

Janet Fuss Submission to ADC Draft Accreditation Standards Consultation

Respondent details	
Name:	Janet Fuss
Organisation:	Adelaide University
Role/capacity:	Individual practitioner giving private feedback
Location:	Metro
Do you identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander?	No
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:	Domain 3. The heading is incorrectly given as "Public Safety" in the draft - it's meant to be "Program of study" 3.9 the broadened draft criterion refers to "cultural diversity" as does the current criterion. Despite the positive intent and changed wording, members of the public, and the profession, will continue to interpret the phrase "cultural diversity" as relating to First Nations and CALD cultural groups only. More direct or specific wording would be required for the reader to include diversity arising from sexuality, disability, ... Similarly words directing the reader to consider diversity between metropolitan and regional and remote locations would be needed.

	Statement 5.4 is ambiguous. Feedback to individual students will be specific to each student's performance (unless it's broad-brush feedback to a group). In what way should feedback be consistent? Its frequency? Its format? The nature of the activities for which feedback is provided? 6.4 The wording of this criterion is ambiguous. What are the educational institutions expected to provide by "culturally responsive clinical placements" rather than "experiences" providing culturally responsive care? Will students need to provide direct patient care in a health setting dedicated to providing care to First Nations peoples?
Are there any additional Standards or Criteria that should be added? (Yes, No, Unsure)	Unsure
Additional comments:	Perhaps the area of diversity would be better served by dividing the proposed criterion in two criteria.
Are there any Standards or Criteria that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, No, Unsure)	Yes
Additional comments related to your response, and clearly reference the specific criteria you are referring to for refinement.	Domain 3. The heading is incorrectly given as "Public Safety" in the draft - it's meant to be "Program of study" 3.9 the broadened draft criterion refers to "cultural diversity" as does the current criterion. Despite the positive intent and changed wording, members of the public, and the profession, will continue to interpret the phrase "cultural diversity" as relating to First Nations and CALD cultural groups only. More direct or specific wording would be required for the reader to include diversity arising from sexuality, disability, ... Similarly words directing the reader to consider diversity between metropolitan and regional and remote locations would be needed. Statement 5.4 is ambiguous. Feedback to individual students will be specific to each student's performance (unless it's broad-brush feedback to a group). In what way should feedback be consistent? Its frequency? Its

format? The nature of the activities for which feedback is provided?

6.4 The wording of this criterion is ambiguous. What are the educational institutions expected to provide by "culturally responsive clinical placements" rather than "experiences" providing culturally responsive care? Will students need to provide direct patient care in a health setting dedicated to providing care to First Nations peoples?

Do you have any other questions or comments on the Standards?

No thank you.