

Accreditation Monitoring Framework

Contents

1. Purpose	2
2. Overview.....	2
3. Monitoring as a quality improvement strategy	2
4. Monitoring as a risk management strategy	2
5. Outcomes of program monitoring	2
6. Potential monitoring activities	3
6.1. Program monitoring reports	3
6.2. Targeted monitoring review	3
6.3. Review of material changes to a program	3
6.4. Stakeholder engagement.....	4
6.5. Education data	4
6.6. Graduate data.....	4
6.7. Website and publication monitoring	4
6.8. Monitoring examination	4
6.9. Thematic review	4
6.10. Concerns about accredited programs	5
7. Additional guidance	5
8. Related documents.....	5
9. Document information.....	5

1. Purpose

The purpose of this document is to:

- provide clarity on the use of monitoring by the Australian Dental Council (ADC) under the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme (NRAS)
- outline how monitoring is used in accreditation activities, and
- provide an overview of the range of monitoring activities used by the ADC.

2. Overview

The Australian Dental Council (ADC) accredits dental practitioner programs pursuant to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* (the National Law).

In relation to monitoring the National Law states at Section 50, Division 50 (1):

The accreditation authority that accredited an approved program of study must monitor the program and the education provider that provides the program to ensure the authority continues to be satisfied that program and provider meet an approved accreditation standard for the health profession.

To enable the ongoing monitoring of all accredited programs, the ADC undertakes a range of routine, targeted or occasional monitoring activities.

3. Monitoring as a quality improvement strategy

The accreditation assessment and monitoring activities contribute to the ongoing quality assurance of a program of study. Aside from providing assurance to stakeholders that accreditation standards are being met, monitoring processes and activities ensure the ongoing review of programs and where required drive improvements to programs of education.

4. Monitoring as a risk management strategy

Monitoring processes and activities assist the ADC to identify, mitigate and manage risk, while ensuring that regulatory responses are in proportion to the identified level of risk.

Monitoring activities and the response to any reports provided are consistent with the NRAS regulatory principle 4, which is outlined below.

In all our work we:

- identify the risks that we need to respond to
- assess the likelihood and possible consequences of the risks
- respond in ways that are culturally safe, proportionate, consistent with community expectations and manage risks so we can adequately protect the public, and
- take timely and necessary action under the National Law.

Source: www.ahpra.gov.au/about-ahpra/what-we-do/regulatory-principles.aspx

5. Outcomes of program monitoring

Monitoring activities are designed to ensure that ADC accredited programs of study continue to meet the ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation Standards for Dental Practitioners (2021)

If the ADC reasonably believes the program of study and education provider no longer meet the accreditation standards, the ADC will:

- Impose conditions on the program to ensure the program of study will meet the standard within a reasonable timeframe; or
- Revoke the accreditation of the program of study.

The ADC will inform the Dental Board of Australia written notice of the ADC's decision.

6. Potential monitoring activities

The ADC's Monitoring activities may include, but not limited to, the following:

- Program Monitoring Reports
- Targeted monitoring review
- Review of material changes to a program
- Stakeholder engagement
- Education data
- Graduate data
- Website and publication monitoring
- Monitoring examination
- Thematic reviews
- Concerns about accredited programs

6.1. Program monitoring reports

Frequency: As requested, often annually

Program monitoring reports completed by education providers to assist the ADC to track changes and developments in accredited programs and to monitor continued compliance with the Accreditation Standards.

Program monitoring reports are required to be submitted using the ADC's pro-forma.

Reports are reviewed internally by the Accreditation Secretariat, with assistance from the Chair of the Accreditation Committee, other members of the Accreditation Committee and ADC assessors where required. Any issues or irregularities will be brought to the Accreditation Committee's attention.

6.2. Targeted monitoring review

Frequency: As arises

Where the ADC becomes aware of a matter that may pose a significant risk to a program's ability to meet the Accreditation Standards the ADC may conduct an out-of-cycle monitoring review of a program. The review may be paper based, via a site visit or through a combination of both.

6.3. Review of material changes to a program

Frequency: As reported

Material changes are program changes that will or may significantly affect the way the program meets the Accreditation Standards.

