

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Ryan Smagalski

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 contact.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

The ability of a professional peer to evaluate a practitioner's personal plan would be difficult without thorough evaluation of said practitioner's day to day activities. This would be more feasible over a longer period (annually is unreasonable) but even then, how will this ensure competence to the public? My understanding is that there is concern over dentists who do not gain sufficient peer contact and/or who do not truly engage in their chosen CPD, but with the proposed system two dentists could agree to approve each other's plans and then have no actual professional development. A better system would be to make membership in an approved organization mandatory, with larger groups ensuring professionalism in development. Finally, writing an annual statement about what we want to achieve sounds like high school homework.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

With the current CPD system, annual recertification would be reasonable. Annually creating a personal plan, having it thoroughly vetted, and also taking time to vet another dentist's plan (on average, each dentist will have to do this once) then implementing said plan is an excessive burden.

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

Depends on the content.

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 two years

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 program.

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

No,

Please explain.:

They sound like good ideas to me.

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

just right,

Please explain.:

I studied in the US. The longer training meant I graduated with more maturity than many NZ trained dentists. I still opted for an additional year in a general practice residency. When I came to NZ I was not faced with much culture shock but I could see this being problematic coming from countries with significantly different cultures. Also, the vast majority of products and practices are essentially identical.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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.:

Although it was not an official program, I have always worked in the same practice as older NZ dentists who were/are available for advice.

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?

Vision is quick and easy to test.

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

Yes

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

I would add some dexterity testing. I have not seen it myself but I have heard of dentists practicing with shaking hands.

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?

They are thorough and fair.

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

Public health and safety should be the primary concern, balanced with the knowledge that more legislation and paperwork does not always equate to improved conditions. Far better to thoroughly evaluate options than to jump to the first proposed plan without due consideration of all consequences.
