

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Anna Dawson**

**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 support the need to prove to the public and fellow practitioners that registered professionals are competent. It appears to have been developed through evidence, research into contemporary programmes world wide and with education consultants.

I'm in support of practitioners developing a PDP based on reflection of their own practice, writing it down, discussing with peers, and especially the proposal to broaden the scope of professional development activities.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

I am a little concerned at what peer review/interaction might look likely in reality when developing and signing off a PDP? Should peers be close friends/colleagues? In that situation, is the PDP meaningful and objective or might peers just sign it off without discussion. What about if a peer feels a practitioner isn't developing or carrying out the PDP, but feels obliged to or unable to challenge the sign off? Equally if peers are relatively unknown to each other, will that be a meaningful conversation? I think some practitioners will cope very well with the reflective and investigative process required to develop an appropriate PDP, while many others may just see it as a box ticking exercise they don't engage with, the way Council intends. In the end, I am more supportive of a reflective, written PDP, made of up of multiple types of PDA's than the current system. I am supportive of developing increased support for new graduates and registrants, though I suspect it may be challenging to find suitable mentors/supports for the 400 new registrants each year. I wonder if alternative compulsory multimedia supports could be developed eg watching videos about ACC, School Dental Benefits, practising in NZ or setting up online, webinar types support meetings between 2-4 registrants and one mentor.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

In view of the requirements of Council to be able to prove competence before issuing APC's yearly, then I support it. I was initially concerned at the additionally workload this may place on Council and practitioners. The information from the webinar seemed to indicate this yearly competence would take account of fluctuating ability to participate in PDA's eg maternity/paternity leave, ill-health, family commitments, need for short break from practice, which I am in support of.

**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 support an online, open book test using the Standards framework - so long as it's intended to be supported, increase and maintain knowledge rather than punitive. I would like to hear more though on what would be the process if practitioners failed the test.

**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**

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Respondent skipped this question

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Answered in previous section

---

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
See previous section

---

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

**too long**,  
Please explain.:  
12 months may be sufficient

---

**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,**  
Please explain.:  
Some experienced practitioners from countries with similar education and societal systems may not need as much support as others, but all new registrants to New Zealand would benefit from specific cultural competency relative to NZ, and unique organisations such as ACC and the School Dental Service.

---

**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'm happy to have 2 yearly eye checks for over 40's.

I would be interested to hear more about how Council might assess/address concerns over other age/health related decline in relation to competency. Eg, how that might be tested and assessed.

---

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

Respondent skipped this question

**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?

They are too vague at the moment for me to comment fully.

If practitioners are repeatedly non-compliant, then I would expect that there is an investigation into why this reoccurs eg is it ignorance, health related, arrogance, some of which should be managed with re-education and support. But wilful ignorance and non-engagement should not be tolerated or be allowed to use up valuable Council resources.

---

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

---