

Nidhi Medara Submission to ADC Draft Accreditation Standards Consultation

Respondent details	
Name:	Nidhi Medara
Organisation:	Sydney Dental School, The University of Sydney
Role/capacity:	Senior Lecturer
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:	
Are there any additional Standards or Criteria that should be added?	No
(Yes, No, Unsure)	
Additional comments:	
Are there any Standards or Criteria that should be deleted or reworded?	Yes
(Yes, No, Unsure)	
Additional comments related to your response, and clearly reference the specific criteria you are referring to for refinement.	Domain 2.4 While the rationale for criterion 4.2 "Admission and progression requirements and processes are fair, transparent and informed by program staff" is sound, this is hard to implement

practically at the admissions level. It is true that Schools within a Faculty/University can set requirements for entry to a program. For example, these may be inherent requirements, language requirements, threshold marks for Grade Point Average from a previous degree, various entrance tests like UCAT or GAMSAT, interviews, reflective written work or any other suitable combination. However, the implementation of accepting students is rarely at the School level and Schools or Programs cannot choose the "fitness" or "character" of students who enter a program. Moving the process external to the School removes any unwanted biases, nepotism or conflicts or interests.

As Schools don't actually have access to the admitted students until they are enrolled in the program, it is hard to work toward or implement this standard. There is also duplication here with the new criterion 5.1 for assessment domain.

I would suggest rewording criterion 2.4 with "Admission and associated process are fair, transparent and consistently applied"

Also progression requirements are closely aligned with assessments. As such, it is more appropriate in the assessment domain. It would fit more with the new 5.1 criterion as "Assessments and progression requirements conform to the principles of validity, reliability and fairness and informed by program staff". There is emphasis in the rationale for consistency of assessment practices applied throughout the program.

Domain 3.3

"The complexity, quantity, duration and variety of clinical education is sufficient to produce a graduate competent to practise." It is unclear what "duration" here adds in addition to quantity. Unless the duration is explicitly prescribed, it is hard to work toward this criteria.

Domain 5.5

Single "exit" or "high stakes" examinations are unlikely in current contemporary assessment practices like programmatic assessment. It is more likely that progression or completion decisions are based on a combination of multiple assessment sources like written, clinical, oral or OSCE components in the final year.

Likewise, external expertise is valuable and appropriate at any level of the program.

As such, criteria 5.5 may be reworded as "Students are assessed throughout the program by qualified and experienced educators, including external experts in final year."

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