

In reply please quote C1: DR

11 December 2007

Mr C Palmer
Executive Officer
Australian Medical Council

via email

Dr Mr Palmer

Re: Draft National Accreditation Standards

Thank you for providing a copy of the draft National Accreditation Standards for consideration and comment.

We provided a copy of the draft to our Councillors whereby the following comments have been received from our Accreditation Committee representatives. We understand that these comments are being received outside of the timeframe you requested and we apologise for this.

General Comment

1. The Committee congratulates the authors on the thoroughness of the document and considers that the principles and processes proposed appear to be very robust.

Assessment Teams

2. The suggestion that "teams should include a majority with a background in education in the relevant profession or professional practice" may prove a little difficult within the smaller professions however it was noted that the statement includes "should" and not "must" which may alleviate this difficulty. At present, we include at least a 50% profession specific membership on assessment teams.

Accreditation Decision

3. There does not appear to be an option for "deferring" a decision, which we currently have within our Accreditation Policy and Procedures.
4. The Committee was also a little concerned regarding the option to "deny or withdraw accreditation" where the statement refers to a remedy period of "a few years". The Committee feels that the implications and background rationale for this need further thought as well as what constitutes "a few years".

The Final Report

5. The Committee assumed that the "final report" referred to the final version of the Assessment Team Report.
6. It was noted the words "the accreditation agency provides the report to the registration agencies as well as to the institution".

This is not consistent with our position and the Committee was unclear whether this draft document is meant for future operation under the proposed new model, or for adoption now by members of the Forum. Our procedure is that the Team Report is not provided outside of the Accreditation Committee however a comprehensive synopsis is provided to Council Members upon adoption by the Council. Whichever, the proposal regarding the release of the report concerns the Committee as there are no caveats and timing relative to an accreditation decision. The appeal period is also a little unclear as is the influence of the Institution's Response to the matters of fact and face -to-face sessions etc.

7. The Committee considers there is a valuable step in our process that is not included in this draft, which is a "face-to-face" session with Institutional representatives. The Committee meets with Institutional representatives prior to the Council formally receiving and considering the Accreditation recommendation.

Again, thank you for providing us with an opportunity to comment on the draft and we hope that our comments will be of use.

Yours sincerely

Debby Ramsay

Debby Ramsay
Executive Officer