

Accreditation Monitoring Framework

Contents

1. Purpose	2
2. Scope	2
3. Overview	2
4. The role of monitoring in quality assurance and risk management	2
5. Potential monitoring and external validation activities	3
Monitoring activities	3
External validation activities	5
6. Outcomes of program monitoring activities	5
7. Notifications	6
Dental Board of Australia	6
Other regulatory bodies	6
8. Additional guidance	6
9. Related documents	6
10. Document information	7

1. Purpose

The purpose of the accreditation monitoring framework is to allow for the ongoing quality assurance monitoring and assessment of all Australian Dental Council (ADC) and Australian Dental Council International (ADCI) accredited programs to ensure continued compliance with the Accreditation Standards throughout periods of accreditation.

2. Scope

This framework applies to dental practitioner education programs accredited by the ADC and ADCI.

3. Overview

The ADC accredits dental practitioner programs pursuant to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* (the National Law).

In relation to monitoring the National Law states at Section 50, Division 50 (1):

The accreditation authority that accredited an approved program of study must monitor the program and the education provider that provides the program to ensure the authority continues to be satisfied that program and provider meet an approved accreditation standard for the health profession.

The Dental Board of Australia (DBA) has authorised the ADC to accredit dental practitioner programs in Australia. ADCI accredits international dental practitioner programs.

The ADC undertakes a range of routine, targeted or occasional monitoring activities for all accredited programs, which this framework outlines.

4. The role of monitoring in quality assurance and risk management

Monitoring activities and processes assist the ADC to identify, mitigate and manage risk, while ensuring that regulatory responses are in proportion to the identified level of risk.

Monitoring activities and responses are consistent with the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme (NRAS) regulatory principle 4, which is outlined below.

In all our work we:

- identify the risks that we need to respond to
- assess the likelihood and possible consequences of the risks
- respond in ways that are culturally safe, proportionate, consistent with community expectations and manage risks so we can adequately protect the public, and
- take timely and necessary action under the National Law.

The accreditation assessment and monitoring activities also contribute to the ongoing quality assurance of a program of study. Aside from providing assurance to stakeholders that Accreditation Standards are being met, monitoring processes and activities ensure the ongoing review of programs and where required drive improvements to programs of study.

Source: www.ahpra.gov.au/about-ahpra/what-we-do/regulatory-principles.aspx

5. Potential monitoring and external validation activities

The ADC's monitoring activities may include, but are not limited to:

- annual monitoring reports
- review of material changes to a program
- monitoring visits
- concerns about accredited programs
- monitoring examination.

The ADC may from time to time use other data sources to validate information submitted by education providers. The purpose is to inform ADC processes and to provide critical insights and evidence to support monitoring decisions. External validation activities may include, but are not limited to:

- stakeholder engagement
- education data
- graduate data
- website and publication monitoring
- thematic reviews.

Monitoring activities

Annual monitoring reports

Frequency: Annually, or as requested

The ADC requires education providers to complete annual monitoring reports for each accredited program to track changes and developments and to monitor continued compliance with the Accreditation Standards. This is generally conducted annually, however in extenuating circumstances the ADC may request reports more regularly.

Annual reports are required to be submitted using the ADC's pro-forma.

Reports are reviewed internally by the Accreditation Secretariat, with assistance from the Chair of the Accreditation Committee, other members of the Accreditation Committee and ADC assessors when required.

All annual reports are reviewed and approved by the Accreditation Committee. If an issue or irregularity is identified and it is determined there may be issues which bring into doubt whether the program continues to meet the Accreditation Standards, the ADC will request further information from the education provider. The additional information will then be considered by the Accreditation Committee to determine if further action is required.

Review of material changes to a program

Frequency: As reported

Material changes are program changes that may (or will) significantly affect the way the program meets the Accreditation Standards.

An education provider must notify the ADC in writing of a material change to any part of an accredited program relevant to the Accreditation Standards. This may include,

- discontinuation of a course or part-of a course, or a significant change in the length of a course (i.e. months/years). Please note that the ADC publishes guidelines on 'Teach out of accredited programs' that should be referenced when advising the ADC of a decision to teach out an accredited program
- marked changes (i.e. other than continuing evolutionary changes) in the design of a program that may affect learning opportunities and/or achievement of learning outcomes
- a change in the mode(s) of delivery or participation (such as a move to distance education)
- a change in delivery partner or arrangements with a delivery partner
- substantial changes in the expected learning outcomes for graduates

- changes to admission requirements that potentially present barriers to the achievement of learning outcomes
- significant changes to student assessment
- significant change to arrangements for monitoring program quality and graduate outcomes of programs
- a substantial change in student numbers for the program relative to available resources, including capital, facilities and staff
- significant changes in the staffing profile
- a significant change in overall funding of the program
- any conditions imposed on the provider by an educational regulator (the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) or the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA)).

Planned changes should be reported to the ADC in advance of their occurrence, and in sufficient time to enable an assessment against the Accreditation Standards. The Accreditation Committee will determine if what is reported is a material change and if it warrants a reassessment of the accreditation status of a program.

Monitoring visits

Frequency: As arises

There may be instances where at the time of an accreditation visit a program meets the Accreditation Standards, but a known future event or activity creates uncertainty as to whether one or more of the Accreditation Standards will continue to be met during the period of accreditation. This could, for example, include cases where an education provider is moving to new clinical facilities that could not be viewed by the Accreditation Team at the time of the site visit, or a new program that appears compliant on paper, but which has not yet graduated any students. In such cases, the ADC may undertake a monitoring visit to ensure that the program continues to meet the Accreditation Standards.

Concerns about accredited programs

Frequency: As arises

The ADC's 'Concerns about accredited programs policy' is a mechanism to raise a concern that an approved program or an education provider may no longer be meeting the Standards.

