


Australian Medical Council Limited

Procedures for Assessment and Accreditation of
Specialist Medical Programs and Professional
Development Programs by the
Australian Medical Council 2019

AMC



Specialist Education Accreditation Committee

Approval

Australian Medical Council – February 2022

ABN 97 131 796 980

ISBN 978-1-925829-62-4

Copyright for this publication rests with the:

Australian Medical Council Limited

PO Box 4810

KINGSTON ACT 2604

AUSTRALIA

Contents

1.	Management of the accreditation process.....	1
1.1	The Australian Medical Council (AMC)	1
1.2	AMC Specialist Education Accreditation Committee	1
1.3	Assessment teams.....	1
1.4	AMC secretariat.....	2
1.5	AMC advisory groups	2
2.	The conduct of the accreditation process	3
2.1	Legislative framework.....	3
2.2	Purpose of AMC accreditation process	3
2.3	Scope of AMC accreditations.....	4
2.4	Timing of accreditations	4
2.5	AMC conduct	4
2.6	Contribution of doctors in training to AMC accreditation processes.....	5
2.7	Conflict of interest	6
2.8	Confidentiality.....	6
2.9	Public material	7
2.10	Complaints.....	7
2.11	Fees and charges.....	8
3.	The administration of the assessment process	10
3.1	Types of assessments	10
3.2	Assessment of new developments	10
3.3	Assessment by an AMC team	13
4.	AMC monitoring of accredited programs.....	20
4.1	Purpose of AMC monitoring.....	20
4.2	Monitoring Submissions	20
4.3	Accreditation extension submission	21
4.4	Unsatisfactory progress procedures	22
5.	Accreditation outcomes.....	23
5.1	Reaccreditation of education providers and programs of study	23
5.2	Accreditation of new education providers and/or programs.....	24
5.3	Accreditation of material changes to established programs.....	24
5.4	Procedures following the accreditation decision.....	24
6.	Review of accreditation standards and procedures	26

1. Management of the accreditation process

1.1 The Australian Medical Council (AMC)

The AMC is a national standards and assessment body for medicine. Its purpose is to ensure that standards of education, training and assessment of the medical profession promote and protect the health of the Australian community.

The AMC is a company limited by guarantee. Its objects and membership are defined in its Constitution. The AMC Directors manage the business of the Australian Medical Council.

1.2 AMC Specialist Education Accreditation Committee

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee reports to AMC Directors. It performs functions in connection with standards of medical education and training, specifically specialist medical education, education and training for endorsement of registration, continuing professional development, and specialist international medical graduate assessment.

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee:

- (i) Develops, monitors and reviews standards and procedures relating to the accreditation of medical programs and the assessment of programs and their education providers.¹
- (ii) Oversees the AMC's accreditation activities for specialist medical programs and continuing professional development programs and programs for endorsement of registration.
- (iii) Supports improvement in medical education in Australia and New Zealand.
- (iv) Oversees the AMC's advisory role to the Medical Board of Australia on the recognition of new and amended medical specialties and fields of specialty practice.

The Committee includes members appointed after consultation with the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council; the Australian Medical Association; the Council of Presidents of Medical Colleges; the Medical Council of New Zealand; the Medical Board of Australia; Universities Australia and Medical Deans Australia and New Zealand. The Committee also includes members from other related AMC committees; members who hold senior positions at a health service in Australia and New Zealand; a doctor in training and a specialist doctor who has recently completed training; members with a background in, and knowledge of, health consumer issues; and, two positions to enhance the contribution of Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and Māori people to the AMC's accreditation processes.

1.3 Assessment teams

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee constitutes an assessment team to assess each education provider and its programs. Teams report to the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee. They work within the accreditation policy and guidelines of the AMC.

Teams are responsible for:

- assessing the program(s) of study and their education provider against the approved accreditation standards, and the provider's own goals and objectives;

¹ The *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law* uses the term **education provider** for organisations that may be accredited to provide education and training for a health profession. The term encompasses universities, tertiary education institutions, or other institutions or organisations that provide vocational training; or specialist medical colleges or other health profession colleges. For consistency, the AMC uses the National Law's terminology in its standards and guidelines.

- with the education provider, developing an accreditation program for the assessment appropriate to the provider's structure, size, range of activities, and programs of study;
- preparing a report that assesses the program(s) and the provider against the accreditation standards.

Observers are permitted on AMC assessments, subject to the approval of the chief executive of the education provider and the chair of the AMC team. The AMC's expectations of observers are described in separate statements.

1.4 AMC secretariat

The AMC assesses specialist medical programs using these procedures and the approved accreditation standards.

AMC staff implement the accreditation process. Their roles include managing the accreditation work program; implementing AMC policy and procedures; supporting AMC accreditation committees, working parties and teams; and consulting and advising stakeholder groups on accreditation policy and procedures and the assessment of individual programs.

The AMC asks organisations undergoing accreditation to correspond with the staff and *not* directly with AMC committees and team members.

AMC staff will provide as much assistance and advice as possible on the assessment process but organisations are solely responsible for their preparation for accreditation.

Interpretation of AMC policy and processes is the responsibility of the relevant AMC accreditation committee.

1.5 AMC advisory groups

There are circumstances where education providers require additional advice on AMC accreditation requirements. In these circumstances, with the agreement of the education provider, the accreditation committee may recommend to the AMC Directors the establishment of an advisory group.

The advisory group works with the education provider to clarify the requirements that must be satisfied.

The advisory group does not:

- give detailed advice on curriculum development, planning or delivery; it is expected that the education provider will engage appropriate staff or consultants if such expertise is required;
- contribute to writing the provider's curriculum documentation or submissions to the AMC;
- make a recommendation on accreditation to the AMC.

The advisory group determines the frequency and means of contact with the education provider.

The advisory group is required to keep the AMC accreditation committee informed of any plans for meetings or site visits.

The education provider pays the direct cost of the work of the advisory group.

2. The conduct of the accreditation process

2.1 Legislative framework

The AMC has been appointed to conduct accreditation functions under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law* (the National Law).

This set of procedures relates to the following AMC accreditation functions:

- to improve health through advancing the quality and delivery of medical education and training associated with the provision of health services in Australia and New Zealand
- to act as an external accreditation entity for the purposes of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law
- to develop accreditation standards, policies and procedures for specialist medical programs and continuing professional development programs based predominantly in Australia and New Zealand
- to assess education providers, specialist medical programs and continuing professional development programs based predominantly in Australia and New Zealand leading to specialist medical registration of the graduates of those programs to determine whether they meet the approved accreditation standards;
- to advise on the recognition of new medical specialties.

The approved accreditation standards relevant for the accreditation assessments covered by these procedures are at <https://www.amc.org.au/accreditation-and-recognition/accreditation-standards-and-procedures/>.

