Page 2: Information about the person or organisation completing this submission

Q1 This submission was completed by:

| Name | **Adam Doudney** |

| **Q2** Are you making this submission | **as a registered practitioner** |

| **Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents | **a registered dentist or dental specialist** |

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

Q4 What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

Possibly the reflective plan however things change so it could not be a solid plan for goals.

| **Q5** Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change? | **Yes,**
Please explain.:
The recertification sounds like we are not trusted, no other profession I know of shows such low trust in thier members. Change the name for a start. Peer review can be difficult for some in single practice so this will be unfair, pushing more into group or corporate practice. |

| **Q6** Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months? | **No,**
Please explain.:
We have a lot of work as it is. This is too often. |

Q7 Do you think our proposed core recertification programme should include a requirement for practitioners to complete an online open-book assessment of their technical and clinical knowledge and skills?

No,

Please explain.:
Going over codes of practice is ok however to cover more than this is not right as who sets the questions and are they relevant and they have different ways of doing things anyway. For example much of what we learnt at dental school needed to be thrown out when we entered private practice such as amalgam etc.

Q8 If a proposal about an online open-book assessment of a practitioner's technical and clinical skills and knowledge is supported, how often should practitioners be required to complete an assessment?

**Every five   ,
years**

Please explain.:
You do not leave a space for never No other medical professional in the world shows this requirement that I know of. The trust seems broken to me fir no valid reason. I could imagine the building industry requiring this with all the public outcry to varying skills but not dentistry.

Q9 Do you have other proposals about our proposed core recertification programme you would like us to consider? Please explain.

I think If there are dentists you don't trust then they will go undetected as they will make a way around it. It just makes it difficult for many good dentists.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

Q10 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for supporting new registrants?

This makes sense to some level however it depends on how much emphasis on different subjects there is.

Q11 Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?

Please explain.:
No sure at this stage as I havnt mentored a new grad for some time. But it can be hard work so if this actually makes it easier then good.

Q12 Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:

just right

Q13 Do you think all new registrants should participate in a mentoring programme, or are there some new registrants who should not be required to participate in a mentoring programme?

Please explain.:
Does this include those from overseas who have practiced for years??

Q14 Do you have other proposals about supporting new registrants you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

Q15 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?

I think it is a slippery slope in that the dental council may make a bar that good clinicians may not make it over in older age.

Q16 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?

Yes,

Please explain.:
Eye tests I think from 60, but what other things are we talking about? Who sets the bar at which lets someone practice or not? Sounds a little controlling to me.

Q17 Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Area four: addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours

Q18 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?

The section for those who have multiple complaints about them is fair and what this whole thing should be about. Keep this bit and focus your energy on this. And the new grad section seems helpful. The rest is not very palatable and no dentist who has talked to me seems to like it.

Q19 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

Yes,

Please explain.:
The first section of late APC payers seems a bit tough. I'm presuming they have financial troubles?

Q20 Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Peer review here seems good idea.

Page 7: Final thoughts and comments

Q21 Do you have any other comments, suggestions or information you want to share with us about the draft proposals for improving our approach to recertification?

DCNZ have not shared how many upheld complaints NZ dentists have had. I was told 18. Which must be tiny compared to other professions. This seems a little over the top - I think focusing energy and our sub fees on new grads and new dentists to NZ and those who have had several complaints would be far more worthy.
Also I never even heard about " phase 1" of this process. There seems to have been very little about this until it's late in the process. It should be related for a year and given proper time fir dental associations to go over. I'm sorry but it does feel like we have been kept out of the process and a bit pushed over by our own team.