prefix. This work is more relevant to the College's values than attempts to link back to colonialism.

The future of the College's name is more appropriately connected to the wider political debate around republicanism. In the absence of Australia and New Zealand voting to

become republics, the impetus for such a momentous change is lacking.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Michael Weightman  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8451-2529>

References

1. Kealy-Bateman W, Nash L, Shields R, et al. Should we be royal? *Australas Psychiatry* 2021; 29(4): 402–405.
2. Sharma K. Charter of the Commonwealth. <https://thecommonwealth.org/sites/default/files/page/documents/CharteroftheCommonwealth.pdf> (2012, accessed 1 September 2021).

Michael Weightman 
Adelaide, SA

DOI: 10.1177/10398562211067196