

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name	<b>Celeste Compton</b>
Company/organisation	<b>Christchurch Branch DOHTA</b>
City/town	<b>Christchurch</b>

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**on behalf of a** ,  
**group**

If group, company or organisation, please specify::

Christchurch Branch DOHTA

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

**a registered dental therapist,**  
**a professional**  
**association**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

Involves interaction with peers.

It suggests the possibility of individualised plans for professional development.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

We would like to see Indemnity Insurance as part of our fees. We would like to see a greater number of practitioners audited to gain a fairer outcome.

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

We would like to see the time frame longer for competent practitioners.

## 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.:

Open-book assessments may only be necessary for non-compliant, non-competent practitioners. (section 4/5)

**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.

A 1 year CPD cycle seems to be too short.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Mentoring should be a priority.

We would also like to see Mentors being financially rewarded for this role as a step on our pay scale.

Different roles may need varied periods of mentoring e.g. DT/OHT may require a shorter period than Dentists.

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

**Yes**

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

**too long** ,

Please explain.:

In some cases too long. Different roles may need varied periods of mentoring e.g. DT/OHT may require a shorter period than Dentists, new registrants from overseas with English as a second language may need a longer mentoring period.

**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.:

Important for all new registrants to participate in a mentoring programme to enable consistency in our workforce.

**Q14** Do you have other proposals about supporting new registrants you would like us to consider? Please explain.

We would like to see mentors rewarded financially. We would like to see this as another step on our pay scale. At present our mentors do not receive any benefits for taking on this responsibility.

---

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

We agree eye tests are important. Perhaps every 3 years rather than every 2 years.

---

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

We would also like to see hearing checks added to this.

---

**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?

This appears to be very fair and gives plenty of opportunity to remedy.  
Appears to be a very supportive approach.

---

**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**

---