

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Sarah Gray**

**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?

I agree with the principle of keeping our skills up to date with professional development which is what I have been doing since I graduated.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

What responsibility will the peer have for the practicing dentist? Will there be a conflict of interest? Reviewing another dentist's work is fraught with different philosophies. How will we be able to propose a development Plan when we have so few courses in Christchurch (let alone rural dentists) and we don't know what those courses will be before we have to plan.

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

I feel that the current system allows flexibility for practitioners in that if there is sickness or some other event or crisis they can still maintain their required hours over the 4 year period.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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 feel that as a responsible practitioner I read journals, articles, talk to peers, attend meetings and courses and conferences and therefore maintain my skill level as I promised with my graduation oath. An open book assessment would not prove that I have more or less knowledge and certainly would not protect the public any more than than sitting an assessment.

**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?

Please explain.:

I disagree strongly with an open book assessment so cannot answer this question.

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

No

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

New graduates are mentored already under the NZDA scheme.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The NZDA already provides a mentoring system for new graduates. Why do we want to make the system more complicated? Who will do the mentoring? How much will be required? Will practices who employ new graduates want to take on the extra work load.?

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

The time frame is right for some and insufficient for others. With the responsibility of being a dentist comes with the responsibility of recognising when you need help or advice from colleagues. We have always practiced this way and it did not stop 2 years after our graduation.

## 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?

**No,**

Please explain.:

This is a question you can't answer. The dental degree is a first but important part of learning. We still continue this every day in our practices. Mentoring a new graduate does not mean you will see their clinical work so therefore can only support their concerns.

**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?

I think it necessary to look after your vision.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The need for an eye test yearly is something I do already and have done for 20 years and most colleagues are responsible enough to do this themselves. Making it compulsory again takes away from the responsibility we have to ourselves, our patients and the public.

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

What is a medical yearly going to achieve? Medical conditions can be managed successfully. Are you going to stop people practising if they have high blood pressure or are going through menopause. How are you going to assess these and who will be the judge?

---

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?

I accept these

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Who will be overseeing the practitioner? Will it be another practitioner who could also be non-compliant?The proposal lacks detail.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No

---

### 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?

How much evidence does the council have to change what seems to work for the majority of dentists. It seems that competent dentists are having to pay for a few practitioners that the council already recognises need help. I see the recertification as a backward step for the profession.

---