

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Andrew johnson

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 older practitioners being questioned

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The time this will take and the obvious increase in our fees will end up costing the patients we see more to use our services. This was written by an academic and not a working practitioner. I think this is in response to the incoming whitecoat.co.nz type websites which will question competence and the dental council is obviously covering it's bases. I am very busy day to day, and have the admin of running a small business along with providing for a young family. I would appreciate a simplified process, not to removed from the current practice

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

Normal family and parental responsibilities mean that some years it is easier to find the time to gain cpd than others. Longer cycles give me flexibility with life demands. What looks good on paper will be hard to achieve in reality with some years having more courses than others

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.:

No! What is the point of cpd???? Wasted money and time if it's all based on a single test. Surely if people are getting a lot of complaints they alone should be tested, not everyone else ?

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.:

Appears to be a revenue gathering exercise Will be a minefield

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

Maybe focus on a single issue not every part of the process

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

It's a good idea because the new graduates don't take kindly to criticism. Mentorship will help them

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Add in the university to the equation. They need be responsible for the students they are producing. And the new graduates need to help current students enter the workforce

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

just right,

Please explain.:

It's more about understanding the industry and how it works. Having a structured approach should also provide the mentors with cpd as well as it will take time and effort.

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.

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?

It is difficult with an aging workforce. How Do you stop somebody's ability to make money ?

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
How is the decline in somebody's health decided? Does this all link back to the test?

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

I question adding ages to the documents.

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?

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.

How do you stop them trading once deregistered? Doesn't that mean there is no means to punish once this has been completed?

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?

Please reconsider this proposal. Most of these changes are already being done by competent practitioners who care for their patients.

The problem with doing these changes to an already high stress health area will see a decrease in the number of practitioners.