

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**mike peters CDT**

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**as a registered practitioner**

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

**a registered clinical dental technician** ,

**a registered dental technician**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

I support change to our current system however can 'we' assume this is a draft overview for all dental health professionals and subject to identify the variation of career vocation

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The NZDC is well intended and can only be functional and supported ethically when 'both parties agree yet may feel agreived' restorative dentistry commits to an accute form of practice often without the practioners having options whereas dental prosthetics the roll is bespoke therefore being more open for craft interpretation ..yet would be unlikely to represent a unanimous view fromthose practioners hence there requires a better understanding as to what the NZDC is endeavouring to acheive by mandatory peer reviews and sight tests.....?

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Again from a council perspective no doubt implicate specific employment levels...high. Cost bourn by practioners for no return of 'investment' compliant or higher standards to the public a more frequent audit I feel dubious about however if the NZDC can support this 12 month term with/by actual evidence?

**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.:

Again an audit system would be in good standing for the NZDC, Dental practioners and the public as 'consumers' Current tone in draft I cannot from the position I am seated see has any strength for me supporting but for the NZDC may lessen any liability as we are having to make written statements concurrent which legally may not be in ones best interests

**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 three years** ,

Please explain.:

Such an assessment would be an account of change both personally and include the act of practicing. This would include tech / product change to both the profession and methodology used Changes to social enviroment and or contracts ie insurance Demographics of a business location ie retrenchment or new business growth in the region My examples are to illustrate a moderate time frame is required to make such observations for one to effect an overview

**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?

no

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Technicians. There is a general view a 'window' be required whereby an assessment of a new registrant can be viewed by peer, an exam result is a record of moment in time whereas a longer term presents more accurately for all

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**too short,**  
Please explain.:  
Three  
years

---

**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?

NZDC has not been specific with this proposal, does this implicate all registered practioners?

---

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Again NZDC has not been specific.....the assumption I make as an "aging" practioner my level of competence is not based on age but health.... Decline is health related My responsibilities are to myself the people I am privileged to practice to and my Council. I maintain proactive healthcare with at least yearly full medical check ups. Any condition that may compromise my health and wellbeing indicates the terms to which I may practice this being the advise of those to whom I am accountable. NZDC be given the right to seek such from a registered practioner. I would not object to it being manditory a yearly medical examination be made, if any imparement ie sight be required to be made then on that outcome one has such an examination.

---

**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**

---

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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