

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Catherine Partington**

**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 like the competency test. I feel it is a good way to force practitioners to read the codes of practice to check they understand the fundamentals of practice. I like that it is open book. I do not believe it will help much in identifying concerning practitioners but I do think it will help some self reflect on their practice.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

I am concerned by the peer review process. I don't think the reviews will largely be honest. Dentists will not like to give peers negative reviews. I also think like minded dentists will find each other and just tick boxes to fill out forms. I don't think it will help much with dentists isolated from the community and I don't think it will encourage self-reflection and honest communication. I think it will be a time waster for both the dentists and the dental council.

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

The amount of work suggested to be done in the peer review and competency test, seems too much for a yearly cycle.

## 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.:

Provided the questions are not subjective, which is very hard, I think some form of competency test is a good idea.

**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**

**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 think mentorship is very important and valuable

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

I think more needs to be done to protect new graduates. They woefully unprepared for the current work force and there is little legislation in place to protect them. Currently there are many kind individuals helping with the mentorship programme, but the mentor is often given well after work has started. Furthermore, there is a lack of incentive for practitioners to volunteer as mentors. If we change the legislation to require mentorship, there must be willing practitioners to fill the demand.

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

I think it important to have programme but after 2 years, often the young dentist moves, or meets more members of the dental community and creates a different support network.

**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.

I think practices which repeatedly have lost new registrants should not be legally allowed hire more until their work conditions are changed. I think the dental council should investigate practices with rapid staff turnover.

---

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?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**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.

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

---