

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Hilton King**

**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?

Less reliance purely on a total figure (ie 80 hours) as a measure of fulfilling CPD requirements

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Having to write a report on another dentist is no guarantee to the public of someone's competence to practice. You could get two incompetent dentists writing in support of each other. Who benefits from this?

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Sometimes you can do a lot of education hours in one year, more than in the following year. Yet the hours in the preceding year would surely still be valid as good current continuing education concepts for at least several years.

## 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.:

Isn't that why we go to university to qualify in the first place? Continuing education is to maintain our knowledge. Who would then be responsible for formulating the tests and what is the consequence of failing. Can you really say that an open book test is really a true test of someone's ability and knowledge? There are so many different ways to manage the same patient, we all know there is no one universal "right way" to do things. So who will decide what is considered perfectly acceptable treatment by some dentists is right or wrong? The public - if that's who we are trying to protect - will not be reassured by an open book test.

**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 four years** ,

Please explain.:

As I said above, an open book test does not truly test anyone's ability to practise, and I believe anyone from the public would view it as lip service and a weak measure. Therefore it is a waste of time, so every four years at a minimum.

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q11** Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q12** Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:

**just right,**

Please explain.:

Most mentee dentists would have covered all the basics in that time.

**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.:

IF you're from overseas, you need NZ cultural advice. New grads definitely need mentoring

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**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?

Respondent skipped this question

---

**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?

Please make it time efficient as we are already bogged down so much by every other licencing body putting in needlessly superfluous requirements. I agree we do need to provide a framework for continuing education and competence, but a carefully thought out well consulted system will encourage good compliance by all automatically. No one will benefit if it is unwieldy and onerous.

---