

## Accreditation Standards and Process public consultation

To the Accreditation Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft accreditation standards and process documents.

### 1. Draft Accreditation **Standard** Document

The draft standard document is lengthy with many sub-title standards or criteria listed under each field. It seems an excessive and arduous task for the education provider to be submitting evidence as part of a self-audit to address all of these discreet descriptors. (93 separate descriptors or criteria in Field 1 alone: Governance, Management and resourcing standards). There are another 82 descriptors to evidence in fields 2, 3 & 4. Could the Committee consider some of these descriptors' detail with a view to reducing and/or grouping more cohesively/ concisely? For example, if a provider has obtained registration with TEQSA, could some of the same/ similar measures be omitted? In reviewing the amount of evidence that would be generated, could the Committee consider which evidence they would expect to review and where there may be alignment with descriptors in different fields or duplication? For example descriptor 1.4.8 and descriptor 3.5.7 have similar elements and the requirement to demonstrate benchmarking against other MRS programs could be difficult data to obtain.

Field 5 has already been addressed through a previous public consultation but since this field is where the most significant outcomes for MRS programs are evidenced with regard to ensuring graduates meet the required standard to be registered as health professionals, this field is appropriate in length. This field should impartially assess quality, ensuring that MRS programs adequately prepare students with appropriate discipline content and clinical competency activities. It is hoped there will be further detail released for the criteria in Standards 5.5, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 so that it is clear what these are being assessed against (ie evidence of written assignment or exam, practical or clinical competency assessment). This conceivably, may feature in the guidance document.

### 2. Draft Accreditation **Process** Document

The accreditation process ideally should have clarity in identifying the format of documentation required. Any guidance materials developed should give examples of evidence deemed acceptable, proformas or templates for each Accreditation Standard field and a website with resources for Education providers to access. A more concise 'accreditation handbook' including decision / timeline flowcharts for reference would also be of assistance in deciphering the process that has been described in the document.

It is hoped there will be modification to the draft Standard document and further consultation with education providers collectively (as a significant stakeholder group) about the process, before its implementation.

Eileen Giles

Stream Coordinator

Radiation Therapy Program

University of South Australia

Sept 5<sup>th</sup> 2013