



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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Nina Ufferhardt



Q2 Are you making this submission

as a registered practitioner

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

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?

That one has to think about where to improve rather than going with the flow. The plan is a good idea but I am very sceptical about the execution

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Teaming up with another member might cause a decrease in Quality in my eyes. Choosing a mate will result in a scratch our backs situation rather than a critical mentoring. Even if the planning is great, there are not always equivalent courses on offer within New Zealand and often the overseas courses/meetings/lectures are too expensive and time consuming (eg. I got two kids and work part time, my income does not allow me to go overseas not to mention childcare...) The plans can be easily manipulated, meaning a practitioner might just write anything down that is "on special" just to tick the box.... resulting in the same quality of CPd as we currently have, just with extra work and administration. A waste of time with no result... I do not think a year for the cycle is a good idea, everyone has a year where things might get busy and do not allow time. Within a two year cycle, there would be plenty of time to make up for it. Everyone can manage their points in two years... 40 is not old. Having a compulsory eye check at 40 seems over the top. I can see 50+ but 40?!? Especially as a technician, if my eyesight deteriorated then no dentist/clinician will book me any longer, hence I believe this is self regulation for the scope of dental technology.

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

No,

Please explain.:

As mentioned above. Plus I could see how people would just go to an annual conference (one stop shop) that covers enough CPd rather than booking chosen courses, that actually make sense for their improvement. Two years give enough time to plan and schedule according to ones needs I do believe a year is going to result in a decrease of CPd quality even further. Should not be longer than two years either otherwise people get slack and procrastinate

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.:

Actually I am quite torn on this one. I do like the idea of a check, however I am very sceptical that it would be manageable without a significant increase in administrative costs and hence fees.... maybe tests on the regulations?!? Like crissinfection as published in dc website

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 four years ,

Please explain.:

If one does not use a language in 7years they loose it. Same with most acquired knowledge. If you don't use it you loose it hence the cycle should be less than 7 but let's face it annually seems over the top

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?

I like the mentoring.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

just right,

Please explain.:

Just right for graduates but toooooooo long for newly/ first time registered parctioners from overseas (in that case 3-6 months) just until they have familiarised with nz regulations

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?

No,

Please explain.:

As explained above. Graduates should be mentored and overseas practioners just for a short time (after passing registration they should get a short mentoring to familiarise themselves with nz regulations and patients)

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

Closer work with associations in regards of mentoring

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?

Where does this come from? Have there been (increased) complaints? If so what type of practitioner were mainly affected (overseas, long term practice, newly grad, newly registered....) maybe focus on that first before generalising. If a dentist is any good they should be able to spot good/bad technicians. Most of the proposed things are a complete overkill for technicians

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

drivers licenses do not require that many checks.... I do like to think that practioners are aware of changes in their eyesight and act adequately. Unless there was a significant number of malpractices due to eyesight this would be just nanny state politics

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?

Non compliant behaviour needs to be addressed, that part of the proposal seems justified to me

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?

Instead of reinventing the wheel the quality could be improved through the quality of CPD rather than changing the whole system. Most CPd approved lectures/courses are nothing but a sales show. I think the approval of what qualifies for CPd shoUld Be stricter. or Passing a test based of the course to gain the points rather than an overall open book test for practioners