

Daniel Fernandez Verduco Submission to ADC Draft Accreditation Standards Consultation

Respondent details	
Name:	Daniel Fernandez Verduco
Organisation:	Auckland University of Technology
Role/capacity:	Oral health lecturer
Location:	Metro
Response to consultation questions	
Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level to deliver competent graduates who are safe to practise?	Yes
(Yes, Somewhat, No, Unsure)	
Additional comments:	
Do you agree with the specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards?	Somewhat
(Yes, Somewhat, No, Unsure)	
Additional comments:	Regarding Domain 3.3, I agree with the intent but have concerns regarding the ambiguity of the term 'sufficient'. As currently drafted, the term lacks a clear metric or benchmark, leaving it open to subjective interpretation. This creates a potential disconnect where an oral health program may deem their clinical exposure adequate, while the Council may disagree. To ensure consistency and avoid confusion, the Standards should either provide a clearer definition of 'sufficiency'—perhaps through minimum clinical indicators—or replace the term with more objective criteria to define the baseline for graduate competence.
Are there any additional Standards or Criteria that should be added?	Yes
(Yes, No, Unsure)	

Additional comments:	Yes, while student wellbeing has historically been the primary focus of academic standards, there is a critical need to establish formal Standards for faculty wellness. Academic staff currently navigate a high-pressure environment, balancing rigorous university compliance, evolving student expectations, and the Dental Council's accreditation requirements. Incorporating staff wellbeing into these standards would ensure that educators are not only fit to teach but are also authentically supported by their institutions and the Council itself.
Are there any Standards or Criteria that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, No, Unsure)	No
Additional comments related to your response, and clearly reference the specific criteria you are referring to for refinement.	
Do you have any other questions or comments on the Standards?	I support the inclusion of Criterion 5.2, particularly as it relates to the rapid emergence of Generative AI in clinical and theoretical assessment. Educational institutions are already proactively developing internal strategies—such as AI-augmented proctoring, verbal assessments, and updated academic integrity policies—to mitigate these risks. However, for this criterion to be effective, there must be a formal recognition of the resources and staff training required to implement these 'mechanisms.' The Council should ensure this standard supports a collaborative approach where institutions and the Council share best practices for maintaining assessment pedagogy in an AI-driven environment