

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Sabrina Wei Seen Tan

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.:

Majority of the general dentists are conscientious practitioners who abide by the code of compliance and do not wish intentional harm on our patients. This can be evidenced by the number of complaints upheld (which is less than 10 cases per year) Hence we DO NOT need to have a yearly peer reviewed assessment. Also the mandatory eye exam for practitioners over 40 are also superfluous to needs. Most clinicians are already wearing magnifications and are also wearing eyewear. We already have mandatory rules set by our drivers licences if we do eye wear, we don't need extra hurdles to confirm our vision. All these are superfluous to needs, and increases bureaucratic hurdles for our yearly annual registration process, not mentioning increased costs.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

Not everyone of us have the resources (time, mainly, but sometimes finances or location access) to attend to continuing education on a regular basis, in the year. Some may be away during the year. But almost all clinicians are motivated to fulfill their CPD requirements when the cycle is ending. And again, not mentioning, extra bureaucratic hurdles for both council and practitioners, which, frankly time can be used on other more productive endeavours. (like increasing public awareness on dental health, getting more financial support from government organisations)

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.:

Waste of time and resources.

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.:

If have to. But practising dentists are already competent and fit to practice by default, due to the stringent exam requirements at Otago university and also the foreign dentists' exam qualification in NZ.

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 support the compulsory mentoring programme.

Am part of the NZDA mentoring programme and found it beneficial for both mentee and mentor.

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
Yes. It should not be mandatory to have eye exams for clinicians over 40 years old. Age discrimination and also it's extra bureaucratic hurdles for everyone involved.

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?

Respondent skipped this question