

About respondent

Organisation	Oral Medicine Academy of Australasia
Name	Ramesh Balasubramaniam

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. The executive has reviewed the draft standards and in our opinion public safety has been appropriately considered.
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. Accredited dental specialists training programs have similar approaches to training and the draft standards appears to take them into consideration

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. The Executive supports standards on cultural competence for vulnerable populations.
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 Executive supports standards on cultural competence for vulnerable populations.
The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used. (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes. This background information is useful to put the Standards in context.
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. The executive support a transparent process for students in accreditation training programs.
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. The executive was willing to have the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement. We believe that ultimately students are being trained to care for patients and hence their input should be considered.

<p>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)</p>	<p>Yes. The executive agree that streamlining design and development into one criterion is best.</p>
<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. This is important to ensure that Standards are met. In order for this to happen, academic governance and quality assurance processes must be effective.</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. This is beneficial as previously assessment of this was difficult and subject to interpretation of the standard. Specifying “intra- and inter-professional education” will make it more objective.</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. This section is now streamlined and executive are happy with the changes.</p>
<p>Additional comments</p>	
<p>Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Do not know. Executive could not think of anything else; however we are are not in the business of developing accreditation standards.</p>
<p>Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Do not know. Executive could not think of anything that needs to be deleted and the reworded standards were appropriate; however we are are not in the business of developing accreditation standards.</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments on the Standards?</p>	<p>The OMAA would like to thank the ADC for the opportunity to review the accreditation standard and provide feedback.</p>