

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Bill Gaudie

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?

The move to an annual cycle is appropriate to match the issuance of an APC.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The concept of working with a peer to ensure compliance with ongoing professional development is good in theory, but implementing this for many practitioners will be very challenging. There will also be challenges validating a practitioner's plan and ensuring the peer is acting independently. The Dental Council has proved inadequate in monitoring the existing legislation for compliance with Codes of Practice, including cod, and it is difficult to believe that it will be possible for the Council to monitor a more complex recertification programme.

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

Yes

Phase two consultation on recertification

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.:

But only if it can be shown that such an assessment is accurately reflecting the state of that individual practitioner's practice - is what is documented in theory in such an assessment in fact what that practitioner is doing in practice. It brings to mind the adage "Do as I say not as I do."

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.:

There is little point in investing in the time and money required to run such an assessment on an annual basis - the knowledge base is not changing that rapidly. For practitioners who pass such a test it would be reasonable to defer repeating the test for a period of time - perhaps a 3 to 4 year period would be suitable. If a practitioner failed to pass such a test, then subsequently met the requirements required to demonstrate competence, then perhaps an annual review would be valuable - assuming the test reviewed different competencies at different times.

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?

I am happy with these proposals as long as there is sufficient support for mentors and as long as steps are taken to support new registrants who are not progressing well. It is also important that Council acts promptly with any practitioners who are proving unsafe in their practice and failing to meet approved standards.

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,

Please explain.:

But perhaps there might be provision to extend the period of mentorship where a practitioner has demonstrated difficulties adapting to practice - this assumes that they are sufficiently competent to merit this extension. If the Council is to truly act to protect the New Zealand public then it must be prepared to stand behind the standards it is promulgating and act to remove unsafe practitioners. Council in the past has been slow to act when instances of non-compliance have been identified.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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.:

All new registrants should be part of a mentoring programme.

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

No

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 am happy with the proposals. I find difficult to comprehend that a dental practitioner would not currently see an optometrist on at least a 2 yearly basis to ensure their eye health!

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

No

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

No

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?

The proposals are satisfactory. The problem will be whether or not Council is sufficiently proactive to identify these practitioners and, once identified, whether sufficient resources will be made available to ensure that these practitioners make progress to become compliant. Past experience suggests that the Council has much to do to improve its performance in this area.

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.

No

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?

No
