

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name	<b>Juan Restrepo</b>
Company/organisation	<b>Lakes DHB</b>
City/town	<b>Rotorua</b>

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**on behalf of a company or organisation**,  
If group, company or organisation, please specify:.  
Lakes  
DHB

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents

**a district health board**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

The policy objectives: assuring the public their oral health practitioners are competent and fit to practice, managing practitioner competence and the prevention of competence decline, and identifying at risk or unsafe practitioners.

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

**No**

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Every 12 months will be enough to achieve the targets proposed.

## 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?

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

This option sounds good, because could be an option to reassure the level of knowledge and skills

**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.:

I believe that every two years is enough to have practitioners on track

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

No

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

The shift from quantitative to qualitative outcomes

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

**No**

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

**too long** ,

Please explain.:

I believe that with the appropriate standards to be followed, one year will be enough.

**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 participate in a mentoring programme, this is the best way to guarantee that standards have been reached

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

No

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**Q15** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?

This topic is very important to protect the public and the practitioners.

---

**Q16** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change? **No**

---

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

No

---

### 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?

Make this practitioners to participate in an individual recertification programme to address their non-compliant attitudes and behaviours, should be enough to have a proactive approach

---

**Q19** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change? **No**

---

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

No

---

### 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?

I believe that this proposals are well orientated with the aim to protect the public and the practitioners.

---