An education provider must notify the ADC in writing of a material change to any part of an accredited program relevant to the Accreditation Standards. This may include, for example, curriculum, staffing, clinical exposure for students, support for students, leadership or governance changes, or other resource changes.

Planned changes should be reported to the ADC in advance of their occurrence, and in sufficient time to enable an assessment against the Accreditation Standards.

The Accreditation Committee will determine if what is reported is a material change and if it warrants a reassessment of the accreditation status of a program. Re-assessment of the accreditation status may take the form of a desk top evaluation, online meetings or a site visit by an Accreditation Team.

6.4. Stakeholder engagement

Frequency: Ongoing

The ADC liaises with a wide range of stakeholders in the accreditation process including other regulators, professional and representative bodies, and other health professions. Information sharing with these stakeholders assists the ADC to monitor the performance of education providers and programs. It also enables the ADC to look for continual alignment of common activities such as monitoring to reduce the regulatory burden on programs.

Should the information obtained by the ADC warrant further investigation, the provider involved is contacted formally. Where necessary, further monitoring of the program may be required using one of the mechanisms described in this Monitoring Framework.

6.5. Education data

Frequency: Periodic

The ADC regularly reviews data from a range of external sources on accredited Australian dental programs. For example: Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) including Student Experience Survey (SES) data, TEQSA status, UCube and other higher education data. These are used to inform the ADC processes or prompt further investigation of programs.

6.6. Graduate data

Frequency: Periodic

The ADC gathers data from newly registered dental practitioners to obtain qualitative feedback regarding their education, clinical experience and other issues relevant to their education and training.

6.7. Website and publication monitoring

Frequency: Ongoing

By scanning relevant publications and websites, all providers of accredited programs are regularly monitored regarding recruitment, information to current and prospective students including about the accreditation status of a program, proposed changes or new programs offered.

Where programs are also accredited by other regulatory authorities, the ADC may also review accreditation reports published by those authorities.

6.8. Monitoring examination

Frequency: As requested

Final year dental students may be asked to complete a monitoring examination for dental programs. The ADC provides de-identified feedback to participating schools on the performance of students and of the performance of their student cohort against the wider (de-identified) group of participants.

The ADC may monitor the performance of a specific School's program in the examination as an indicator of whether the program continues to meet the Accreditation Standards.

6.9. Thematic review

Frequency: As arises

The ADC may conduct a thematic review of an issue or a number of issues within the dental profession that are relevant to compliance with the accreditation standards and/or to the quality improvement of

programs. Thematic reviews may be conducted with all providers or a subset of providers depending on the theme being reviewed.

Themes to be reviewed may be chosen by the ADC Board from time to time based on significant matters brought to the ADC Board's attention by key stakeholders; matters of significant public concern regarding the dental profession; or common issues that are revealed through an analysis of ADC accreditation reports or decisions and which would benefit from further review.

The ADC does not conduct thematic reviews of matters that are not related to the accreditation standards.

6.10. Concerns about accredited programs

Frequency: As arises

The ADC may become aware that the accreditation Standards are not continuing to be met by an approved program or an education provider through the receipt of a concern about an accredited program or the education provider.

A concern may be raised by any person or entity who has a concern about an ADC accredited program. The ADC will only consider and investigate concerns about an ADC accredited program which meets the definition of a systemic complaint. A systemic complaint is information that may be evidence of a systemic issue that may signify a failure of an ADC accredited program or provider to meet one or more of the Accreditation Standards.

7. Additional guidance

The above list of monitoring activities is provided for information. Please contact the ADC at accreditation@adc.org.au if you wish to discuss a particular activity or approach to monitoring.

8. Related documents

- [ADC/DC\(NZ\) accreditation Standards for dental practitioner programs](#)
- [Concerns about accredited programs policy](#)
- [ADC accreditation guidelines for dental practitioner programs](#)
- [ADC guidelines for the review of specialist dental practitioner programs](#)

9. Document information

Document Owner:	ADC Board of Directors
Approval date:	3 September 2022
Effective date:	1 November 2022
Date for review*:	When required or two years
File reference:	

*unless otherwise indicated, this policy will continue to apply beyond the review date