

### About respondent

<b>Name</b>	Mathew Lim
<b>What is your interaction with the ADC and/or DC(NZ)?</b>	Education provider, Examiner of overseas trained dental practitioners, Member of a professional association /academy/society, Employer of dental graduates

### Feedback on draft Accreditation standards

	Partly.
<b>Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety?</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	This remains more of a question about the level of competency decided rather than the standard. The standard and new wording provide statements which in principle reflect what is desired
<b>Do you consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers delivering accredited programs?</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.

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

	Partly.
<b>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).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	I feel the inclusion of a specific standard for indigenous peoples institutes an idea that cultural safety for these populations is more important than that of people of other ethnicities which is key to the multicultural nature of both countries. Perhaps a more general standard reflecting the need to be culturally safe to all cultural identities is more relevant
<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).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Partly.  As above
<b>The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used.</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.
<b>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).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.  I agree with a specific standard of this nature because it brings to the forefront the importance of our obligations as a profession

**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)

No.

While I think the public's view and input is important in developing standards, I don't believe that consumers have an adequate understanding of patient safety and how this needs to be reflected in training of health professionals

**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)

No.

I think that having separate standards is clearer despite the overlap. I fear that combining the standards is likely to result in reduced input from external parties

**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)

No.

The new standard does not place the emphasis on communication which was vital to this standard and preventing the issue of oral health being a silo

**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.

### Additional comments

Yes.

**Are there any additional Standards that should be added?**

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Although there is an increased focus on indigenous populations, other vulnerable populations (e.g. patients with special needs) that experience significant barriers to access of care are notable absent from all standards continuing to allow programs to be highly variable in the education provided in this area.

**Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded?**

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

Partly.

**Do you have any other comments on the Standards?**

There remains ongoing concern in the profession that the problem is not with the standards but the level of competency dictated for these standards