



## Response template for providing feedback to public consultation on draft proposed accreditation standards

The Podiatry Accreditation Committee welcomes your feedback on the draft proposed professional capabilities and the draft proposed accreditation standards.

Please use this response template to respond to the questions on the **draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatry and podiatric surgery programs**.

Please indicate which set of draft proposed accreditation standards you are providing feedback on by placing an 'X' in the box below. Please use a separate response template for each document you are providing feedback on.

Then provide your responses to all or some of the questions in the text boxes on the following pages. You do not need to respond to a question if you have no comment.

X	Draft proposed accreditation standards for entry-level podiatry programs
	Draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatric therapeutics programs for registered podiatrists and podiatric surgeons
	Draft proposed accreditation standards for registered podiatrists and podiatric surgeons addressing requirements for endorsement of registration in relation to scheduled medicines (ESM programs)
	Draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatric surgery programs

Please submit your responses to the questions in the template by email to: [accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au](mailto:accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au) using the subject line '*Feedback on draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatry and podiatric surgery programs*'

**Feedback should be provided by Friday 12 March 2021.**

### Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

<b>Name:</b>	Steven Walmsley
<b>Organisation Name:</b>	Western Sydney University

## Your responses to the consultation questions

<b>1. Does any content need to be added to the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
<p>Standard 3 – There is no current reference to the need to programs to demonstrate that they provide students with an adequate standard of digital literacy a future-ready health care practitioners who are likely to use online patient management systems and need to access and use information from online portals. I feel there needs to be a substandard on this given how low levels of digital literacy can negatively impact standards of patient care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Although there is reference to the education provider offering development opportunities for staff to stay abreast of education technologies/approaches, I wonder if there should be reference to academic staff being committed to scholarly academic research and developments in the field? Universities should be able to demonstrate investment in staff being able to achieve this important goal for the profession, programs and student learning.</li></ul>
<b>2. Does any content need to be amended in the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
<p>Standard 3.1 – Can we have clarification in relation to this standard only being relevant to undergraduate podiatry programs where ESM may be embedded? A general entry level program without EMS (i.e. general registration) will not qualify students to prescribe and cannot be held against 3.11.</p>
<b>3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording of the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
<p>'Examples of formal mechanisms' is used very frequently for evidencing the standards, which the glossary refers to as 'documented procedures or processes in place to support their implementation'.</p>
<b>4. Are there implementation issues the Accreditation Committee should be aware of?</b>

**5. In relation to the draft proposed accreditation standards:**

- a) Do the draft proposed accreditation standards, associated criteria, expected information and explanatory notes indicate clearly what is required for education providers to demonstrate their programs are producing safe and competent graduates?**

Standard 5.3 refers to 'external referencing of assessment methods including outcomes'. Can clarification be provided on this? Does it mean benchmarking of assessment methods and outcomes with other institutions?

'Examples of formal mechanisms' is used very frequently for evidencing the standards, which the glossary refers to as 'documented procedures or processes in place to support their implementation'. It would be helpful to provide examples or specifics for each standard, not because programs will not be performing such procedures rigorously but because of how broad and diverse they may be relative to AHPRA's expectations.

**5. In relation to the draft proposed accreditation standards:**

- b) Do you think education providers will have difficulty in providing evidence (expected information) to meet any of the criteria?**

Provided it is clear what the expected information is (i.e. avoiding unexpected consequences), education providers should not have difficulty presenting it on review.

**6. Do you have any general feedback on the draft proposed accreditation standards?**

Feedback provided during the first round of consultation has largely been incorporated and this has improved them.



## Response template for providing feedback to public consultation on draft proposed accreditation standards

The Podiatry Accreditation Committee welcomes your feedback on the draft proposed professional capabilities and the draft proposed accreditation standards.

Please use this response template to respond to the questions on the **draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatry and podiatric surgery programs**.

Please indicate which set of draft proposed accreditation standards you are providing feedback on by placing an 'X' in the box below. Please use a separate response template for each document you are providing feedback on.

Then provide your responses to all or some of the questions in the text boxes on the following pages. You do not need to respond to a question if you have no comment.

	Draft proposed accreditation standards for entry-level podiatry programs
x	Draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatric therapeutics programs for registered podiatrists and podiatric surgeons
	Draft proposed accreditation standards for registered podiatrists and podiatric surgeons addressing requirements for endorsement of registration in relation to scheduled medicines (ESM programs)
	Draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatric surgery programs

Please submit your responses to the questions in the template by email to: [accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au](mailto:accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au) using the subject line 'Feedback on draft proposed accreditation standards for podiatry and podiatric surgery programs'

**Feedback should be provided by Friday 12 March 2021.**

### Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

<b>Name:</b>	Steven Walmsley
<b>Organisation Name:</b>	Western Sydney University

## Your responses to the consultation questions

<b>1. Does any content need to be added to the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
N/A
<b>2. Does any content need to be amended in the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
No, standards are clear
<b>3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording of the draft proposed accreditation standards?</b>
No, it is clear.
<b>4. Are there implementation issues the Accreditation Committee should be aware of?</b>
N/A
<b>5. In relation to the draft proposed accreditation standards:</b>
<b>a) Do the draft proposed accreditation standards, associated criteria, expected information and explanatory notes indicate clearly what is required for education providers to demonstrate their programs are producing safe and competent graduates?</b>
N/A

**5. In relation to the draft proposed accreditation standards:**

**b) Do you think education providers will have difficulty in providing evidence (expected information) to meet any of the criteria?**

N/A

**6. Do you have any general feedback on the draft proposed accreditation standards?**

I have no specific feedback on this particular set of accreditation guidelines.