



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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Doug Waters



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 think what you are trying to do is very good and definitely a step up from previously. Not sure you are there yet but this will help.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I think you should still retain a CPD element with a compulsory number of hours of lecture time as this forces practitioners to interact with others and also stay current. The one single most effective thing the council could do to improve the quality of care to the public would be to make it mandatory for all dental practitioners to wear loupes with an attached light. It is utterly ridiculous that this has not been done in the past and also that the dental school has not made it mandatory for all students to wear loupes; I understand the argument that it is more expensive to students however in the overall scheme of things it is a small cost. I am convinced that if you were to ask any practitioner who wore loupes and a light if they agreed there would be no dissent at all. This one single item is so fundamental to good dentistry. Time and time again I have heard the comment from loupe wearers that if the loupes were damaged and they were not able to wear them they would stop practicing until they were repaired because they understand what a huge effect they have on quality of care. To not bring this in, in my opinion is a straight cop-out.

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

No,

Please explain.:

Think 2-yearly would be adequate.

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.:

There is no way you can test clinical skills or knowledge in a simple 30-minute open-book assessment (which is what you were proposing). The only way that could be done would be with a straight examination. Perhaps a clinical examination should be part of reintegration of practitioners who have been found 'wanting'.

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 two years ,

Please explain.:

Also I think there should be a waver period for new registrants of perhaps 10-years (things do not change that fast).

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 the mentoring scheme is good

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? **No,**
Please explain.:
Those experienced practitioners from other countries should be exempt.

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?

Seems reasonable

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. **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?

Don't have any knowledge regarding this so would run with what you suggest

Q19 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change? **No**

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

Nah all good
