

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Neill Bradley

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?

Nothing

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Everything. Abandon the whole idea because, by your own admission in your draft, "research and the literature indicates the vast majority of practitioners comply with or exceed the minimum standards and requirements.....Our own data.....are reasonably consistent with these findings."

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

No,

Please explain.:

What of the increasing number of female clinicians who may wish to take maternity leave?

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.:

How can an online assessment judge someone's clinical and/or technical skills?

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
The NZDA already has a mentoring programme as does Lumino. It should be a voluntary system based on in-practice oversight.

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

too short,
Please explain.:
A longer period of in-practice supervision is necessary in this litigious environment in order for new grads to gain reasonable experience and confidence to perform the tasks of general dentistry.

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.:
Possibly

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?

Unnecessary nannyism.

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
Given that 70+% of final year students now require eyesight correction but are not required to wear loupes, perhaps the latter should be pushed more vigorously.

Q17 Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

It should be sufficient to rely on self-reporting of any health concerns.

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?

You should concentrate your scrutiny on this group.

Q19 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

Yes,

Please explain.:

Encourage self-reporting without recrimination and collegial oversight but this would need to be in the open rather than anonymous.

Q20 Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Go after the 10% (your figure) non-compliant and leave the other 90% to the current system which you say is working.

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?

The pendulum of compliance has swung far to far to the side of aggressive scrutiny without apparently thinking about the additional costs in time/money/stress that this would cause to otherwise compliant/competent practitioners.