When the AMC assesses a program of study and the education provider against the approved accreditation standards and decides to grant accreditation, the AMC provides its accreditation report to the Medical Board of Australia. The Board makes a decision to approve or refuse the accredited program of study as providing a qualification for the purposes of registration to practise medicine.

2.2 Purpose of AMC accreditation process

The purpose of the accreditation process is to recognise specialist medical programs and education providers that produce medical specialists who can practise unsupervised in the relevant medical specialty, providing comprehensive, safe and high quality medical care that meets the needs of the Australian and New Zealand healthcare systems, and who are prepared to assess and maintain their competence and performance through continuing professional development, the maintenance of skills and the development of new skills.

In Australia, accreditation based on a process of regular review by an independent accreditation authority has been chosen as the means of quality assurance of the phases of medical education.

A system of accreditation of medical programs and their education providers is perceived to have the following advantages:

- (i) Periodic external assessment provides a stimulus for the organisation being accredited to review and to assess its own programs. The collegiate nature of accreditation should facilitate discussion and interaction with colleagues from other disciplines to benefit from their experience.
- (ii) The accreditation process respects the autonomy of the education provider, and acknowledges the expertise in and achievements of the education provider and its programs.

- (iii) Accreditation provides external validation of the high standards of Australian medical programs.
- (iv) The accreditation process supports and fosters educational initiatives.
- (v) The accreditation report assists the education provider by drawing attention both to weaknesses of the organisation's education, training and professional development programs and its strengths.
- (vi) Accreditation, as a quality assurance mechanism, benefits prospective trainees, employers of the graduates of programs and, ultimately, healthcare consumers.

Diversity of approach is one of the strengths of medical training and education in Australia. The AMC accreditation process supports diversity, innovation and evolution in approaches to medical education. It follows that the AMC process will not prescribe any particular model of education and training.

2.3 Scope of AMC accreditations

The AMC accredits programs in Australia as a function of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law. It accredits programs offered in Australia and New Zealand in collaboration with the Medical Council of New Zealand.

Under these procedures, the AMC accredits specialist medical programs which lead to qualifications for registration in *recognised* medical specialties. Australia and New Zealand set registration requirements that require doctors to participate in accredited continuing professional development (in New Zealand recertification) programs. The AMC also accredits these education providers' continuing professional development programs.

Accreditation is awarded to the education provider for the specific medical program, identified by its award title and recognised specialty and field of specialty practice (in Australia).

The AMC assesses programs offered jointly by two or more education providers which result in the award of a qualification by more than one provider as one program, but it accredits all the institutions which award a qualification for the program. Changes in the structure and governance of any one of the accredited education providers may affect the accreditation status of the joint program. (See 3.2.3)

All AMC accreditations are based on the education provider demonstrating that it meets or substantially meets the approved accreditation standards.

2.4 Timing of accreditations

AMC accreditation entails a cyclical program of review of programs of study, and the AMC work program for any year is determined in part by the requirement to assess those programs whose accreditation expires in that year. AMC staff negotiate dates for these assessments first. The AMC fits assessments of new developments, such as new programs or material changes to established programs, into this work program.

The AMC sets an accreditation work program each year.

2.5 AMC conduct

The AMC will:

- (i) recognise each education provider's autonomy to set its educational direction and policies in response to its specific operating environment and context;
- (ii) in making decisions, gather and analyse information and ideas from multiple sources and viewpoints;

- (iii) follow its documented procedures, and implement its accreditation process in an open and objective manner;
- (iv) adopt mechanisms to ensure that members of assessment teams, monitoring submission reviewers, committees and staff apply standards and procedures in a consistent and appropriate fashion;
- (v) apply a code of conduct for members of assessment teams, monitoring submission reviewers, committees and staff;
- (vi) review its processes and the accreditation standards on a regular basis;
- (vii) gather feedback on and evaluate its performance; and
- (viii) work cooperatively with other accreditation authorities to avoid conflicting standards and to minimise duplication of effort.

The AMC process entails both accreditation (validating that standards are met) and peer review to promote high standards of medical education, stimulate self-analysis and assist the education provider to achieve its objectives. Accreditation is conducted in a collegial manner that includes consultation, advice and feedback to the education provider.

In the accreditation of programs, the AMC:

- focuses on the achievement of objectives, maintenance of educational standards, public safety requirements, and expected outputs and outcomes rather than on detailed specification of curriculum content or educational method;
- as far as possible, meshes its requirements with internal academic priorities;
- following accreditation of a program of study, monitors the response to conditions and recommendations and other developments in the program; and
- undertakes a cycle of assessments, with a full assessment of each program at least every ten years.

2.6 Contribution of doctors in training to AMC accreditation processes

The AMC considers it important that those completing programs of study, the doctors in training, have opportunities to contribute to the assessment of these programs.

Opportunities for doctors in training to contribute to the accreditation process include:

- input into the AMC's development and review of the accreditation standards, policy and procedures;
- membership of the AMC accreditation committees;
- membership of AMC assessment teams.

Opportunities for doctors in training to contribute to the assessment of their own program of study include:

- AMC surveys and/or trainee submissions;
- during an accreditation assessment, discussion with members of the AMC assessment team;
- contribution as appropriate to the education provider's monitoring submissions to the AMC.

2.7 Conflict of interest

Members of AMC committees are expected to make decisions responsibly, and to apply standards in a consistent and an impartial fashion.

The AMC recognises there is extensive interaction between the organisations that provide medical education and training in Australia and New Zealand so that individuals are frequently involved in a number of programs. The AMC does not regard this, of itself, to be a conflict. Where a member of an AMC accreditation committee or an assessment team has given recent informal advice to an education provider on its program of study outside the AMC accreditation process, that member must declare this as an interest.

The AMC requires its Directors and members of its committees to complete standing notices of interest on their appointment and to update these regularly. These declarations are available at each meeting of the committee. The agendas for AMC committee meetings begin with a 'declaration of interests', in which members are requested to declare any additional personal or professional interests which might, or might be perceived to, influence their capacity to undertake impartially their roles as members of the committee.

The committee will decide how the member's interest in a particular item will be managed within guidelines provided by the AMC. Members will not vote on matters on which they have a declared personal or professional interest. All declared interests will be recorded in the committee minutes, as will the committee's decision in relation to the interest.

The AMC requires proposed members of assessment teams to declare to the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee any personal or professional interest that may be perceived to conflict with their ability to undertake impartially their duties as an assessor. The AMC will disclose all declared interests of the persons recommended to the education provider and seek the education provider's comments on the team membership. Having considered the interests declared and the provider's comments, the accreditation committee makes a decision on the appointment of the team.

Where the education provider's view on the suitability of an appointment conflict with the view of the accreditation committee, the committee will refer the appointment of the team to the AMC Directors for decision.

