



## 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](mailto: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:

<b>Name:</b>	Professor Rodney Hill – Head of School, SBMS Lyle Brewster – Course Director Paramedicine Clare Sutton – Discipline Lead Paramedicine
<b>Organisation Name:</b>	Charles Sturt University

## Your responses to the public consultation questions

<b>1. Does any content need to be added?</b>
With respect to criteria 1.3, we do offer a suggestion to further expand on the definition of 'prerequisite capabilities' prior to workplace learning. Specifically, the explanatory note could offer additional details to differentiate between clinical and physical capabilities.
<b>2. Does any content need to be amended?</b>
Minor amendments as noted in template.
<b>3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording?</b>
We reviewed the standards for potential unintended consequences of current wording and are satisfied that the explanatory notes offer sufficient clarification.
<b>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?</b>
The standards are generally clear about what is required from education providers.

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

On the whole, we do not think education providers will have difficulty providing the required evidence. It should be noted that although universities have mechanisms in place surrounding the supervision of students on placement, WIL preceptors are trained and supervised by their employer not the individual universities.

**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 that it is important to offer high quality experiences that allow for clinical and soft skill development while promoting interprofessional and reflective practice. WPL opportunities should expose students to patients of all ages and ensure they can practice relevant skills under supervised practice.

We would like to see international placement experiences awarded appropriate recognition if they have provided a high quality learning experience which allowed students to meet the required learning outcomes.

Further clarification regarding the definition of what would constitute a 'quality experience' and how this would be evidenced would be beneficial.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft accreditation standards. Following review of the standards, we are satisfied that the explanatory notes offer sufficient clarification.

We appreciate the work that has gone into drafting these standards and look forward to working with the Paramedicine Board and AHPRA.