

About respondent

Name	Tim Benson
What is your interaction with the ADC and/or DC(NZ)?	Assessor of education programs, Community / Consumer representative

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)	Yes. All graduates need to be at a comparable level

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. We need to respect people from all cultures not just indigenous and the white population - we live in a multi-cultural environment
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. We need to respect people from all cultures not just indigenous and the white population - we live in a multi-cultural environment
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. From a patient perspective these are important considerations
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)	Yes. Very important to ensure that the patient perspective is considered
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)	Yes. Tunnel-vision needs to be avoided

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.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards.

Yes.

A multi-discipline approach will hopefully re-connect the mouth to the rest of the body

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the standard statement and to the criteria underneath (Domain 5 in the draft Standards).

Yes.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Additional comments

Are there any additional Standards that should be added?

No.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded?

No.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Do you have any other comments on the Standards?