

### About respondent

<b>Name</b>	Tony Skapetis
<b>What is your interaction with the ADC and/or DC(NZ)?</b>	Education provider, Assessor of education programs, Member of a professional association /academy/society, Employer of dental graduates

### Feedback on draft Accreditation standards

<b>Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety?</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.
<b>Do you consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers delivering accredited programs?</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.

### Do you agree with the following specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards?

<b>In New Zealand: A dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural competence for Māori and Pacific peoples, and its criteria (Domain 6a in the draft Standards).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Do not know. From Australia
<b>In Australia: A dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural safety for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples and its criteria (Domain 6b in the draft Standards).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.
<b>The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used.</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.
<b>An additional criterion requiring programs to ensure students understand the legal, ethical and professional responsibilities of a registered dental practitioner (criterion 1.8 in the draft Standards).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes.
<b>Amended criteria to require the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement (criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards).</b> (Yes, no, partly, do not know)	Yes. In addition consumers should be integrated into assessment processes as well. Also in terms of outcome focus, there should be a requirement for evidence to be provided that consumer feedback has been acted upon.
<b>For internal, external, professional and academic input into program design and development to be combined into one criterion (criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards).</b>	Yes. In addition inter-professional input into program design should be encouraged.

(Yes, no, partly, do not know)

<p>The revision of the criteria in Domain 2 – Academic governance and quality assurance to clarify that the focus of the Standards is at the program level. (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes and there needs to be included more emphasis on student engagement in both curriculum &amp; assessment design as well, with evidence required to show how student feedback has been acted upon (outcome focus).</p>
<p>A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards. (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. This needs to be more clearly articulated against provision of patient care ( outcome focus)</p>
<p>Amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the standard statement and to the criteria underneath (Domain 5 in the draft Standards). (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

#### Additional comments

<p>Are there any additional Standards that should be added? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. A standard around “Understanding of evidence based research to guide practice” should be considered.</p>
<p>Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded? (Yes, no, partly, do not know)</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Do you have any other comments on the Standards?</p>	