

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Melissa Lowry

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The proposed changes sound very time consuming and time intensive and costly. We already work in a profession that requires a lot of our time outside of work with continuing education and dealing with the business and clinical side of dentistry. And adding onto that more seems unreasonable. Yes, I think it is appropriate to be continually striving for knowledge in our field. But the proposed restructuring sounds time intensive as well as budget intensive. And for some of us with large student loans, paying for lots of peer contact continuing education isn't attainable. I often will find webinars to listen to that have quizzes at the end or continuing education books to read. Things that don't require money or travelling. And even to join the New Zealand Dental Council, you have to pay a fee and be nominated by other dentists. Which is very hard to do when you work as a solo practitioner and moved from America. I think study groups are a great idea, and there should be a resource to find such groups to join but I don't think I should have to pay to be apart of them especially if the Council decides to move forward with these changes. The freedom to focus on the things I'm interested in and I think the restructuring would take away from the freedom. Sometimes something will happen and I'll have a question, but with the way you're proposing to restructure, rather than having the time to research the questions that come up in practice, I would be locked into the Professional Development Plan I created at re-certification.

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

No,

Please explain.:

I think 12 months doesn't give enough time. With the proposed changes it would mean taking more time off to go to Continuing education courses in the same year, rather than being able to spread it out over a number of years.

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.:

We worked hard to pass all of our licensing exams. And I think that if you maintain good standing, that making practitioners re-take exams every year sounds like over kill. If we're doing the required CE, and its approved by the Council, there should be trust that we're maintaining our skills and clinical knowledge. I think the hard work we put in to obtain our degrees affords us some trust from the council and the community at large that we will maintain our skills and clinical knowledge. And also, completing an online book assessment doesn't take into account the variation in clinical preference. Not every clinician agrees with every other clinicians view points. And there is more than one right way to do something and a test with only one right answer negates the ability to have differing view points.

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.:

I don't support this at all. And if it goes through I think it should be done as little as possible.

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

Create a resource that provides study groups for free to practitioners. Because then you would provide a resource for the peer discussions and give practitioners a place to go, especially when they don't know many other practitioners. But it should be more of a peer community where clinicians can discuss and talk things over without judgment and can genuinely be a resource to ask questions to improve our clinical skills.

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

I think it's a great idea to give new registrants someone to ask questions to. But I think it's unreasonable to script that for them. I think mentors should volunteer and that the registrants should be able to use their own discretion to determine whether they want or need. I think the way you've proposed it makes it seem like there is no trust for the new graduate. We worked hard for our degrees and especially if you're moving from another country, likely have lots of clinical experience. And the way this is set up sounds demeaning and demoralizing. What's the point of all the schooling we paid for and went through, if when we graduate it doesn't actually let us be a doctor. I can understand doing that if you didn't think that the school that we went to was up to par. But I graduated from a top American school. And I don't need someone to babysit me or make me feel like my degree means nothing. I passed the examinations. And those are there to prove qualitatively that I can be trusted in this field and have the knowledge and expertise to practice independently.

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

**too ,
long**

Please explain.:

Again, I think providing this as a resource is a good idea but mandating it for every registrant is overkill.

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?

No,

Please explain.:

I don't think everyone should participate. I think if you've passed the licensing exams that that shows your competency in the profession. And requiring mentoring is confining. Building mentoring relationships takes time. And just requiring that we find any person just to say we have a "mentor" takes away from the actual purpose of building that relationship.

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

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. **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? **Respondent skipped this question**