If a conflict of interest emerges for an assessor during an assessment, the team chair and executive officer will determine an appropriate course of action. This may entail changing the report writing responsibilities of the assessor, requiring the assessor to abstain during relevant discussion, or altering the assessment program. Any such conflicts, and the course of action taken, will be reported to the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee.

2.8 Confidentiality

In order to discharge its accreditation function, the AMC requires education providers to provide considerable information in accreditation submissions and subsequent monitoring submissions. This may include sensitive information, such as strategic plans, honest appraisal of strengths and weaknesses, and commercial in confidence material.

Education providers are advised to prepare their accreditation submission as a public document. To facilitate stakeholder consultation (see 3.3.5) the AMC asks education providers to make their submission publicly available, for example on their website.

The AMC requires the members of its committees and assessment teams to keep as confidential the material provided by education providers and, subject to the statements below on research, to use such information only for the purpose for which it was obtained in conjunction with the AMC assessment process.

The AMC provides detailed guidance to its committees and teams on its confidentiality requirements and their responsibilities for secure destruction of information once an assessment is complete.

The AMC may conduct research based on information contained in accreditation submissions, monitoring submissions, surveys and stakeholder submissions. The results of this research may be published in AMC policy and discussion papers. Normally, this material will be de-identified. If the AMC wishes to publish material which identifies individual education providers it will seek the providers' permission.

The AMC provides opportunities for education providers to review drafts of the AMC accreditation report at two stages in the assessment process. At such points, these drafts are confidential to the AMC and the provider. The education provider should not discuss the draft report with third parties without the AMC's consent. If the AMC needs to confirm material in a draft report with a third party, it will advise the provider of these plans.

2.9 Public material

The AMC places the following material concerning the accreditation status of individual programs of study and their education providers in the public domain:

- The current status and accreditation history of accredited programs and the date of the next accreditation assessment are posted on the AMC website.
- AMC accreditation reports are public documents.
- The AMC posts an annual summary of its response to monitoring submissions submitted by accredited education providers on the AMC website.
- The AMC issues a statement after it has made an accreditation decision and publishes the full accreditation report.

The AMC expects that any public statement made by education providers about their accreditation status will be complete and accurate, and that organisations will provide the contact details of the AMC in any such public statement. The AMC will correct publicly any incorrect or misleading statements about accreditation actions or accreditation status.

2.10 Complaints

The AMC does not have a role in investigating the complaints of individual students, staff or trainees. It will not intervene on behalf of an individual complainant to address grievances relating to matters such as selection, recognition of prior learning/experience, training post allocation, assessment outcomes, or dismissal from a program. The accreditation standards require education providers accredited by the AMC to have processes for addressing grievances, complaints and appeals, and the AMC reviews these processes when conducting an accreditation assessment.

From time to time, the AMC receives questions and/or complaints about the educational processes of programs and providers it has accredited or is assessing for accreditation. The AMC policy, *Complaints about programs of study, education providers and organisations accredited by the Australian Medical Council* available on the AMC website applies.

The AMC distinguishes between:

- comments or complaints received during the process of conducting an assessment for accreditation. During an assessment the AMC seeks comment and feedback from a range of people or organisations associated with the program or provider being assessed. Matters which might be characterised as complaints received during an assessment process will be addressed as a part of the assessment.

and

- complaints received outside a formal assessment process, which may be relevant to the AMC's monitoring role (see section 4).

In broad terms, complaints will fall into one or two categories:

- a. A personal complaint which the complainant seeks to have investigated and rectified so as to bring about a change to their personal situation. This would include, for example, matters such as selection, recognition of prior learning/experience, training post allocation, assessment outcomes, or dismissal from training.
- b. A systemic complaint which may evidence some systemic matter that could signify a failure of a program or provider to meet accreditation standards.

The complaints process relates to systemic complaints.

2.11 Fees and charges

The AMC undertakes accreditation assessments on a cost-recovery basis.

AMC policy is to charge individual providers the direct costs of the assessment of their program(s) including the monitoring of accredited programs. A charge applies to any AMC process which may result in a new decision on a program's accreditation. Costs are related to the work of any assessment team or advisory group (including AMC direct staff support for that work), and the work of the AMC accreditation committee.

Fees for accreditations of specialist medical programs and providers ²are as follows:

Stage 1 submission (applies to new programs and providers and material changes to programs and providers): \$10,000

The fee covers all work associated with the review of the Stage 1 submission. Once the education provider is invited to proceed to assessment by an AMC team, the AMC undertakes work on a cost-recovery basis as described below.

Accreditation extension submission: \$7,500

The fee covers the review and consideration of an accreditation extension submission and subsequent accreditation decision.

Accreditation assessment costs: AMC to advise case-by-case

The AMC provides a cost estimate to the education provider at the commencement of the assessment.

The education provider seeking accreditation pays the direct cost of the assessment. Most costs are related to the work of any expert AMC group such as an accreditation team including AMC staff. The cost includes a fee of 15% of the total assessment visit cost to contribute to the costs incurred by the AMC in making the accreditation decision and ongoing review of monitoring submissions and reports on accreditation conditions.

Deposit: \$20,000

The education provider is required to pay part of the fee as a deposit when lodging its accreditation submission.

² Fees current from January 2016

The AMC issues an invoice for the remaining fee when it completes the assessment. Payment is due before the AMC makes the decision on the accreditation.

All fees are GST exclusive.

3. The administration of the assessment process

The AMC has developed standard procedures for assessing education providers, and their specialist medical programs and continuing professional development programs against the approved accreditation standards and accrediting those programs that meet the standards.

The AMC and the Medical Council of New Zealand work collaboratively to assess education providers delivering programs across Australia and New Zealand against the approved accreditation standards. These procedures apply to these assessments, and providers are informed of any additional procedures necessary to assess their programs in New Zealand.

3.1 Types of assessments

The AMC undertakes assessments in the following circumstances:

- assessment of new developments including:
 - assessment of **new** education providers and programs of study;
 - assessment of proposals for **material change** in established specialist medical programs
- assessment for the purposes of **reaccreditation** of established specialist medical programs and their education providers
- where the accreditation committee considers it necessary, as part of the review of an **accreditation extension submission** (see section 4.3).

In cases where conditions on accreditation or reaccreditation require it, the AMC also conducts **follow-up** accreditation assessments. It may conduct a follow-up assessment when an education provider and its programs are found to only substantially meet the accreditation standards, when it has granted an education provider a limited period of accreditation, placed conditions on accreditation, or when it wishes to review plans for later stages of a new program development.

In an accreditation assessment, the AMC appoints an AMC team which reviews the provider's documentation, undertakes a program of meetings, and prepares a report.

For a new development, the provider seeking AMC accreditation must first demonstrate that it is ready for this intensive assessment. This entails additional steps *before* the AMC begins its standard process for assessment of the program by an AMC team. These steps are outlined in section 3.2.

