



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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**lorna byrne**



**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

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

**Respondent skipped this question**

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
4 years was far too long however two years fits perfectly with a clinician and their personal goals.

## 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.:

For what it is worth this is bordering on demeaning. Also, does this mean for those of many years qualifications would be penalized against those recently qualified? How would you take this into consideration? CPD is regularly undertaken, verified and skills refreshed but you would now like to test us? As a dental hygienist I am already punished in my APC fees for a reducing pool of clinicians which will inevitably become more expensive. Is this the message the DCNZ wishes to put across? That you may as well leave the trade..... Disappointed, mainly as I know only too well that my opinion will not matter.

**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.:

as above

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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:

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

## 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.:

Make the minimum age 60. Not 40yrs. The NZTA senior test is for 75yrs so if the government believed that eye and hearing test were necessary to prevent a dangerous driver behind the wheel of a car by your proposed standards then all drivers 40 and over would need to be tested.

---

**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?

**No**

---

**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?

I appreciate the DCNZ is about protecting the public but surely somewhere your registrants should also be thought of as we are legally required to pay our APC fees. We matter too so why set up more and more hurdles for us to jump.