



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 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:

Name:	Nello Marino
Organisation Name:	Australian Podiatry Association

Your responses to the consultation questions

1. Does any content need to be added to the draft proposed accreditation standards?
2. Does any content need to be amended in the draft proposed accreditation standards?
3. Are there any potential unintended consequences of the current wording of the draft proposed accreditation standards?

4. Are there implementation issues the Accreditation Committee should be aware of?

Work integrated learning supervisors and Relevant accreditation and licensing.

page 13.

The proposed standard seems to suggest placements should be in accredited practices (QIP). There are a limited number of practices that have now proceeded through the second edition of accreditation and this would put undue strain on the exemplary practices that have exceeded public expectation by voluntarily performing practice accreditation.

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?**

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?

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