

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Chris Castle**

**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?

Mentoring program post-graduation and the non-compliant practitioner evaluation.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

All mentioned areas of the 'Core' recertification program do not actively promote or fall inline with modern business practices, mainly through time constraint issues attributed/ associated when running a business, and business interactions within the proposed market sector - dental - i.e. the ability or willingness to allow a competing business to assess and hold responsibility over how an individual runs or is able to run his/her business is contentious at best and would most likely promote a toxic environment between competing businesses. The latter point I am sure is already present within the current working environment, but to hold sway over your direct competitor and their ability to affect your ability to work could have serious implication, both legally, financially and ethically.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

As suggested above, time constraint when running a business is limited at best, having a longer time span to complete required CPD is favoured over less, I feel the current cycle of two years is a better compromise over he suggests 12 month.

---

**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.:

As per above time constraint issues.

---

**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.:

As we know, knowledge growth in terms of new content being promoted is and will continue to increase exponentially over time, thus what is relevant to the practitioner and suggested treatment of patients will change considerably on an annual basis, therefore being quite difficult to implement a reassessment protocol, the purpose of getting a degree is to implement the knowledge base required to complete said professional activities, competency should and can only be increased through experience over time. i.e. an annual assessment of a practitioner one year post-graduate will yield possibly a more current knowledge base but with a poor clinical and technical skill which have yet to develop, where as a practitioner with 5 years experience, may not present with the latest knowledge base, but would obviously out perform the clinical and technical skill assessment.

---

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

I feel the 2 year cycle is a good step in the right direction, with the proposed attention on new graduates/ practitioners entering the work space as well as in-competent current practitioners having closer scrutiny to reinforce a high standard of care across New Zealand.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

See previous comment

---

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

1 year I feel should be enough time to provide a healthy frame work for the new registrant to operate safely, mainly as a result that these professionals will most likely have quite a difficult time finding viable job vacancy/mentoring positions available.

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

**too ,  
long**

Please explain.:

See above

**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?

Please explain.:

as mentioned above, the availability of these mentoring positions will most likely be very limited at best, this would most likely in turn lead to less practitioners willing to enter the market thus leading to shortages in the future, or promoting a market where demand out ways supply thus further promoting pricing increases for the private sector which would again impact negatively on a profession which is already perceived as being over priced.

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

see above

---

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?

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

We already have a code of competency which outlines specific health related concerns which restrict our profession. The proposed restrictions are over zealous and are not currently promoted across any other professions as I am aware at this stage in time.

**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

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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