

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name	<b>Riana Clarke</b>
Company/organisation	<b>Ministry of Health</b>
City/town	<b>Wellington Auckland</b>

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**on behalf of a company or organisation**,  
If group, company or organisation, please specify::  
Ministry of Health

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

**a government organisation**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

Support for new registrants. Action on serial non-compliant practitioners. Peer relationships

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
2 years is a long time to mentor an experienced, though newly (to NZ) registered, practitioner. 12 months might be enough unless the mentor spots difficulties. There may need to be different arrangements for new grads versus experienced practitioners.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Particularly in the first instance, it will take time to line up a peer and prepare all the relevant paperwork and after the year finalise the rest of the paperwork. We may become more slick at this in time but to start with, perhaps a 2 year cycle would be more pragmatic.

**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.:

Writing down what you know (or can look up) doesn't mean you can perform the tasks in a patients mouth.

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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?

Great idea to have mentoring/support

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Shorten the time span of mentoring required for experienced overseas new registrants

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

Good length of time for new grads. Too long for experienced overseas new registrants

**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 should but varied by experience

**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?

Eye test a good idea

---

**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?

Good to focus on those who are consistently non-compliant.

---

**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**

---