More than one education provider may consider that it provides an appropriate program of study for a medical specialty. All such bodies may apply to the AMC for assessment and accreditation of their specialist medical program and professional development program.

Section 3.3 provides a description of the standard process for assessment by an AMC team.

3.2 Assessment of new developments

For new developments, the AMC will first assess if the planned program is likely to comply with the approved accreditation standards and if the education provider has demonstrated that it is able to implement the program.

The procedures for this first stage assessment of each type of development listed in section 3.1 are described below.

3.2.1 First stage assessment of a material change in an established program

Material changes to an accredited program or provider may affect accreditation status. The AMC expects to be informed prospectively of such developments. The regular monitoring submissions required of accredited education providers is one avenue for such advice. (See section 4). While plans for material change are evolving, the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee is able to give general advice as to whether the proposed changes are likely to comply with the accreditation standards. As many of the changes described below will need to be assessed by an AMC team before they are introduced, the AMC requests at least 18 months notice of the intended introduction of the change.

Definition of a material change to an accredited program

Any of the following might constitute a material change in an accredited program or education provider: a significant change in the objectives, educational approach, or emphasis of an existing program; a change in program length; a change in the resources available to support delivery of the program, including a change in the ownership or governance of the program. Significant changes resulting from a major reduction in resources leading to an inability to achieve the purpose and/or outcomes of the program are also material changes. While the gradual evolution of a medical program in response to initiatives and review does not constitute a material change, depending on their impact the AMC may regard a number of minor changes as collectively constituting a material change.

Note: In deciding to grant accreditation, the AMC makes a judgment about the adequacy and appropriateness of the total resources available to support the program. For this reason, whilst it does not accredit programs for a specific trainee intake, the AMC would regard a substantial change in trainee numbers relative to resources as a material course change. The AMC expects accredited education providers will report on any planned or proposed increase in trainee intake in monitoring submissions.

When it considers the initial advice from an accredited education provider about planned changes, either through a specific notice of intent or through monitoring submissions, the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee will decide if it is a material change. If it is, the Committee will also decide whether the material change can be approved for introduction within the current accreditation of the program or is of comprehensive impact that would require reaccreditation of the whole program.

The AMC will advise the education provider of the decision.

In the event that the AMC decides to assess the change within the current period of accreditation, the education provider will be required to submit a broad outline of the new program, transitional arrangements for existing trainees if appropriate, the resources including clinical teaching resources available to deliver the specialist medical program, the resource implication of the change for healthcare facilities, and evidence of engagement of stakeholders. Information on any changes proposed to the continuing professional development programs for the specialty will also be required. The Committee will consider this submission and make a recommendation to the AMC Directors on accreditation of the program including any specific reporting requirements.

In the event that the AMC decides to assess the changed program before it is introduced, the AMC may also require the education provider to demonstrate that the planned program is likely to comply with the approved accreditation standards and that the provider is able to implement the program. The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee reviews the submission following the process described in section 3.2.3.

3.2.2 First stage assessment of a new specialist medical program or provider

In its accreditation role, the AMC assures the quality of specialist medical programs. The AMC does not comment on the desirability or otherwise of new education providers or new

programs. Organisations contemplating the establishment of a new program should conduct independent negotiations with the appropriate state and national authorities concerning training places.

Organisations require considerable time to design and plan a new specialist medical program and to organise the necessary resources. By advising the AMC early of their intentions, organisations have access to general advice on the accreditation standards, and flexibility in negotiating the timing of the AMC assessment. The AMC expects to receive notification of an organisation's intention when planning begins and at least 24 months in advance of intended program commencement.

Once the institution has notified the AMC of its intention, the AMC will provide a guide for completion of the preliminary (Stage 1) submission. The AMC judges the organisation's readiness for assessment on the basis of this submission. The submission must outline the curriculum for the specialist medical program and the continuing professional development program, and the resources including health service posts for work-based training to deliver these programs.

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee reviews the submission following the process described in section 3.2.3.

There is a separate process to assess applications for the recognition of new medical specialties or fields of specialty practice in Australia.

The Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council (AHWMC) has provided guidance to National Boards in relation to the criteria for the approval of specialties. The AHWMC approved guidance, *Approval of specialties under section 13 of the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act. Guidance for National Board submissions to the Australian Health Workforce Ministerial Council*, is available on the AHPRA website.

Once a case has been made to recognise a new specialty or field of specialty practice leading to a new specialist qualification, the program and provider can be assessed for accreditation by the AMC.

3.2.3 AMC decision on first stage assessments of new developments

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee completes Stage 1 assessments of new developments based on a review of the applicant's submission.

The AMC will generally assess Stage 1 submissions within four months of their submission. This is subject to the meeting schedule of the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee. The dates of the meetings of the Committee are available from the AMC.

The Committee may recommend one of the following to the AMC Directors:

- (i) that the AMC invite the education provider to submit its program for assessment by an AMC team;
- (ii) that further development is required and the education provider be invited to submit additional information for consideration;
- (iii) that the AMC not assess the program for accreditation. Where it has rejected a Stage 1 submission, the AMC may specify a period of time to lapse before it will consider a new submission.

Should the AMC invite the education provider to proceed to assessment, the AMC and the provider will set a date for the assessment. The AMC aims to complete the team's assessment six months before the program begins, so that the education provider can demonstrate it has satisfied any conditions that must be met before commencement.

The AMC will ask the education provider to complete an accreditation submission addressing the accreditation standards and providing the outline of the full program of study and details for at least the first two years, details of resources such as clinical training resources and supervisors to implement all years of the program and to support the program when fully implemented, and an institutional assessment of strengths and weaknesses in relation to this development.

For a material change in an established program, the education provider should also address the following: the impact of the change on existing trainees and the proposed transitional arrangements; the resource implication of the change for healthcare facilities; and stakeholder consultation concerning the change. If the change entails a new subspecialty program, information on the likely effects on service provision is also required. Information on any changes proposed to the continuing professional development programs for the specialty will also be required.

The education provider may choose to present the detailed curriculum and implementation plans either on the entire new program or in progressive stages. Should the education provider present its plans in stages, these plans will require separate follow-up assessments. Information presented in preceding stages need not be re-presented, only updated where necessary.

AMC staff are able to advise on the date the submission should be lodged and the format of the submission.

3.3 Assessment by an AMC team

The AMC has developed standard procedures which apply to all assessments conducted by an AMC assessment team. The types of AMC assessment are detailed in section 3.1.

3.3.1 Initial contact

AMC staff write to the education provider concerning the timing of the assessment, the process of assessment, and the documentation required. The staff write to education providers which need reaccreditation approximately two years before their accreditation is due to expire. For a follow-up assessment, the staff contact the education provider 12 months in advance. For organisations seeking accreditation of a new development, the AMC provides customised advice on AMC timings and requirements.

