

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

WM Thomson

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 like the general principles.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Yes - see below. The recertification cycle is far too frequent. I also believe that practitioners' attendance at conferences and other educative experiences should still count in some way. As an editor, I would prefer that you use "practise" as the verb and "practice" as the noun (which is the practice outside North America).

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

12 months is too frequent. The vast majority of practitioners are safe, conscientious operators. The proposed 12-monthly process will result in a tiresome burden for them, as well as a large increase in administrative work for the DCNZ. We pay for the DCNZ, and the costs of this process will inevitably be passed on to us. It is difficult enough at present to get the Council to move quickly and efficiently on its current work (witness the unconscionable length of time it takes to process registration applications from overseas-qualified practitioners, for a start - those people are materially disadvantaged by the Council's tardiness in that process).

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.:

This would be gamed by many of those taking part. The cost of failure would be too high.

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.:

While arguably necessary, this sort of thing can easily become intrusive and burdensome.

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

See above re the conference attendance, etc.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Again, this could be useful as long as it does not become burdensome.

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?

Please explain.:

There needs to be a distinction made between new graduates and experienced practitioners who have gained registration in NZ for the first time.

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?

Yes,
Please explain.:
Being in my early 60s now, I find much of your language ageist and bordering on offensive.

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?

Bad apples need to be eliminated from the practising workforce.

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