

About respondent

Organisation	Griffith University School of Dentistry
Name	Professor Robert M. Love

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)

Yes.

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)

Partly.

It is appropriate to have this criterion however the wording of proposed criterion 1.8 is problematic. Specifically the use of the word "Ensure" in the context of "Ensure that students understand.." 1. sets a standard that is not achievable i.e. an educ

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)

Partly.

It is not clear what the difference is between patients and dental consumers?

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.

<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.</p> <p>This should be made clear in the Domain i.e. "Academic governance and quality assurance of the program." Regarding the change of wording for 2.1- it is not clear how can a "program demonstrate academic governance". The original wording recognises that th</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.</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>No.</p> <p>The inclusion of "to ensure graduates are competent to practise." does not add anything, every Standard has this aim? 5.4 It is unclear what this means? e.g. what are mechanisms? why does a "range ensure a consistent" as apposed to a single process?</p>
<p>Additional comments</p>	
<p>Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Some of the suggested changes.</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments on the Standards?</p>	<p>3.9 I think the new wording is "clumsy" compared to the old wording. Specifically: The use of "ensure" is difficult to quantify. Re: "students are equipped to provide..." The standards are not designed for students, they are designed for the graduating outcome, suggest it should read "graduates are equipped to provide..." It is not clear how the new 3.11 is not covered by 3.8. With the introduction of the new Standard 6 the documentation is unclear on how the regulatory bodies will manage the differences between Australia and New Zealand when it comes to TMR as technically the standards are different. This would also apply to other areas of recognition e.g. Canada.</p>