The timing of the assessment is planned in consultation with the senior office bearers and chief executive of the education provider.

The AMC assessment team works through the AMC Secretariat and the office of the chief executive of the education provider. All requests for information are made to the chief executive, and the plans for assessment visits and meeting are finalised in consultation with the chief executive or nominee.

3.3.2 Documentation

The AMC provides a guide to assist the education provider in preparing the accreditation submission, which is the basis for the assessment of the program(s) of study and the continuing professional development programs. The guide outlines the requirement for self-assessment and critical analysis against the accreditation standards. The submission should describe plans for future development. It should also provide detailed information on the program of study and the continuing professional development program, the resources supporting these programs, such as staff, education resources and health service facilities, and the processes for assessing specialist international medical graduates. The education provider may nominate particular areas for review.

For a follow-up assessment, the AMC asks the education provider to develop an accreditation submission addressing the accreditation standards, outlining developments since the most recent assessment, and responding specifically to any outstanding accreditation conditions. The

AMC also provided copies of the education provider's monitoring submissions (see section 4) and relevant correspondence between the AMC and the education provider to the assessment team.

The AMC normally asks the education provider to submit its documentation six months ahead of the assessment. For a follow-up assessment, a shorter timeframe may apply.

3.3.3 Selection of the assessment team

For each assessment, the AMC appoints an assessment team. Assessment teams are appointed by the relevant accreditation committee following a review of the declared interests of proposed team members and an opportunity for the organisation being accredited to comment on the proposed membership.

The size of the team depends on the complexity of the task and the skills required. Whilst the expertise of individual members is of prime importance, the composition of the team provides for a balance of knowledge and experience with particular, but not exclusive, emphasis on specialist medical training and professional development, health service and community interests. In the case of education providers offering programs of study in Australia and New Zealand, the assessment team will include at least one assessor and desirably two from New Zealand appointed after consultation with the Medical Council of New Zealand.

An experienced AMC assessor is appointed as chair of the team. One member of the team is a staff member of the AMC, who is the executive officer. The chair has overall responsibility for the conduct of the assessment. The executive officer provides policy advice, organises the assessment with the education provider, supports and contribute to the team's assessment, collates and edits the team's report, and ensures the assessment process is evaluated.

The AMC maintains a database of potential team members, based on nominations from stakeholder organisations. The AMC includes a mix of new and experienced members on each team.

Teams for follow-up assessments include some members of the original team and some new members.

The AMC produces a detailed guide on the work of the team, *The AMC Accreditation Handbook*, which is given to each team member when their appointment is confirmed. The AMC also provides professional development opportunities for team chairs and assessors.

3.3.4 The team's preliminary meeting

The assessment team holds a preliminary team meeting normally five months before the discussions and/or site assessment visits. At this meeting, the team identifies key issues and develops an outline of the accreditation program. The members of the team divide the assessment task into specific responsibilities, depending on their expertise and interests. These responsibilities are directly linked to the contents of the final accreditation report.

The AMC invites representatives of the education provider to the final session of the team's preliminary meeting. This allows discussion of the team's preliminary assessment of the accreditation submission.

Following the meeting, AMC staff confirm in writing the team's accreditation program and request for any additional information.

3.3.5 Stakeholder consultation

The AMC invites stakeholder submissions on the program of study and continuing professional development program addressing the accreditation standards. For education providers and programs operating across Australia and New Zealand, the Medical Council of New Zealand contributes to the stakeholder consultation processes in New Zealand.

The AMC routinely invites comment from the following: providers of other specialist medical programs; professional bodies for related health professions; education providers for training in other phases of medical education; Australian state and territory and the New Zealand health departments; and health consumer groups. The AMC has standard questions for each group consulted, which are reviewed and customised for each accreditation assessment.

The AMC asks the education provider to identify other relevant interest groups.

The AMC also gathers feedback from trainees, training supervisors, and specialist international medical graduates whose qualifications and experience are being assessed by the education provider. It may use surveys and/or interviews. The AMC has standard survey instruments. These are reviewed and customised for each assessment in consultation with the education provider. AMC staff prepare surveys, arrange distribution, and manage the survey returns. For privacy reasons, the AMC requests that the education provider distribute the surveys to its trainees and supervisors.

For a follow-up assessment, the assessment team decides on the extent of the stakeholder consultation required, having considered the issues to be addressed in the assessment.

The AMC provides the education provider with a copy of the stakeholder feedback and, if relevant, de-identified survey reports once the team has completed its assessment.

3.3.6 The team's assessment

An assessment normally occurs over a number of weeks. The team begins with observation of summative assessment processes and training-related meetings, and visits to a sample of the sites at which training occurs. It then spends a period of up to a week generally meeting with the education provider's senior officers and committees.

All interviews are conducted with the knowledge of the senior office-bearers although not necessarily in their presence. This ensures that dissenting views can be expressed freely without being attributed to individuals.

In order to maximise the time available during the assessment and to contain costs, the AMC divides the team into sub-teams for components of the assessment visits.

Team members visit a number of the states or regions in which the education provider has approved training posts, sites or program. The aim of these site visits is to allow the assessment team:

- to judge the robustness of the education provider's processes of accreditation of training sites, posts and/or programs;
- to consider if the education provider's educational goals are achievable in the training environment;
- to assess the implementation of education provider's policies and processes in a distributed training system, including assessment processes.

For education providers and programs of study operating across Australia and New Zealand, the accreditation assessment includes visits to New Zealand training sites.

Before the team's preliminary meeting, AMC staff ask the education provider to tabulate information on the location of its trainees and to provide information on the features of a range of healthcare facilities and training institutions. This information is discussed at the team's preliminary meeting, and a draft outline of the site visit program is developed. The final program is then negotiated between the AMC and the education provider.

In addition to meeting trainees and supervisors of training, the team's site visits to states/regions allows the team to meet other groups concerned with the delivery of the

program, such as senior staff of the local health departments, members of the local training and continuing education committees, and specialist international medical graduates whose qualifications and experience have been assessed by the education provider.

For a follow-up assessment, the decision to include site visits is made after the AMC team has considered the issues to be addressed in the assessment. If site visits are required, the program is likely to be limited in scope.

The AMC provides a *Guide to Arranging Site Visits* to assist the education provider to structure the agreed accreditation program. Organisation of the site visits is primarily a responsibility of the education provider with assistance from AMC staff.

Following the preliminary team meeting, AMC staff send the education provider a guide to assist in planning the final program of meetings. Normally, the team meets committees and individuals with responsibility for: the management of the curriculum; program evaluation; training site/department accreditation; assessment and examination; trainee selection; and continuing professional development, and assessment of specialist international medical graduates. Maximum opportunities for interactive discussion are provided.

