

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Rachel Smith

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

1. The 12 month timeframe is too short for recertification and it discriminates against: a. women who take maternity leave b. people who work part-time which are often women as they are caring for family, people who are starting their careers and those at the end of their careers, c. people with illness who need to take time off These changes will make drastically change the dynamic of the workforce and those able to provide locum cover for the profession 2. The administrative overhead is high and rests entirely with the practitioner. 3. I don't understand the motivation behind these changes. I assume it is to improve the quality of the workforce. I would argue the following points: a. There are few complaints about Specialist orthodontists b. The majority of complaints about orthodontics are laid against dentists doing orthodontics. Recertification changes do not address this issue.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

It is discriminatory towards females, those who work part-time (offer women or older practitioners) and the sick.

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.:

I assume that the motivation behind this is to improve competence. If you can read you can pass the test - this has nothing to do with your dental skills What are you going to test that is relevant information to each practitioner in the 'open book exam'? Who sets this test? What do they test?

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.:

Never. It is poor test to prove competence

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

Peer to peer review is excellent.

Strong regulation by the dental council is important.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Yes, mentorship is a great model although logistically that may be hard to implement

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

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.:

Everyone needs support and guidance at every stage of their career

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?

Being concerned about practitioners health is important. I am unsure that an eye test is important to regulate for.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Strong regulation about this is important

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

These changes are discriminatory, bureaucratic and expensive for practitioners with little change likely to result in practitioner competence.
