

Smitha Sukumar Submission to ADC Draft Accreditation Standards Consultation

Respondent details	
Name:	Smitha Sukumar
Organisation:	The University of Sydney
Role/capacity:	Senior Lecturer/ Clinical Educator
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, Somewhat, No, Unsure)	Unsure
Additional comments:	The Doctor of Dental Medicine program was recently accredited and while this was done under the previous standards it's clear to clinical staff and students that these Standards have no material impact on the operations of the School in terms of quality of teaching (curriculum and clinical exposure). At the time of accreditation a handful of courageous staff and students alerted the ADC to significant issues resulting in the graduation of graduates that lacked basic clinical skills. Imagine the surprise when we are told the course have been accredited. It was incredibly dispiriting process which made a mockery of the ADC standards.
Do you agree with the specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards? (Yes, Somewhat, No, Unsure)	Yes
Additional comments:	I think the specific additions make the criteria more meaningful and easier to interpret. This means it can be actioned and the action can be assessed.

Are there any additional Standards or Criteria that should be added?

No

(Yes, No, Unsure)

Additional comments:

I think the standards are actually well defined yet broad enough to encompass fast moving changes in dental ed including AI

Are there any Standards or Criteria that should be deleted or reworded?

No

(Yes, No, Unsure)

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?

While it says in the preamble new and existing courses are assessed against these standards this falls well short of reassuring the public and the wider profession that there are significant problems there are repercussions... are they? The DMD program falls short in all the Domains - old and revised. This suggests that Schools are able to subvert the process and overwhelm with documentation which can provide rose colour tinting of the actual circumstances. The academic community believe the accreditation process needs to be more vigorous and enforceable with penalties that ensure public safety can be guaranteed by public universities charging eye watering fees to students.