

## **Consultation paper - Proposed changes to the ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programs**

Thank you for an opportunity to respond to the consultation paper with the proposed changes to the ADC/DC(NZ) accreditation standards for dental practitioner programmes.

With respect to the consultation questions, following is the response from the University of Otago Faculty of Dentistry.

### **Q1. Do you consider that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety?**

Yes, the Faculty considers that the draft Standards are at the threshold level required for public safety.

### **Q2. Do you consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers delivering accredited programs?**

Yes, the Faculty consider that the draft Standards are applicable across all types of education providers that deliver accredited dental practitioner programmes.

### **Q3. Do you agree with the following specific proposals as incorporated in the draft Standards?**

- a. *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).*

The Faculty strongly supports a dedicated domain in the Standards on cultural competence for Māori and Pacific peoples, and its criteria for New Zealand programmes. The Faculty and the University are committed to cultural competence and our Māori and Pacific peoples. The University of Otago has a Māori strategic framework and the Office of Māori Development is responsible for the strategic approach to Māori advancement across the University of Otago, and within the Division of Health Sciences, the Māori Health Workforce Development Unit is the centre of excellence for Māori health workforce development. The University also has a Pacific Strategic Framework and a Pacific Islands Centre that supports Pacific people throughout the University. Within the Division of Health Sciences, the Centre for Pacific Health supports Pacific health teaching and research across the Division. The University also has an affirmative action policy for Māori and Pacific people for admission to dentistry within the University of Otago Health Sciences First Year category. The Faculty notes that the Standard on cultural competence was written in consultation with our Associate Dean Māori, Professor John Broughton and through our Associate Dean Maori, and our Associate Dean Pacific (Dr Osea G Dukuno, Head of School, School of Dentistry & Oral Health, Fiji National University) the Faculty is committed to cultural competence within our dental programmes. Further, our cultural competence standards for Māori and Pacific peoples are developed in consultation with our Māori Health Workforce Development Unit

and the Centre for Pacific Health within the Division of Health Sciences, with the Office of Māori Development and the Pacific Islands Centre within the University and the Office of Māori Development facilitates the formal relationships between the University (including the Faculty) and the Maori providers across New Zealand.

- 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).*

The Faculty strongly supports the need for cultural competence in accredited dental practitioner programmes but are satisfied that this question is best answered by Australian responders.

- c. *The introduction of a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used.*

The Faculty agrees that it would be beneficial to include a preamble explaining the purpose of the Standards and how they will be used.

- d. *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).*

The Faculty agrees that this should be included in Standard 1, criterion 1.8.

- e. *Amended criteria to require the involvement of dental consumers in accredited program design, management and quality improvement (criterion 2.2 in the draft Standards).*

The Faculty would like clarification of the definition of dental consumers for the purpose of the Standards. This is because patients are also commonly referred to as dental consumers, and as patients are also specifically included in criterion 2.2, we are uncertain why it would be a requirement to include dental consumers in accredited programme design, management and quality improvement.

- f. *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).*

The Faculty agrees with combining internal, external, professional and academic input into program design and development into one criteria, but as mentioned in Q3e, would like clarification of what is considered a dental consumer compared with a patient.

- g. *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.*

The Faculty supports the revision of the criteria in Domain 2 – Academic governance and quality assurance to clarify that the focus of the Standards is at the programme level.

- h. *A revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards.*

The Faculty supports the revised criterion regarding intra- and inter-professional education, replacing criterion 3.6 in the existing Standards.

- i. *Amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the Standard Statement and to the criteria underneath (Domain 5 in the draft Standards).*

The Faculty supports the amendments to the domain on assessment, including changes to the Standard Statement and to the criteria.

**Q4. Are there any additional Standards that should be added?**

No, the Faculty doesn't consider that there are any Standards that should be added.

**Q5. Are there any Standards that should be deleted or reworded?**

The Faculty of Dentistry was uncertain of the following and suggests rewording or clarification as noted in responding to Q3e - For Standard 2, 2.2, could **dental consumer** be defined or deleted, as in New Zealand, a dental consumer can also be a patient, who are also specifically mentioned in 2.2;

also

In 3.10, should attributes be replaced with professional competencies ie  
Criterion 3.10 - The dental program has the resources to sustain the quality of education that is required to facilitate the achievement of the necessary **professional** competencies;

**Q6. Do you have any other comments on the Standards?**

The Faculty of Dentistry is satisfied with the proposed changes to the ADC/DC(NZ) Accreditation standards for dental practitioner programmes as outlined and have no other comments.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.