

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**David Corcoran**

**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?

It sounds good in practice, but will not add to making the profession either better or weeding out the poor practitioners. It comes across as a glorified 'box ticking' exercise.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The mentoring, essays on what we would like to do, the logs kept etc , etc, etc. nb all of it. The questions raised at NZDA meetings about this scheme were valid, and the whole thing only adds to an already committed calendar and makes GDP's lives more difficult and stressful, without having any impact on the crux of the matter ie finding out about, and removing the poorer or weaker practitioners, and making dentistry safer for all.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

This just ramps up the difficulties, costs, and stress in this new scheme.

---

**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.:

Are qualified GDPs trusted at all? Is the profession [ie"... an occupation.. that involves prolonged training and a formal qualification'] to be pit through the final BDS every year to satisfy some arbitrary, ill defined, and unwarranted goal?

---

**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.:

Not supported.

---

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

Who chooses the mentors? If the mentors are disqualified does that rule out the mentee?, what is a 'satisfactory' topic for pursual?, what if the topic is regarded as unsatisfactory etc, etc, etc.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

They have some validity, and may be useful.

---

**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**

---

**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.:

Well qualified new registrants eg overseas graduates [from suitably calibrated countries]

---

**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.:  
Experience of similar UK training programmes [eg NHS Vocational training] suggests that they soon become hard to get onto, difficult to access, and a barrier to work, excluding well trained and qualified practitioners.

---

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

Practitioners work quality usually increases as they age. Given that most practitioners wear Loupes, and will have their eyesight checked anyway if there are problems, this proposal comes across as just a money making exercise for Opticians.

---

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?

**Yes**

---

**Q20** Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

What is wrong with the current system?

---

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?

The impression given is that this proposal is going to go through whatever the profession suggests, little changes will be made, and consultation is just a fig leaf.

---