

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Andrew Lush

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?

Some increased emphasis on non compliant practitioners.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The current system is not broken and for the great majority of practitioners it is a very good tool for encouraging and recording their continuing education and needs no change. However increasing the requirements for all will not pick up the few who do not comply now and your proposed changes seem to overlook this. Additionally in that we as practitioners are expected to base our treatment on evidence based therapy, it would seem that the same should apply to the Dental council regulations and I would have thought that at very least a pilot study on a small number of practitioners should be done to prove its worth before inflicting such huge change on our profession.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

This will impact very unfairly on females wanting to take maternity leave and on the ability for part time practitioners to stay on and act as locums to provide emergency cover of which there are precious few already.

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.:

An examination model is an outdated method of determining competence and needs to be replaced by something more relevant.

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 five years ,

Please explain.:

As infrequently as possible as this is not a suitable method of determining competence.

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

I think the model of a practice accreditation programme as started by the NZAO with outside practitioners carrying out a practice inspection and audit is a far better model to attest to compliance and competence.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Good idea to help all new practitioners become both competent and compliant with regulations.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Not all practitioners are going to be suitable role models for new registrants.

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.:

The mentoring relationship should be able to take into account the ability of the practitioner and will mean more able practitioners will need less support.

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?

Sounds a good idea but how much evidence is there that this is a significant problem ?

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
Need to provide evidence that this is a problem already and that these proposals are going to solve it before adding to regulatory issues that we have to comply with.

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?

Nothing. Are non compliant practitioners not the ones that the dental council focuses on already ??

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
I think waiting till practitioners have problems with compliance or complaints made against them is not a good system for picking up problems and won't address the issue of 'dishonest' replies. The NZAO practice accreditation programme of encouraging all practitioners to attain a certain standard verified by practice visits would be a better way of identifying the competent practitioners and then those who haven't attempted to become accredited would be a better pool to look at random audits of compliance and competence.

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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