Concerns can be received by the ADC from any person or entity. The ADC will only consider and investigate concerns about an ADC accredited program if the issue raised may signify a failure of an ADC accredited program or provider to meet one or more of the Accreditation Standards. The ADC will follow the 'Concerns about accredited programs policy' as published on the ADC's website.

Monitoring examination

Frequency: As requested

Final year dental students may be asked to complete a monitoring examination for dental programs. The ADC provides de-identified feedback to participating schools on the performance of students and of the performance of their student cohort against the wider (de-identified) group of participants.

The ADC may monitor the performance of a specific School's program in the examination as an indicator of whether the program continues to meet the Accreditation Standards.

External validation activities

Stakeholder engagement

Frequency: Ongoing

The ADC liaises with a wide range of stakeholders in the accreditation process including other regulators, professional and representative bodies, and other health professions. Information sharing with these stakeholders assists the ADC to monitor the performance of education providers and programs. It also enables the ADC to align of common activities, such as monitoring, to reduce the regulatory burden on education providers and programs.

Education data

Frequency: Periodic

The ADC regularly reviews data on accredited Australian dental programs from a range of external sources. For example, Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) including Student Experience Survey (SES) data, TEQSA status, UCube and other higher education data. These are used to inform ADC processes or prompt further monitoring of programs.

Graduate data

Frequency: Periodic

The ADC gathers data from newly registered dental practitioners to obtain qualitative feedback regarding their education, clinical experience and other issues relevant to their education and training.

Website and publication monitoring

Frequency: Ongoing

By reviewing relevant publications and websites, the ADC regularly monitors all providers of accredited programs for information relating to recruitment, information provided to current and prospective students (including the accreditation status of programs), and any proposed changes or new programs

Where programs are also accredited by other regulatory authorities, the ADC may also review accreditation reports published by those authorities.

Thematic review

Frequency: As arises

The ADC may conduct a thematic review of one or more issues within the dental profession that are relevant to compliance with the Accreditation Standards and/or to the quality improvement of programs. A thematic review may involve all education providers or a subset of providers, depending on the theme under review.

Themes for review may be identified by the ADC Board from time to time based on significant matters raised by key stakeholders, issues of significant public concern within the dental profession, or common issues identified through analysis of ADC accreditation reports or decisions that would benefit from further review.

The ADC does not conduct thematic reviews of matters that are not related to the Accreditation Standards.

6. Outcomes of program monitoring activities

Program monitoring activities aim to ensure that ADC-accredited programs continue to meet the Accreditation Standards. If the ADC reasonably believes a program or education provider no longer meets the Standards, it will write to the education provider and invite a written response.

The education provider's response will be considered by the Accreditation Committee (domestic programs) or the International Accreditation Committee (international programs) and there are five possible outcomes:

- **No action** - the relevant Accreditation Committee is satisfied that no further action is required to ensure the Accreditation Standards are met. This outcome is appropriate where the education provider's response demonstrates that issues identified through monitoring activities do not affect compliance with the Standards, or where corrective action has already been taken
- **Condition imposed** - the relevant Accreditation Committee is satisfied that the Accreditation Standards are substantially met; however, the program has a deficiency in one or more Standards that can be addressed within a reasonable period. The program must demonstrate that the condition has been

met within the stipulated timeframe to remain accredited.

- **Monitoring requirement imposed** - the Accreditation Committee is satisfied that the Accreditation Standards continue to be met but requires further information to provide assurance about the implementation and effectiveness of planned or future changes to a program.
- **Targeted review** - the Accreditation Committee has concerns that a program may not be meeting the Accreditation Standards and determines that a targeted review by an Accreditation Team is required. The targeted review will focus on the Accreditation Standard or Standards that may not be fully met. The review may be conducted as either a paper-based assessment or a site visit, depending on the nature of the issues, the Standards involved, and the level of assurance required.
- **Accreditation revoked** - the ADC may revoke accreditation from a program of study, in accordance with the National law, if a program is identified as having serious deficiencies or weaknesses such that it no longer meets one or more Accreditation Standards, or an education provider fails to demonstrate that progress has been made towards meeting any conditions of accreditation within the prescribed period of time. The ADC will advise the education provider that accreditation of the program is to be revoked with reasons for the decision and will require the provider to advise how it proposes to manage and protect the interests of students who are enrolled in the program.

7. Notifications

Dental Board of Australia

The ADC communicates accreditation decisions to Ahpra and the Dental Board in line with the [National Boards' Framework for Communicating Accreditation Decisions](#).

The ADC will inform the DBA of all ADC monitoring activities that have been undertaken and the outcomes.

Other regulatory bodies

For ADCI accredited programs, the ADC may inform the relevant regulatory authority in cases where the ADC has a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to share accreditation outcomes with the regulator. For example, the ADCI will share accreditation outcomes with the Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) in the United Arab Emirates for education programs that have undergone joint accreditation with the ADCI and CAA.

8. Additional guidance

The above list of monitoring activities is provided for information. Please contact the ADC at accreditation@adc.org.au if you wish to discuss a particular activity or approach to monitoring.

9. Related documents

- [Accreditation Standards for dental practitioner programs](#)
- [Concerns about accredited programs policy](#)
- [ADC accreditation guidelines for dental practitioner programs](#)
- [ADC guidelines for the review of specialist dental practitioner programs](#)
- [ADCI guidelines for the accreditation of international dental programs](#)

10. Document information

Document Owner:	Executive Director Accreditation, Policy and research
Approver:	Board of Directors

Approval date:	12 March 2026
Effective date:	12 March 2026
Date for review*:	12 March 2028
Version:	4

*unless otherwise indicated, this policy will continue to apply beyond the review date