

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name **John Perry**

**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?

The Personal Development Plan  
Peer contact/support

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
The 12 month recertification cycle - see below The online open book assessment - see below I believe reflection is a very important part of clinical practice and learning. However, an annual written formal reflection is of little benefit when compared to personal or peer-related regular, informal reflections.

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
Changing to a 12 month recertification cycle is an unnecessary burden on dedicated and busy practitioners. It will cost valuable time which would be better spent caring for patients directly. I am unaware of any other dental regulatory bodies which have 12 monthly recertification/CPD cycles.

## 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.:

The concept of an online open book assessment of technical and clinical knowledge and skills is diametrically opposed to evidence suggesting that medico-legal cases in dentistry are most often related to communication issues and poor 'soft-skills'. An 'exam' format approach does not sit well with the Council's current emphasis on peer contact activities and self-directed learning. It is unclear how a 'blanket' open book assessment approach could be relevant and useful for the whole profession considering the broad range of work environments of general and specialist dentists.

---

**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**

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Additional support for new registrants

---

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The 2 year mandatory programme for new registrants is a good idea but a huge undertaking. The UK has mandatory 2 year Dental Foundation Programmes for new graduates. The curriculum has been developed over decades and is supported by large amounts of government funding, the National Health Service, NHS educational authorities, the BDA, the GDC and COPDEND. Dental Foundation trainers are paid salaries as part of their role. Unfortunately, Dental Foundation Trainers in the UK have become increasingly disillusioned in recent years due to increasing workloads and pressures from COPDEND to meet mandatory targets as part of their training roles. This has led to a shortage in Dental Foundation Trainers in the UK and subsequent lack of Dental Foundation Training positions for new UK dental graduates. As this 2 year programme is compulsory this has led to unemployed UK dental graduates who have ever increasing university debt. I am concerned about the little detail provided relating to plans and funding for a 2 year mandatory programme for new dental registrants in New Zealand. A lengthy consultation process and significant funding would be required, considering the magnitude of organisation and planning required for such a programme to be successful. New registrants and their mentors should not be overloaded with multiple mandatory targets and little operational support. Such a programme should provide a structure, service and safe environment so that new registrants can reach their full potential in their formative professional years. The DCNZ should be responsible for the success of such a programme.

---

**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?

I believe mandatory eyesight checks may improve patient care

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Mandatory eyesight checks do not address health-related competency decline in many other areas i.e. 'burnout'. Many dental practitioners use loupes and microscopes to provide a large proportion of patient care. Their use should be accounted for in any proposals. The DCNZ has not provided any evidence to suggest that dentists' poor eyesight is impacting on patient care.

---

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**