

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Amanda Johnston

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?

Nothing. The current system allows practitioners to provide adequate proof of competence in a reasonable timeframe and encourages them to participate in peer activities to gain CPD. Its success is shown in the very low number of competency issues that have arisen.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The requirement of every practitioner to produce a written PDP, proof of participation in PDA, provision of written reflective statement and attestation from a peer EVERY YEAR is very onerous. How much attention will be brought to these attestations by the Council? What will be the outcome if they are seen to be insufficient? As a practitioner is a provincial area, CPD events held locally are limited. An annual PDP will be very challenging for many practitioners in rural areas or those working part-time or with young families to achieve as those PDA events may not be available.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

I do not support the change of recertification cycle to 12 months. This will place very difficult timelines on practitioners and I believe systems can be put in place where the Dental Council can rely on the honesty of professionals to attest to their own competence annually as is the current system. The cycle should remain 4 yearly.

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.:

I disagree with this proposal. I believe it is impossible for an online open-book assessment to give any measure of the technical and clinical skill of an oral health professional. Besides the obvious difference between the required technical and clinical knowledge of, for example, a Dental Technician and a Periodontist, who would set this test? What would the results mean? This proposal is completely unnecessary and impossible to implement.

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?

Please explain.:

I hope this is not supported.

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

If change is required, I would like to suggest the use of a professional portfolio as a tool for assessing and recording a practitioner's fitness to practice. This portfolio could use a template devised by Dental Council or another professional body guided by Council. The portfolio would record the professional situation of each practitioner and could be reflected on by that practitioner annually to fulfill the annual recertification requirement. The portfolio could include:

Working conditions, including number and types of associates and co-workers, location of the practice(s), type of equipment in use
CPD

Branch membership and participation

Membership of special interest groups and societies

Participation in charity events or volunteer activities

Publications

Participation in a mentorship programme or contact with peers

Participation within professional body or community groups

Perhaps review of the Dental Council Practice Standards Framework and/or Code of Ethics

Once this is set up, it could be reviewed and updated annually and so give the practitioner the opportunity to reflect on how their professional role is evolving and whether any changes in their practicing situation are required to maintain their own best practice situation. This may identify areas where further peer group contact or PDA activity is required and allow the practitioner to remedy their own situation without a punitive result. It may also highlight the huge effort to which many practitioners are going, to fulfill their professional and ethical responsibilities off their own backs.

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

I agree in practice, that it would be very good to have mentors to support all new registrants. However, assessing the quality of the mentors and the mentoring relationship is necessary and is very time-consuming. Also we do not have enough registered, qualified professionals willing to give their time to mentor all new registrants for free for 2 years. This proposal is unsustainable.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

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.:

My personal opinion is that ALL practitioners should have mentors and as they become more experienced, they may be both mentor and mentee from time to time. Mentors are important throughout a practitioner's life and should be continuous but not necessarily formalized or required within specified time frames. I prefer the idea of a "Professional Support Network". It may be that all practitioners are able to identify a "Support peer" (or 2) to indicate peer group participation and relief from isolation.

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 don't believe these proposal address health related competence decline concerns in any way.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Evidence of an eye test will show that a practitioner is measuring (but not necessarily acting on) their ability to see. Eyesight is one of the many physical and mental requirements needed to perform adequately as an oral health practitioner and must be assessed by that professional on a daily basis. According to the advice of my optometrist, I have my eyes tested every 2 years. However, it is my belief that the Council would be better served focusing on other aspects of competence rather than chasing up (or withholding licenses from) practitioners who are late for their eye test.

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?

It is my opinion that this is where the Council should be focusing attention as the evidence shows that this is the group who are most at risk of competence issues.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission regarding Phase 2 of the Recertification Proposal. I would like to make an objection to the very short time frame allocated to consider this proposal. As it has taken many months for the Council to consider all aspects of this recertification project, so it takes a significant amount of time for practitioners to assess, discuss and make a submission, whether as individuals or in groups. I don't feel there has been enough time to consider this fully. Also, I would like to point out that unfortunately I was unable to attend the forum in my region nor either of the webinars as they were all held over the school holiday period. As a practitioner with school-aged children, this timing is totally inconvenient for me and already scheduled many months in advance. My other comment is regarding the inability to make an anonymous submission. This may be a barrier to many practitioners, especially those involved with professional groups, giving honest and personal feedback as their names will be known to the public and the profession.