3.3.7 Preliminary findings

At the end of the program of meetings, the assessment team prepares a statement of its preliminary findings that, if sustained, would form the main points and conclusions of its report. It identifies achievements and weaknesses, problem areas requiring attention, and distinctive activities to be encouraged.

The team presents its findings in a written statement which is discussed with key staff and office-bearers of the education provider. The organisation has an opportunity to correct errors of fact and discuss any draft recommendations and action that would need a response. AMC staff circulate the final statement (revised to correct errors) to the education provider and the team members. This statement is confidential to the education provider and the AMC.

The team makes no announcement concerning accreditation. This is a decision taken by the AMC Directors after considering recommendations from the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee.

3.3.8 Preparation of team's draft report

At the conclusion of the visit, the team prepares a draft report presenting its findings against the standards. The report also provides feedback to the education provider to improve program quality. The team executive officer coordinates this task.

The aim is to provide the team's draft document to the education provider usually within six weeks of the conclusion of the assessment. More time may be required depending on the complexity of the assessment. The AMC invites the education provider to comment, within a reasonable timeframe, on the factual accuracy of the draft and on any recommendations, conclusions or judgments in the draft.

The team's draft report will include the team's recommendations to the committee on proposed conditions on the accreditation. The AMC will provide an opportunity for the education provider to discuss with AMC staff and the team chair the timeframes for meeting any draft conditions.

The team finalises its draft report having considered the education provider's comments.

AMC staff submit this report to the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee. They also submit comments by the education provider if these raise any significant concerns regarding the recommendations, conclusions or judgments in the draft report. The AMC provides the team's draft report to the Medical Council of New Zealand for consideration through its committee processes.

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee considers the team's draft report. It may seek additional information from the education provider or the team. The Committee decides on the final wording of the report to be presented to the AMC Directors and develops its accreditation recommendations.

3.3.9 Presentation of the Committee's report to the education provider

AMC staff provide a copy of the report and accreditation recommendations endorsed by the Committee to the education provider.

The education provider may:

- (i) ask that the Committee's report and recommendations be submitted to the AMC Directors and the Medical Council of New Zealand for an accreditation decision; or
- (ii) ask the Committee to consider minor changes, such as editorial and wording changes before submitting its report and recommendations to the AMC Directors and the Medical Council of New Zealand for an accreditation decision; or
- (iii) ask the Committee to consider significant change to the report and/or recommendations through the AMC's formal reconsideration process. (See 3.3.10)

3.3.10 Formal reconsideration of the Committee's report

The education provider may seek formal reconsideration of the Committee's report and/or accreditation recommendations.

Reconsideration is undertaken by the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee. The education provider must lodge a request for reconsideration in writing with the secretary of the Committee within 14 days of receiving the Committee's report.

Within 30 days of receiving the Committee's report and accreditation recommendations, the education provider must identify the areas of concern, and provide a full explanation of the grounds for reconsideration and any additional material considered relevant to the reconsideration.

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee will discuss the request for reconsideration either at its next scheduled meeting or by special arrangement. The Committee will determine any process considered necessary to undertake the reconsideration.

The Committee considers the accreditation report and recommendations, the material supplied by the education provider, and any additional material and documentation agreed by the Committee. The Committee finalises its report and accreditation recommendations. The Committee will advise the education provider of its response to the request for reconsideration in writing following its meeting and provide a copy of its final report and recommendations.

3.3.11 Decision on accreditation

Having considered the Committee's report and recommendations, the AMC and the Medical Council of New Zealand make their individual accreditation decisions. The AMC will determine an accreditation outcome generally in accordance with the possible accreditation outcomes in section 5. The AMC and the Medical Council of New Zealand may consult informally with one another before their final decisions on accreditation are made. However, each makes its final decision in the independent exercise of its own discretion.

As well reporting to the AMC Directors, the Chair of the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee is available to the Medical Council of New Zealand to discuss any issues concerning the accreditation decision.

The AMC notifies the education provider. If the decision is to refuse accreditation the education provider is advised of the reasons for the decision and that it may seek internal review in accordance with section 48(4) of the National Law. (See 3.3.12)

The AMC notifies the Medical Board of Australia and the Medical Council of New Zealand of its decision and provides the accreditation report to them.

The Committee's report is a public document. If the decision is to refuse accreditation, the AMC will not make the decision and report public until after the time has passed for seeking internal review, or if internal review is sought, until it is completed.

3.3.12 Internal review of a decision to refuse accreditation

An education provider must make any request for an internal review of a decision to refuse accreditation in writing to the AMC Chief Executive Officer within 30 days of receiving notice of this decision. A fee applies to the internal review process.

The request for internal review must provide a detailed explanation of each reason which the education provider claims justifies a different decision, together with all supporting material that the education provider relies on.

The reasons for seeking review would include (but are not limited to) matters such as:

- (i) that relevant and significant information, whether available at the time of the original decision or which became available subsequently, was not considered or not properly considered in the making of the decision to refuse accreditation;
- (ii) that irrelevant information was considered in the making of the decision to refuse accreditation;
- (iii) that AMC procedures that relate to the making of the decision, as described in this document, were not observed;
- (iv) that the original decision was clearly inconsistent with the evidence and arguments put before the body making the original decision; or
- (v) that an error in law or in due process occurred in the formulation of the original decision.

The AMC will establish a review committee comprising members with appropriate qualifications and experience which will meet as required to consider any request for a review of a decision to refuse accreditation. The review committee will not include any person on the original assessment team.

The review committee will determine the process to be undertaken for the review and will inform the education provider of that process and the timeframe.

The review committee considers the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee's final report and recommendations, all submissions by the education provider during the original process and the materials and submissions made by the education provider as part of the request for internal review. The committee may seek further information from the assessment team, the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee, the education provider or AMC staff.

The review committee may recommend that Directors:

- (i) confirm the decision which is the subject of the review;
- (ii) revoke the decision and refer it the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee for further consideration (either in whole or in part); or
- (iii) revoke the decision and replace it with another decision.

The review committee may also recommend that the Directors waive part or all of the costs associated with the review.

The Directors consider the review committee's recommendation and make its decision on the accreditation. The Directors notify the education provider, the Medical Board of Australia, and the Medical Council of New Zealand of the decision.

4. AMC monitoring of accredited programs

4.1 Purpose of AMC monitoring

Once it has accredited an education provider and its programs, the AMC monitors them to ensure they continue to meet the accreditation standards. The Medical Council of New Zealand contributes to the AMC's ongoing monitoring of accredited programs and the two Councils, where possible, align reporting requirements.

The principal monitoring mechanisms are structured monitoring and accreditation extension submissions, and the full accreditation assessment every ten years. In addition, the AMC expects that accredited education providers will report at any time on matters that may affect the accreditation status of their programs, such as a change to capacity to meet the accreditation standards, or any change that may meet the definition of a material change to the program. (See 3.2)

If at any time the AMC has reason to believe that changes are occurring or planned in the program or provider that may affect the accreditation status of program or provider, it may seek information from the provider in writing.

