

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Elizabeth Hitchings

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 like the move away from counting hours of CPD and the risk-based approach. I feel that this approach will encourage us to grow and take responsibility for our own development whereas the current process feels like a 'box-ticking' exercise.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I am unclear of the value of a professional peer and how this would work in practice. Some practitioners may feel compelled to agree with the clinician they are reviewing, even if they were unhappy doing so.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

After attending the forum I understand that this will ensure the Council is complying better with the Act, so is a change that needs to happen.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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.:

I am not against an open-book assessment in principle, but I would prefer the assessment to be more about Dental Council regulations and guidelines than clinical knowledge and skills. I am often in contact with practitioners who have been unaware of changes to regulations or guidelines. It takes time to stay updated with new documents and there is always something more urgent to do - this will ensure that we have an active engagement with new knowledge. If the Council chooses to set questions about clinical knowledge and skills then great care needs to be taken to ensure the questions are relevant to everyone as many clinicians have chosen to work within different scopes of dental practice.

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.:

This would probably align with the review process for most guidelines (assuming the open book assessment is about guidelines rather than clinical skills and knowledge; see my answer to previous question).

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

There may be an unintended consequence that without the driver of explicit formal CPD (I accept that PDAs would include CPD) market forces may result in reducing the quantity of good quality courses that are available.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

I like that this proposal recognises that new registrants are entering an unfamiliar area and need support.

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?

Please explain.:

Yes, all registrants should participate in a mentoring programme; no, there are no new registrants who should not be required to participate. By definition, any new registrant has not practiced in the New Zealand context, so will need support to navigate it.

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

The NZDA has a very successful mentoring programme. However, smaller professional groups may find this more difficult to achieve.

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?

It appears to be evidence based. I like that the eye-test will be assessed in the same way that the CPR is; self-declaration by practitioners

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? **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.

This needs to be done in a supportive, not accusative way; I believe most practitioners who are failing are not doing so maliciously but are unaware that there is a problem.

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**
