

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Rashid Bharuchi

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?

peer mentoring of new grads.

practitioners with multiple complaints undergo additional assessments

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Peer review. Seems like the DCNZ do not trust the Dentists, but then trust the same Dentists to judge our fellow Dentists. Development Plan. It is human nature to not show our inadequacies. Why would we? Trust us to know what we need and then to pursue this through courses. Annual recertification. Are the people proposing these changes actually Dentists? We are inundated with compliance that we must follow. Stress, costs, time are all issues our profession is dealing with on a daily basis without having to tip the scales further. Making it annual seems to be a right waste of time and resources. Losing the CPD component is going to reduce Dentists contact time with colleagues, as well as reduce the quality of our presenters as the numbers won't be there to justify them presenting. Trade expo's and conferences will see reduced numbers and then we are on a slippery path.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

No. It seems like an awful lot of work, that includes impinging on not only the Dentists time but also their peer reviewers.

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.:

Only if it was along the lines of 5 yearly. The DCNZ and University have declared us fit and competent upon graduating, and the new proposal suggests that there is mistrust in this by the DCNZ. Dentistry does not change so much in a year that we go from competent to incompetent in that time.

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.:

We do not go from competent to incompetent in a year.

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?

mentoring is great

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

No

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?

Yes

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

eyes should be tested 4/5 yearly.

As a dentists I feel we should be able to assess if we need glasses/contacts/surgery

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
eye testing 4/5
yearly

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Seems to be rushed!!

My feelings are that the DCNZ have already made up there minds and that this whole process is about just going through the motions.
