

About respondent

Name	Tony Skapetis
What is your interaction with the ADC and/or DC(NZ)?	Education provider, Assessor of education programs, Member of a professional association /academy/society, Employer of dental graduates

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.

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)	Do not know. From Australia
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)	Yes. In addition consumers should be integrated into assessment processes as well. Also in terms of outcome focus, there should be a requirement for evidence to be provided that consumer feedback has been acted upon.
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. In addition inter-professional input into program design should be encouraged.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

<p>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)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes and there needs to be included more emphasis on student engagement in both curriculum & assessment design as well, with evidence required to show how student feedback has been acted upon (outcome focus).</p>
<p>A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards. (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. This needs to be more clearly articulated against provision of patient care (outcome focus)</p>
<p>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)</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Additional comments

<p>Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. A standard around “Understanding of evidence based research to guide practice” should be considered.</p>
<p>Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments on the Standards?</p>	