



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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Christopher Ferreira



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 understand that council feels there is a need to improve the way in which competence and professional development of practitioners is assured. The proposed programme itself appears laborious and burdensome.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I have read the phase 2 discussion document in some detail and attended the online webinar. I am part of a large group practise and have been a dentist for 34 years. I have previously been in government service overseeing multiple clinics and solo private practice. In my experience, most dentists are true professionals and proud of what they do. They operate within the limit of there skills and acquire the necessary training, before moving into new fields of practice. Ongoing learning and updating is part of being a dentist in a constantly changing profession. Something that we do freely and eagerly. I have never had to feel that someone was constantly looking over my shoulder. Recertification should be a process that motivates practitioners and not have them be reluctant participants. In our practise we have had discussion as a group regarding these proposals. Additionally on 16 October at the monthly ADA meeting robust and lengthy discussion took place as well. For the most part the consensus is that the new proposed system is going to place a significant additional burden and be intrusive on practitioners who are compliant and competent and love there profession. By all means identify new graduates and those with overseas qualifications who require assistance and mentoring. Regarding those non- compliant practitioners and those who have regular complaints. Of course they will need to be identified and assisted.

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

No,

Please explain.:

12 months is too short. A 3 year cycle will be more manageable.

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.:

Once again the majority of compliant competent practitioners update and refresh their knowledge freely. For those who don't, they will become known and can be assisted in the manner described.

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 four years ,

Please explain.:

More manageable, less of a burden.

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?

New registrants generally welcome additional support. There is merit here

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.:

Some may request additional support when required. The NZDA is big on offering mentorship.

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.:

Those with years of experience, but qualified overseas may require mentorship in certain aspects of practice only.

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?

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.:

My feeling is that once again the majority of practitioners are very aware of any medical shortcomings and take remedial action (especially vision) without prompting or a need for compulsory checking.

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?

By all means assist and modify the non compliant practitioner when identified.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

These proposals have vast implications for us as practitioners. They need to be carefully thought out before implementation.
