

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Akruti Tataria**

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**as a registered practitioner**

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents

**a registered clinical dental technician**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

The proposed recertification program will not benefit the practitioner. Writing reports to obtain an APC annually and getting it reviewed by dentists makes the practise of clinical dental technicians useless as the work would be carried out by the dentist themselves. This puts us in a position of submission and there would be no guarantee that the skills of the dentist reviewing the reports would be up to scratch. Making the argument that the skills of a clinical dental technician are focused on removable prosthodontics, the assessment of reports would be very subjective. I don't think this recertification should take place.

**Q5** Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change?

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

I don't think this recertification should take place with the need to write peer-reviewed reports. Instead, group seminars and interactive activities should be organised that help gain knowledge and improve skills.

**Q6** Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months?

**No,**

Please explain.:

If you change it to 12 months, will the fees drop? Will the levy decrease?? How would this compensate for this?

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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.:

It should be the practitioner's responsibility to keep their skills up to date and the monitoring of their skills should not feel like they are being sent back to school. Open-book assessments will not improve anything as the answers will be googled and no knowledge will be gained by the practitioner - they will just do it without motivation to learn anything and just for the sake of getting it done.

**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 four years**

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

**Respondent skipped this question**

### Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

I like the fact that there would be a mentoring program. This would be a constructive way to improve their skills and allow them to become comfortable to deal with everyday dental tasks.

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

**No**

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

After 2 years, the practitioner in charge of mentoring the other practitioner should advise the council if they are in need of further mentoring. There should also be a training program for mentors that gives them the ability to properly guide the new practitioners.

**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?

**No,**

Please explain.:

Mentoring should be based on the experience of the practitioner in the industry. New registrants who have practiced overseas should be given the ability to prove competency before it is decided that they should be mentored or supervised. New graduates are the ones that really would benefit from the mentoring program and it should be mandatory for them. This would also depend on the risk level of the job. A dental technician for example is at a low risk job whereas a dentist would be at a high risk - calling for more supervision.

**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?

The eye tests is a good idea.

---

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

No

---

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

---

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

No

---

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

Supervision is a big thing that should be taken into account. Being supervised if there are complaints against you or you have done something incorrectly would mean that this would happen less frequently. These practitioners should also be placed on the mentoring program to assist their skills in a constructive way.

---

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?

Respondent skipped this question