

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Philippa Corcoran**

**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?

The two year eye tests for over 40s.

CPD requirements from previous years to continue

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

PEER REVIEW AND PEER ATTESTATION A WASTE OF TIME This quote from colleague Fiona Bailey represents my view entirely: " - Some dentists will find it very challenging and stressful writing an unfavourable peer report (even partly unfavourable)... so may write a "slanted" favourable report, two dentists might pair up and just write something of no significance just to complete the compliance..... Less ethical dentists may give each other a glowing report..... just getting a "like minded peer" achieves nothing the DCNZ is trying to implement."  
REFLECTION ALSO A WASTE OF TIME Obviously most dentists are going to reflect favourably on their own work!  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN A WASTE OF TIME The vast majority of us do this anyway so that we meet our CPD cycle requirements. It is unnecessary and a waste of time and resources for dentist to have to document and submit a CPD plan an then pay DCNZ indirectly to review these plans.

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Dentists may have certain years where they are less able to complete the required CPD due to family or work commitments, or injury/illness. The current four year cycle allows dentists to balance out their CPD requirements by doing more CPD in some years and less in others depending on their other commitments.

**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.:

Again a waste of time and money. This will do nothing to improve the competency of dentists.

**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.:

The current four year cycle is working well.

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

The current system is perfectly adequate. There is no need for any change.

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

Nothing

---

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Remove them  
all.

---

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

**too ,  
long**  
Please explain.:  
Not necessary. The mentoring happens anyway as  
needed.

---

**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.:  
Not necessary. The mentoring happens anyway as  
needed.

---

**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 tests are a good thing for over 40s.

---

**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?

The are ok.

---

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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?

No

---