AUSTRALIAN DENTAL COUNCIL

Dental Council
Te Kaunihera Tiaki Niho

About respondent

Name	Rod Marshall
What is your interaction with the ADC and/or DC(NZ)?	Assessor of education programs

Feedback on draft Accreditation standards

Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety? **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
Do you consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers delivering accredited programs? **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Partly. The major factor which is missing is a temporal limitation. A provider can offer evidence of program facilities, staff and curricula on one day, and withdraw them the following day. There needs to be some evidence of sustained application across the durat

Do you agree with the following specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards?

In New Zealand: A dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural competence for Māori and Pacific peoples, and its criteria (Domain 6a in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
In Australia: A dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural safety for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and its criteria (Domain 6b in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used. **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
An additional criterion requiring programs to ensure students understand the legal, ethical and professional responsibilities of a registered dental practitioner (criterion 1.8 in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
Amended criteria to require the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement (criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Partly. Broadly agree with this sentiment, however, the relevance for some programs may be limited, especially postgraduate specialty programs eg radiology

	No.
For internal, external, professional and academic input into program design and development to be combined into one criterion (criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	This combined criteria is too much like a "hamburger with the lot" where no individual stand out. It combines design of the program with improvement and by implication gives equal ranking to consumers, students, academics and external peers. In an effor
The revision of the criteria in Domain 2 – Academic governance and quality assurance to clarify that the focus of the Standards is at the program level. **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards. **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes.
Amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the standard statement and to the criteria underneath (Domain 5 in the draft Standards). **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Yes. This is much improved, especially with the "competent to practise clause"

Additional comments	
Are there any additional Standards that should be added? **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	Partly. As mentioned above, not a Standard per se, but rather the need to maintain the standards through the period of accreditation, and for there to be some form of reporting requirement, possibly 6-12 monthly to certify that all standards are continuing to be met at least, to the level that was applicable at the time of accreditation. I know of one program where there has been an almost complete turnover of staff and curricula twice in an 18 month period, yet the program has maintained accreditation as there is no process or requirement for the education provider to inform the council that the program may not be reasonably be expected to maintain its existing accreditation.
Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? **(Yes, no, partly, do not know)**	No.
Do you have any other comments on the Standards?	see above about a reporting requirement to certify continuation of meeting all the standards since accreditation was granted.