

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Maurice Brown

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?

I applaud the initiative to protect the public from receiving dental care that is inappropriate or of a poor quality

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The proposal is short on detail with respect to how practitioners would choose their peers. It would seem illogical for couples or associates who struggle to meet acceptable standards to pair together. I know of surgeries where this would happen and where one party has been before the Dental Council on more than one occasion and I would suggest this person would not be a suitable peer for anyone.

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

No,

Please explain.:

I have no problem the current term of 4 years. This would allow maternity leave to be flexible with little hassle and allow time for all the other compliance (workplace safety etc) to be slotted into already busy schedules.

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.:

Keep the whole thing simple and to the purpose it is intended - for the protection of the public where details online could be misleading

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 four years

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

More care should be taken when assessing overseas graduates

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

References should be supplied from overseas applicants

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 short,

Please explain.:

Much would depend on where the applicant comes from and their experience

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.:

For some, no mentoring would be required

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

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

This seems sensible to me

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I would have thought common sense would have dentists use their own initiative to check their eyesight but understand a recent study at Dental School might suggest it has to be made compulsory for them, but perhaps every 4 years would be okay

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?

This is where I feel the Dental Council needs to stand up and really do something meaningful. I have been a part of complaint assessment and professional conduct committees and have chaired peer review and offered advice to the Health and Disability Commission. We already have the HDC which, to quote a former Commissioner, is a dog with more bark than bite. The Dental council is comfortable with grilling those late to obtain their APC but when presented with recent cases of substandard work by one dentist (presented by a number of dentists) found 2 months supervision only as an appropriate solution.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I know of a practitioner who has been before the Dental on more than one occasion who is "not scared or worried about having to confront the Council following a complaint". I see no point with any changes with all these drafts if it leads to this sort of outcome. Preventing practice for period of time could well affect change for recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours. There is a real possibility that a lot of time will be spent by competent practitioners with these proposed changes, and the targets that are out there, will still slip through your net or receive consequences that won't affect change.

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

See above

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?

Best delay all this for 4 years. I will retire then!