

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Gus Ariaens

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

This document doesn't state what the main problems actually are, where are the areas of lack of performance? In a time of evidence based knowledge, where is the evidence in this report? How is the Dental "industry" going to source enough mentors year after year for the growing number of graduates and potential immigrating (and thus needing recertification) dentists coming to NZ? I would suggest that such a peer "buddy" system is going to be ineffective at determining competence and assurance. We know collegiality and peer contact is vital for being part of our profession and isolation is potentially risky regarding less favourable treatment outcomes, but reviewing a peer is a significant skill which we "all" cannot quickly or easily acquire. We have very good peer contact systems in place already, perhaps increasing the number of contacts (including via FaceTime or similar) could be an option. Every dentist has a different philosophy and a different personality. Assessing another dentists competence is very subjective. Some dentists will find it very challenging

Phase two consultation on recertification

and stressful writing an unfavourable peer report (even partly unfavourable)... so may write a "slanted" favourable report, two dentists might pair up and just write something of no significance just to complete the compliance..... Less ethical dentists may give each other a glowing report..... just getting a "like minded peer" achieves nothing the DCNZ is trying to implement. If a dentist is writing an attestation and declaring it to be true in the DCNZ site, what are the legal implications if the reviewed dentist has a significant complaint case, with the same aspect of dentistry favourably presented in the review? The Dental school teaches that under certain restorations decay may be left in the base of the cavity, as long as there is a marginal seal, what is leaving too much decay?... what is removing too much decay?... either could be considered mistreatment? How does a dentist with no peer review skills assess that?... some dentists have significant minimal intervention, how much is too little treatment, what is over treatment with regard to crowning teeth, some dentists don't like cad cam restorative treatments, some love it!... finding only like minded dentists to write your attestation achieves little, but that is what dentists will do to make the process as easy as possible. Why did the DCNZ draw from the requirement of "the Phycologists Board of NZ", the "Occupational Therapy Board of NZ", and others that are entirely different than us?... and others from overseas?. This process of peer attestation is expected to be repeated every year which is a significant amount of work and I would suggest far too onerous! With no mention of the actual areas of lack of performance, this Recertification draft promotes a significant amount of work for every dentist in New Zealand and surely must add a significant cost to the DCNZ, which I expect will apply a related increase APC fee?

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

No

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

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

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.:

Mandatory eye tests are a burden and unnecessary. Having good eye sight doesn't make you a better practitioner. If there is a complaint received about a particular practitioner relating to the quality of their work, then as part of the investigative process an eye test may be a good idea.

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

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?

Respondent skipped this question