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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name	**Amy**

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

Q3 Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents — **a registered oral health therapist**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

I believe the current shorter CPD cycle is good.

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

Please explain.:
I believe our current CPD requirements are effective. I believe adding more paper work into the programme does not address the concerns instead creates more work for the practitioner. Currently we do not have any study time provided during work hours, thus any further work will take time away from our families and our 'own' time.

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
I believe the cycle being shortened to 12months is effective in keeping update with yearly changes.

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?

Yes,
Please explain.:
I feel practices should have to allow time for practitioners to do this during work time.

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 two years

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

More mandatory study leave issued by employers allowed for practitioners to complete all the task.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

I agree with extending mandatory mentoring to two years

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

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?

Yes

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

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?

This is a good idea

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
Financial assistance or on site eye testing as for some, this can be a very costly thing especially if the practitioner involved is aware they have good vision and are only doing what is required.

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

Cost

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?

Agree

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.

None

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?

None