

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Inah Mundy

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?

No comment. Nothing. The whole proposal was disappointing and over-the-top

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

- Considering that you want to assess and monitor competency, and with the "few" clinicians that are causing problems/or display incompetency- the amount of assessments, peer attesting, reducing the cycle of CPD, "reflection"- which is so airy fairy and unlikely that this will be followed properly, and also mentoring (does this apply to EVERY clinician?)- is outrageous. As a business owner and a busy clinician, with a family, and other commitments, who has the time to do all this?

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

No,

Please explain.:

One year doesn't truly represent a fair chance for someone to meet the criteria if they are sick, or looking after a sick one, maternity leave, travel, holiday, or some other LIFE situation arises- it is better to space this out over the current 3 years to better gain an "average".

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.:

This has already been tested during our university training, and it is disappointing and insulting to propose such an assessment.

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 five years ,

Please explain.:

Never.

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

What was the process in coming up with these proposals? Who contributed? Any currently practicing dentists/practitioners?

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

No comment

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

It seems like a lot of "initiation" work, some of which is unnecessary and time wasting. Maybe the checking of clinical work integrity and standards is necessary, however I assumed this would all be checked as part of university graduation process of NZDREX/overseas application/certification. Not as an extra thing to do. Another hurdle. This seems unfair.

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

too long ,

Please explain.:

No comment- as I am not supportive of this.

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.:

No comment

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

-

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?

-

Q16 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?

Yes,

Please explain.:

I believe being in top optimum health is important for any profession. Is this also "policed" in other health professions? Surgeons? doctors? nurses? Opticians? The lack of autonomy here is an issue.

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

Only require those being investigated, to have to go through all these additional procedures/reflections/mentoring etc- not the majority that exceed competency and have no time for this. Not happy that all this additional administrative requires from DCNZ will most likely mean a registration cost increase for us too= this will all require our dental procedure cost to increase which patients end up paying more.

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

I don't believe this is an improvement at all.

The justification and support from your group of currently practicing dentists- with an ability to discuss this with them, with some "real" clinicians who can relate to our current working situation (not just administrators or legal advisors), would be a good start.

May be a forum group/working body could be established between dentists and also the Dental Council (including dental representatives)- would be a good start to discuss some proposals that is actually realistic, and of which dentists can be supportive of them.
