

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Andrea Copplestone

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?

I do recognise that just by "attending" 40 hours of any continuing ed it is not meaning you are competent. I like the idea of having a written plan of what you want to learn and achieve from it and reviewing it.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I want much more transparency around what the peer attestation means for both parties. I don't feel I can truly make a submission based upon what I am guessing it will be like at this stage. Clarity around selection of a peer and their onus and responsibility for being the attester!

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

No,

Please explain.:

I really do feel annual is just too onerous. I find life/ work combo so busy as it is with ever increasing burden on small business owners to do compliance with the time and cost of it all I just hate this idea. I am still somewhat bemused for all this major overhaul to a system that in the words written in your "report" state that the vast majority of practitioners meet or exceed the requirements and standards expected. So why are we doing all this for the few that so obviously are not up to standard? Is there no other way to focus on them rather than tar every single practitioner with the same brush? Every year we sign a declaration which includes pages of compliance acknowledgement to be able to get our APC. Will there also be site visits to ensure practices are actually complying with what they sign saying they do?

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.:

You don't have an option for unsure so this is my answer: I am uncertain how to respond to the idea of the online testing that could be done. My main thoughts are is it truly relevant, of benefit to determine competence, more onus on time for the practitioner to achieve this. What happens if you "fail" it? I'd like more information - someone said that overseas in the UK? they do something like this. How has it worked there and does it show any sign of being a truly relevant "marker" of competence?

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 three years ,

Please explain.:

How likely is it that someone is going to decline such a significant amount to be non competent within 1 year? I think this is reasonable with everything else people are going to already be doing- APC/ Continuing Ed/ Possibly peer attestation etc etc

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

For newly certified practitioners i like a 2 year mentorship arrangement and am very interested in how this may look and further information would be really appreciated.

Even the idea of ongoing mentorship for practitioners at all stages of their careers is a great concept.

I like the fact that it will vary according to each practitioner.

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?

No,

Please explain.:

If they are totally familiar with New Zealand acts to provide dental services and have been granted the licence to practice in NZ then no.

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?

Seems common sense but still dont feel this needs to be legislated for.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Part Three: Health related competence decline: A very interesting area - where do you start and stop here. This i feel could potentially be more relevant. I hate the concept of forced "eye tests" for over 40 year olds as it just seems too nanny state and is there really any issue of dentists not getting their eyes tested and causing poor work? I can't possibly imagine anyone would work semi blind but maybe some do..... I believe most of us do this already but if it must be legislated not a big issue - will we have to submit results of the tests as proof to the council? What happens however with other physical or mental declines. What do you propose for this. Are these not even more important? Will enforced physicals and assessments by psychologists also be on the agenda to fully determine "health and mental stability" of practitioners providing care to the public?

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?

Yes,
Please explain.:
Part Four: Non Compliant Practitioners. Is this really not the entire gist of this whole proposal. I am pondering exactly what these non compliant behaviours truly are as the only one even getting a mention is late filing of APC's. Your proposal does not outline anything except hand holding for this category. There is absolutely no mention of any "punishment" or next step if compliance still not achieved. So they could literally be stuck in a cycle of not complying , getting mentored , not complying and getting mentored. Is this truly the plan of the council? Of just not a part of this proposal?

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?

I think once all the submissions have been collated, a recap of all the data to date and a further consultation to further hone this would be required.