

Recertification Draft Proposal

Submission by Sarah Lovie

General concerns

Document lacks detail as to data/evidence

Annual time frame too short, particularly for those taking time out to care for young children, sick or elderly

Unclear whether the aim is to improve compliance or competence

Lack of specifics.

Lack of concrete examples from overseas

Is this model likely to better identify risky practitioners than the current model?

Nature of previous complaints not disclosed; are they mostly financial or competency-based?

Who will administer?

What is the time/bureaucratic burden on practitioners?

Area one- New core recertification programme

Peer relationship concept:

What responsibility (if any) does the peer have regarding their colleague's competence/compliance?

Possible conflicts of interest or bias

Annual attestation period too short

Professional develop plan (PDP) and professional development activity (PDA) concept:

Lack of clarity in criteria

Difficulty planning into the long-term future when courses are announced only in the short-term future

Criteria for "reflection" lacking in detail

Open-book test unlikely to protect the public

Area two- Support new registrants

NZDA already provides support systems for new grads

Huge variation in experience and competency of overseas trained dentists

Who does the mentoring?

How much mentoring is required?

Risk of mentoring burden being a disincentive to hire a new registrant

Area three- Address health-related competence decline

Eye exam not required by any other health professional certification body

Dentists tend to already manage their vision

What about loupes?

Evidence behind the eye check requirement?

Area four- Addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours

Lacks detail

Who will be the mentor?