



Response template for providing feedback to public consultation – draft proposed accreditation standards for paramedicine

This response template is the preferred way to provide your response to the consultation on the **Draft proposed accreditation standards for paramedicine**. Please provide your responses to all or some of the questions in the corresponding text boxes. You do not need to respond to a question if you have no comment.

Making a submission

Please complete this response template and send to accreditationstandards.review@ahpra.gov.au using the subject line '*Feedback on draft proposed accreditation standards for paramedicine.*'

Submissions are due by COB on 13 March 2020.

Stakeholder details

Please provide your details in the following table:

Name:	A/Prof Malcolm Boyle
Organisation Name:	Griffith University

Your responses to the public consultation questions

1. Does any content need to be added?
Cultural safety needs to be expanded to all cultural groups not just First Peoples Reference and link to the "Statement of Intent" on page 21 of the document.
2. Does any content need to be amended?
Minor amendments are outlined in the relevant sections
3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording?
The WIL supervisor/mentor does not "assess" or perform an "assessment" of a student, they report on a student's performance following a set of criteria on an evaluation document. A university academic reviews the evaluation documents and makes a judgement on the student's performance and determines if action needs to be taken. A university academic will review the reflection and other assessment tasks completed by the student whilst on placement to determine if they are of an acceptable standard. The WIL supervisor/mentor has nothing to do with reviewing or marking of university assessment tasks.
4. Do the proposed accreditation standards, associated criteria, expected information and explanatory notes indicate clearly what is required for education providers to demonstrate they are producing safe and competent graduates?
The standards appear to outline what is required of universities

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

Evidence of an agreement between the ambulance service and the university for WIL has never occurred in writing so this may be difficult to provide to the accreditation panel.

Standard 1.4 – we assume that employees of an emergency ambulance service where students undertake placement as registered, ensuring this is out of the university's control and is the prime responsibility of the ambulance service.

Standard 3.10 – universities do not engage directly with the practitioners who supervise the paramedic students, especially the ambulance service, they liaise with a representative of the organisation or ambulance service. If there are 50 students on placement there could be in excess of 100 paramedics the students work with, this would be an impracticable process. Likewise, universities do not engage directly with practitioners in other healthcare organisations where students undertake placement, there is one person who is the main liaison in which all communication goes through.

6. What do you think should be the Accreditation Committee's minimum expectations for education providers to demonstrate adequate quality, quantity, duration and diversity of a student's experience during paramedicine work-integrated learning? (related to standard 3.11)

We believe a minimum number of hours is not appropriate but an outcomes-based approach as outlined in the Standards allows for variable hours depending on the clinical placement location and the outcomes desired.

There will be some difficulty in ensuring "quality" supervision/mentorship as the education of the supervisors/mentors in a healthcare organisation is outside of the university control. Stipulating supervisor/mentor standards of education and experience is difficult as this would severely limit the availability of appropriately qualified supervisors/mentors.

With registration not mandated in some overseas jurisdictions, eg Canada, ensuring appropriate supervision of Australian students is left up to the local ambulance service with guidance from the Australian university. Like within Australia the quality of the supervision may vary considerably.

7. Do you have any other general feedback or comments on the proposed standards?

We believe, in general, the Standards appear to assess a paramedicine program fairly.