4.2 Monitoring submissions

The aim of the monitoring submissions is to enable the AMC to monitor accredited education providers and their programs between formal accreditation assessments as required by the National Law. The reporting requirement is in no way intended to inhibit new initiatives or the gradual evolution of programs of study in response to ongoing review and evaluation by the education provider.

The frequency of reporting relates to the AMC accreditation decision and the due dates to report on accreditation conditions, as recorded in each education provider's most recent AMC accreditation report.

- Education providers granted the full period of accreditation submit monitoring submissions in the first year following their accreditation assessment, then three, five, seven and nine years after the accreditation assessment (as well as in any additional years in which accreditation conditions must be reported).
- Education providers granted accreditation of a material change, and new providers and programs submit annual monitoring submissions.

The AMC may require additional reports of an education provider granted a shorter period of accreditation.

In their reports, accredited education providers:

- inform the AMC of significant developments, completed or planned, in any area covered by the accreditation standards, as well as their response to any AMC recommendations for improvement;
- respond to AMC conditions on their accreditation, and AMC questions concerning information in earlier monitoring submissions;
- provide program enrolment, progression and completion data.

AMC staff provide each education provider with an outline for the monitoring submission at least four months before the report is due.

4.2.1 Consideration of monitoring submissions

When the monitoring submission is submitted, AMC staff seek a commentary on the submission from a reviewer who is an experienced AMC assessor. The AMC provides guidance to reviewers on the commentary required.

The submission and the commentary, together with a summary of the AMC's response to the provider's previous monitoring submissions, are then considered through AMC committee processes.

4.2.2 Decision on monitoring submissions

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee will determine whether:

- (i) the submission indicates that the program and provider continue to meet the accreditation standards including if accreditation conditions have been satisfied in the time period set by the AMC; or
- (ii) further information is necessary to make a decision; or
- (iii) the provider and program may be at risk of not satisfying the accreditation standards.

If the submission is considered satisfactory, the education provider is advised. The AMC provides details of any matter to be addressed in the next monitoring submission or in supplementary information, and any conditions or recommendations which have been satisfied and do not need to be addressed again.

If the Committee needs more information to make a decision on the monitoring submission, it advises the education provider of the relevant accreditation standards, the information required and a date for submission. The Committee may decide that a meeting with representatives of the education provider is necessary to discuss the AMC's requirements.

If the Committee considers that the education provider may be at risk of not satisfying the accreditation standards, then it invokes the *AMC Unsatisfactory Progress Procedures*. (See 4.4)

If the Committee's consideration of a monitoring submission results in a recommendation to change the accreditation status of a program and its provider, or identifies material changes to the accredited program or provider, the Committee will advise the provider and outline the procedures the AMC will follow. All such actions will be reported to the AMC Directors.

The AMC Directors will report any changes to the accreditation status of programs and providers to the Medical Board of Australia.

4.3 Accreditation extension submission

Each AMC accreditation report indicates the year in which the accreditation of the education provider and its programs will expire. The accreditation report will also indicate if the education provider is able to seek extension of the accreditation before the next reaccreditation assessment by an AMC team. The AMC considers requests for extension via an accreditation extension submission.

In the accreditation extension submission, the education provider is expected to provide evidence that it continues to meet the accreditation standards, and that it has maintained its standard of education and of resources. The submission also provides an appraisal of the developments since accreditation, and information on plans leading up to the next AMC reaccreditation.

The Specialist Education Accreditation Committee may decide that that review of the accreditation extension submission should entail discussions with the education provider or an assessment by an AMC team.

If, on the basis of the submission, the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee decides that the education provider is continuing to satisfy the accreditation standards, it may recommend that the AMC Directors extend the accreditation of the education provider and its programs. The period of extension possible is usually three to four years, taking the accreditation to the full period which the AMC will grant between assessments, which is ten years. At the end of this extension, the education provider and its programs undergo a reaccreditation assessment.

4.4 Unsatisfactory progress procedures

The procedures described below relate to circumstances where the AMC, on the basis of monitoring submissions or other material, considers the education provider and its program no longer may meet the accreditation standards or may have difficulty meeting the standards in the future.

The AMC will investigate the concerns following the process outlined below. If this investigation leads the AMC to reasonably believe the program and the education provider no longer meet the accreditation standards, the AMC will either impose conditions on the accreditation or revoke the accreditation.

The AMC will inform the education provider of its concerns and the grounds on which they are based, and invite the education provider to respond to the statement of concerns. The AMC will inform the Medical Council of New Zealand, the Medical Board of Australia of its concerns and the grounds on which they are based, and the process to be implemented.

A team comprising the Chair of the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee or nominee, one member of the original assessment team and an AMC staff member will normally investigate the concerns. Additional members with specific expertise may be appointed depending on the conditions set.

The team's discussions with the education provider will focus on actions necessary to meet the accreditation standards in a defined period of time. The team may ask the education provider to arrange meetings with other relevant bodies as part of their discussions.

The team reports to the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee, which may recommend to the AMC Directors:

- (i) that the concerns are being addressed. In this case, the AMC will grant ongoing accreditation for a defined period subject to satisfactory monitoring submissions;
- (ii) that the concerns can be addressed by imposing conditions on the accreditation. In this case, the AMC will grant ongoing accreditation for a defined period subject to satisfactory monitoring submissions and to the conditions being met within this period; or
- (iii) that the concerns are not being addressed and/or are unlikely to be addressed within a reasonable timeframe and the education provider and its program do not satisfy the accreditation standards. In this case the AMC will revoke the accreditation.

The same processes as are outlined above for consultation with the education provider, formal reporting and review of reports will apply in relation to these unsatisfactory progress procedures.

The AMC advises the education provider, the Medical Board of Australia and the Medical Council of New Zealand of its decision.

5. Accreditation outcomes

The range of options available to the AMC in granting accreditation is set out below. There are different options available for the reaccreditation of programs and providers, accreditation of new programs and/or providers, and material changes in established programs.

The AMC may grant accreditation with or without conditions. Where it imposes conditions, the provider's continuing accreditation is subject to it satisfying the conditions.

The AMC may accredit a program if it is reasonably satisfied that the program of study and the education provider meet the accreditation standards. The AMC may also grant accreditation if the program of study and the education provider *substantially* meet the accreditation standards, and imposing accreditation conditions will lead to the program meeting the standards within a reasonable time

Each education provider and its programs undergo accreditation assessment by an AMC team at least every ten years. Following an assessment by an AMC team, the AMC grants accreditation for a maximum period of six years. This period can be extended up to ten years on the basis of a written accreditation extension submission in the year the accreditation expires. At the end of the ten-year period, the education provider and its programs undergo a reaccreditation assessment.

