1 / 4

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

| Name | **Janet Vette** |
| --- | --- |

**Q2** Are you making this submission **as a registered practitioner**

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents **a registered dental therapist**

## 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.:
I think that the timeframe of 12 months is too short would you be able to change your nominated peer during the recertification period?

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

**No,**
Please explain.:
what if you have set your objectives & you can't achieve them within the 12 month timeframe

**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 believe that this needs to be achievable for everyone. Surely it should be sufficient that practitioners have identified their learning & on going education and by adding on another assessment this will add pressure for some people, possibly you will have some resignations! Do you think it is possible that this added requirement will deter some practitioners? I think that you need to change the word attestation how can you guarantee that that the practitioner has achieved their PDA?

**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.:
Needs to brought in line with the recertification programme period

**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?

two years is too long

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

**Yes,**
Please explain.:
I believe that 12 months is sufficient timeframe for most new graduates/registrants. I also don't believe that they shouldn't have to do an on line open book assessment either.

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

**too long** ,
Please explain.:
I believe that 12 months is sufficient timeframe for most new graduates/registrants. The DHB has a very robust mentoring programme in place. I have been involved with mentoring for the last 4 years & have found that the first 6 months is intensive one on one and then continued on going support is available as required for the next 6 months or longer if necessary. Possibly the public sector could be a different scenario?

**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.:
It is a really valuable time to allow the new registrants to find their feet " in the big world" to build their confidence & gain the necessary practical experience in a supportive environment, the transition from university to working in a new environment. for registrants going into the public sector this could be a challenge, does the mentor necessarily have to be from that practise?

**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?

why do you have to put an age of 40 to determine to prove their vision is adequate! surely most of us are wearing glasses by then & usually require a 2 yearly check anyway.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:
sure it is a given that as time advances things start to change with our health but do we really have to govern this to the ninth degree? Not everyone is the same, I would hope that an individual who is having issues would acknowledge this area. where are our rights as individuals???

**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?

surely you would use failure to complete practice audit requirement as an indicator than late APC renewal?

**Q19** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

**No,**

Please explain.:
I think what you have covered is great.

**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?

No

---