

Monday, 18 May 2020

Narelle Mills
CEO
Australian Dental Council

By email: narelle.mills@adc.org.au

Dear Ms Mills,

Community Reference Group feedback on ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs

The Ahpra Community Reference Group (CRG) thanks the Australian Dental Council (ADC) and the Dental Council of New Zealand (DC(NZ)) for the opportunity to make a submission to the Proposed changes to the ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs.

The CRG congratulates the ADC/DC(NZ) on the draft Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs.

The CRG took the view that this is a well-developed and carefully considered document that clearly incorporates consultation from a wide range of stakeholders, noting particularly the inclusion of consumers as equal participants.

The rationale on pages 12-13 for consumer/patient involvement in design and curricula is very well explained and reinforced with reference to the ASR 2018 recommendations. This is an excellent example of evidence-based modifications to accreditation standards. Ensuring consumer input as part of the process is best practice.

The CRG welcomes the incorporation of considerations of Cultural Safety and Competence as an integral part of the document.

The attached document *CRG response to the ADC_DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs* contains the CRG feedback which is supportive of the proposed changes.

Please contact [Vanessa Williams](#) Communications Adviser on 03 8708 9370 if you would like any further information.

Kind regards



Mark Bodycoat
Chair, Community Reference Group

Attachment

CRG response to the ADC_DCNZ Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs

Q1. Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know)

In the view of the Community Reference Group ("CRG") the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety.

Q2. Do you consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers delivering accredited programs? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know)

In the view of the CRG the draft Standards should be applicable across all types of such education providers and appear to be appropriately adapted for that purpose.

Q3. 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 \(Domain 6a in the draft Standards\).](#)

The CRG supports the inclusion of the above proposal.

b. [In Australia: A dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural safety for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and its criteria \(Domain 6b in the draft Standards\).](#)

The CRG supports the inclusion of the above proposal.

The CRG also suggests that consideration be given to modifying 6.1 to ensure that the external input to design and management is provided by appropriately qualified Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

c. [The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used.](#)

The CRG supports the introduction of a preamble as suggested.

d. [An additional criterion requiring programs to ensure students understand the legal, ethical and professional responsibilities of a registered dental practitioner \(criterion 1.8 in the draft standards\).](#)

The CRG strongly support this additional criterion.

e. [Amended criteria to require the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement \(criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards\).](#)

The CRG strongly support the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement.

f. [For internal, external, professional and academic input into program design and development to be combined into one criterion \(criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards\).](#)

The CRG supports the above proposal.

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.](#)

The CRG supports the above inclusion.

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

The CRG supports the above revision.

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

The CRG supports the above amendment.

Q4. Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know)

The CRG has no further suggestions.

Q5. Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, No, Partly, Do not know)

The CRG does not consider it necessary to delete or reword any Standards, but refers to its suggestion in relation to 6.1, above.

Q6. Do you have any other comments on the Standards?

See additional comments provided in the cover letter.