5.1 Reaccreditation of education providers and programs of study

The accreditation options are:

- (i) Accreditation for a period of six years subject to satisfactory monitoring submissions. Accreditation may also be subject to certain conditions being addressed within a specified period and to satisfactory monitoring submissions. (See 4) In the year the accreditation ends, the education provider will submit an accreditation extension submission. Subject to a satisfactory accreditation report, the AMC may grant a further period of accreditation, up to a maximum of four years, before a new accreditation review.
- (ii) Accreditation for a shorter period of time. If significant deficiencies are identified or there is insufficient information to determine that the program satisfies the accreditation standards, the AMC may award accreditation with conditions and for a period of less than six years. At the conclusion of this period, or sooner if the education provider requests, the AMC will conduct a follow-up review to consider extending the accreditation. The provider may request either:
 - a full accreditation assessment, with a view to granting accreditation for a further period of six years; or
 - a more limited review, concentrating on the areas where deficiencies were identified, with a view to extending the current accreditation to the maximum period (six years since the original accreditation assessment). Should the accreditation be extended to six years, in the year before the accreditation ends, the education provider will be required to submit an accreditation extension submission for extension of the accreditation. Subject to a satisfactory accreditation report, the AMC may grant a further period of accreditation, up to the maximum possible period, before a new accreditation assessment.
- (iii) Accreditation may be revoked where the education provider has not satisfied the AMC that the complete program is or can be implemented and delivered at a level consistent with the accreditation standards. The AMC would take such action after detailed consideration of the impact on the healthcare system and on individuals of withdrawal of accreditation and of other avenues for correcting deficiencies.

If the AMC revokes accreditation, it will give the education provider written notice of the decision, its reasons, and the procedures available for review of the decision within the AMC. (See 3.3.12)

An organisation that has its accreditation revoked may re-apply for accreditation. The organisation must first satisfy the AMC that it has the capacity to deliver a program of study that meets the accreditation standards by completing a Stage 1 accreditation submission.

5.2 Accreditation of new education providers and/or programs

The accreditation options are:

- (i) Accreditation for a period up to one year after the full program has been implemented, subject to conditions being addressed within a specific period and depending on satisfactory annual monitoring submissions. The conditions may include a requirement for follow-up assessments to review progress in implementing the program. In the year the accreditation ends, the education provider will submit an accreditation extension submission. Subject to a satisfactory accreditation report, the AMC may grant a further period of accreditation, up to the maximum possible period, before a new accreditation assessment.
- (ii) Accreditation will be refused where the education provider has not satisfied the AMC that it can implement and deliver the program of study at a level consistent with accreditation standards. The AMC will give the provider written notice of the decision and its reasons, and the procedures available for review of the decision within the AMC. (See 3.3.12)

Where the AMC refuses accreditation of a new provider, the organisation may re-apply for accreditation. It must first satisfy the AMC that it has the capacity to address the AMC's concerns by completing a Stage 1 accreditation submission.

5.3 Accreditation of material changes to established programs

The accreditation options are:

- (i) Accreditation for a period up to one year after the full new program has been implemented depending on satisfactory annual monitoring submission. In the year the accreditation ends, the education provider will be required to submit an accreditation extension submission. Subject to a satisfactory accreditation report, the AMC may grant a further period of accreditation, up to the maximum possible period, before a new accreditation assessment.

Accreditation may be subject to the education provider addressing certain conditions within a specified period. The conditions may include a requirement for follow-up assessments to review progress in implementing the program.

- (ii) Accreditation of the new program will be refused where the education provider has not satisfied the AMC that it can implement and deliver the complete specialist medical program at a level consistent with the accreditation standards. The AMC will give the education provider written notice of the decision and its reasons, and the procedures available for review of the decision within the AMC. (See 3.3.12)

Where the AMC refuses accreditation of a material change, the education provider may re-apply for accreditation of the change. It must first satisfy the AMC that it has the capacity to address the AMC's concerns about the proposed change by completing a Stage 1 accreditation submission.

5.4 Procedures following the accreditation decision

After it has made its accreditation decision, the AMC provides a report to the Medical Board of Australia. Under the National Law the Board may approve, or refuse to approve, the accredited program of study as providing a qualification for the purposes of registration in the medical profession.

Having made a decision on accreditation of the education provider and its programs, the AMC keeps itself apprised of developments in the accredited program through regular monitoring submissions. This process is explained in Section 4.2 to 4.3.

The AMC has a separate series of procedures that relate to circumstances where the Specialist Education Accreditation Committee considers, on the basis of monitoring submissions or other material available to it, that the education provider's progress against its accreditation conditions is unsatisfactory and/or that the education provider may not satisfy one or more accreditation standards. These procedures are outlined in Section 4.4.

6. Review of accreditation standards and procedures

The process for reviewing AMC accreditation standards and procedures provides opportunities both for contribution by stakeholders and for the AMC to build on the experience of its accreditation committees.

The relevant accreditation committee reviews the accreditation standards and procedures after each assessment by an AMC team. AMC staff collate feedback from the team and the education provider on the application of the accreditation standards and on the assessment process.

- Following each assessment, the relevant accreditation committee receives a report from AMC staff on any questions concerning the interpretation of accreditation standards and feedback from the assessment team chair on the assessment process.
- AMC staff make minor procedural changes agreed to as part of the review process and report to the accreditation committee on their implementation.
- The accreditation committee may recommend to the AMC Directors changes to the explanatory notes accompanying the standards.
- Should the committee decide that a standard or standards require clarification or new standards are required, it may recommend a review by an AMC working party, following the process described below.
- Should the committee identify the need for a change to the published procedures, it may recommend a review, following the process described below.

The AMC reviews the full set of accreditation standards at least every five years. It reviews the accreditation procedures in full at least every five years. In reviewing its accreditation standards, the AMC takes account of the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency *Procedures for Development of Accreditation Standards*. The AMC reviews the procedures in full at least every five years.

The review of accreditation standards and/or procedures is completed by an AMC working parties established for the purpose. The process is as follows:

- The accreditation committee discusses the standards and/or procedures, and presents to the AMC Directors the plan for the review, outlining the proposed scope and timeframe.
- If the AMC is planning to review the standards, it advises the Medical Board of Australia. It places information on the review and consultation processes on its website.
- A working party is established, with an experienced AMC accreditation assessor as chair. The working party includes nominees of key stakeholder bodies. Among other things, the working party consults stakeholders, reviews relevant national and international reports and policies, reviews AMC accreditation reports and committee reports, drafts proposals for change to the standards and procedures, and prepares a summary of stakeholder responses to them.
- The relevant accreditation committee considers the changes, and submits them to the AMC Directors.
- As required under the National Law, the AMC Directors submit changes to the accreditation standards and new standards to the Medical Board of Australia for approval.

