



# ANZAOMS

AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND ASSOCIATION OF  
ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS

## Consultation paper - Proposed changes to the ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs

### ANZAOMS Response

20 April 2020

***The consultation questions are as follows. Please provide detail in your responses wherever possible.***

#### Question 1

Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know) **Yes agree.**

#### Question 2

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 – should be.**

#### Question 3

Do you agree with the following specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know)

- a. 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 agree.**
- b. 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 agree.**
- c. The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used. **Yes.**
- d. 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 agree.**



# ANZAOMS

AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND ASSOCIATION OF  
ORAL & MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS

- e. 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 – strongly agree with this.**
- f. 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, OK.**
- g. 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. **Disagree – We believe even that the governance can be at program level, there needs to be “an oversight” or accreditation from statutory authorities to ensure public and patient safety.**
- h. A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards. **Yes agree.**
- i. Amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the Standard Statement and to the criteria underneath (Domain 5 in the draft Standards). **Yes.**

#### Question 4

Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know) **No.**

#### Question 5

Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know) **No**

#### Question 6

Do you have any other comments on the Standards? **There should be clear pathways for managing complaints or public concerns regarding deficiencies in accreditation standards.**