

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Jiljane Delaney

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 hygienist

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

Q4 What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

I like that there is more focus on the CPD plan as that has been "secondary" to getting whatever CPD is available to get the points required

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

No test for all clinicians (or a random selection) only test those with compliance issues. The whole does not need to be tested. Spend the revenue on practice visits instead as an open book test of the standards will not show any gaps in actual practice standards.

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

No,

Please explain.:

Currently dental hygienists are on a two year cycle down from four year cycle. This is more than adequate.

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.:

No test for all clinicians (or a random selection) only test those with compliance issues. The whole does not need to be tested. Spend the revenue on practice visits instead as an open book test of the standards will not show any gaps in actual practice standards. The cost to set up individual test for all the different fields of dentistry will far out weigh the information doing the test will give! I do not support any kind of testing across the dental fields.

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?

Please explain.:

I do not support any kind of testing across the dental fields.

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?

Mentoring (or another buddy kind of name) is a great idea and is already in place. Formalising this is a good option.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Find a better name for the role. Reward those who do it for their peers. Persons permitted to "mentor" need to be verified.

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

just right,

Please explain.:

Allows for 3 meetings a year, making them meaningful as time between is long enough to cover off things that the person is needing input in. This should be managed by the association and not the Dental Council. If the DCNZ have requirements for special cases they can get involved in them.

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.:

All new registrants should have to be signed off somehow.

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

This should be managed by the association and not the Dental Council. If the DCNZ have requirements for special cases they can get involved in them.

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?

If the DCNZ take on more practice visits or audit more cases in peer reviews then this is likely those clinicians with issues will be identified. It is not necessary to regulate by law the majority.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Clinicians are asked to be responsible for patients, themselves and those they work with. As a professional body we generally take care of these things pretty well. Why is it necessary to regulate to this detail. Unless there are an increase in actual health related, eye sight related incidents I would suggest it is superfluous to requirement. Why has DCNZ not recommended full physical is done annually? targeting the eyes is only one part of the health required for practising dentistry.

Q17 Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Keep things the same as currently

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?

It is the law that these practitioners are treated individually and are on a pathway to becoming compliant

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

No,

Please explain.:

If DCNZ are struggling with non-compliant practitioners they are not fulfilling the law. The HPCSA requires the DCNZ to form individual processes for these practitioners.

Q20 Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Practice visits and audits should target these practitioners and not the bulk of the innocent complaint clinicians

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?

Publish the full motivation for the changes so all can see where the driving forces are coming from. Change for the sake of change is not readily accepted. The forum was good but it did not address this to the satisfaction of those attending. The why behind the what is required.
