

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Ruixing Lin**

**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?

1. Emphasis on collegial study groups and contact with fellow clinicians compared to current programme.
2. Draft Proposal for every practitioner to undertake an open-book assessment based on the Standards Framework. Important that all practitioners in NZ are both aware and understand these.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

1. Proposal for every practitioner to complete a written reflective statement. This should not be made compulsory for all practitioners every year as this increases creates more work for both practitioners (more non-clinical admin) and from the NZDC side (those in charge of receiving, sorting and reading/responding to such reflective statements on a yearly basis) with no guarantee on this resulting in improved clinical outcomes from practitioners. I would consider this as an option for only those with recurring non-compliant behavior rather than make it compulsory for all. 2.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

12 months I feel is a bit too short for a time frame to work with in regards to some of these draft proposals: e.g. Long-terms goals that span greater than a year, if practitioners take 6 months off work/non-clinical. Consider 24 months?

---

**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 agree with online open-book assessment of the Standards Framework since that is legally binding, however in relation to the clinical side of dentistry there isn't always one correct answer. Would be extremely challenging to create an assessment that fits the requirements for all practitioners e.g. Specialist knowledge/opinions vs. GDP's. Different theories/approaches to treatment so standardizing an answer. The saying "you get 10 dentists in one room with one scenario, you may get 10 different diagnosis' and treatment plans". And you cant always say if one, some or all are right/wrong. In regards to open-book, which book would be considered to have the "correct" answers?

---

**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?

**Annually,**

Please explain.:

If we need to be treated like university students, it might as well be annually like university exams.

---

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

Nil

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Mentoring programme to cover core subjects relating to practicing dentistry in New Zealand

---

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

No additional comments

---

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

Similar to NZDA Recent Graduate Mentoring programme, 2 years I believe is a good duration to follow-up and maintain the mentoring relationship.

---

**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,**

Please explain.:

No additional comments

---

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

Nil

---

### 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?

Addressing this issue and including it in recertification

---

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Draft Proposal on eye examination was based on consultation with the Ophthalmology Association is 40 years and above to be the highest risk age of declining vision. Why not then make it that practitioners who wear prescription lenses require an eye examination every 1-2 years etc. regardless of age? Since this is what is stated/legally required on driver's licenses.

---

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

No additional comments

---

### 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?

Addressing this issue as part of the recertification process

---

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
No additional  
comments

---

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

No additional comments

---

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 additional comments

---