



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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

D Stewart



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 principles are laudable, and all the proposals have merit, particularly tightening up on repeat non-compliers, and/ or on those with disproportionate numbers of complaints

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

-an annual review is far too onerous on practitioners. I suggest every 3 years It seems to me that Peer attestations carry an uncertain burden of responsibility.. How many peers are there going to be?- some will be popular for the right reasons and others for the wrong reasons! Should the council be paying professional Peers?. The best people for the task could conceivably be approached by tens or multiples of ten of practitioners- who will they turn down?- will there be any obligation to accept? 'you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make it drink'- Personal attitudes to conduct within the profession of dentistry tend to be best when professionals mix freely, frequently and openly with others of quality. Conversely, certain practitioners with certain shared attitudes seem to band together, and we see an example of that in the GP orthodontics group- some of these groups seem to adhere to a differing code of conduct- I don't see how the new proposals will change attitudes in any way, shape or form. DCNZ seems to be relying on professionalism and honesty wrt the new proposals. In that case, what is wrong with the current system, since that also is what is being relied upon..

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

No,

Please explain.:

too
onerous

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.:

If they have the qualification, then they have passed the examinations already

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.:

greater frequency is too onerous less frequently means skills are not necessarily up to date ; 4 years may be better

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

Respondent skipped this question

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

I am broadly in agreement

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.:

2 years in busy practice represents a lot of experience and seems to me to be sufficient, particularly if the requirements for experienced graduates is significantly changed - eg as proposed

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.:

undergrad training only partially equips practitioners for the realities of practice, regardless of academic ability or natural hands-on talent

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?

eyesight proposals seem fair

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?

agree

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.

no

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?

no
