

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Seung Eun (Debbie) Im

Q2 Are you making this submission

as a registered practitioner

Q3 Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents

a registered oral health therapist

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

Q4 What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

I agree with aims of the proposed core recertification programme, the requirement for the practitioner to identify their areas needed for improvement and plan and implement learning is a good reflective practitioner model.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I think that 12 months is too short a period for the recertification cycle, and that a longer longer period would be better, perhaps 2 years. I feel that a 3 year period is too long however.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

I have concerns about the proposed 12 month recertification cycle. A 12 month period is a short time and could easily add to practitioner stress. A longer period, perhaps 2 years, gives greater flexibility to the professional to plan, schedule, and implement their plan, within their professional and personal life. It is too easy for events to occur within a 12 month period that could negatively impact on a professional's capacity to keep up with a short recertification cycle. Additionally I have concerns about how this would the 12 month cycle would also affect their chosen professional peer. These peers have the responsibility and workload of helping the practitioner develop their PDP, help choose, and review the outcomes of the PDA's, and then prepare a true and accurate reflective statement. I feel this is a non-trivial amount of extra work and responsibility, especially as a single individual may be selected by several professionals to be their professional peer, especially so if done on a yearly basis.

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.:

A standardised assessment is a useful benchmark for both practitioners and the Council. It is important for practitioners to be remember and to keep up-to-date with the theoretical knowledge underlying their professional skills, and an assessment of their technical and clinical knowledge can promote this.

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 ,

Please explain.:

For the period of the assessment, I think that it should initially be set every 2 years. This will enable practitioners to get used to the format, and for any bugs in the process to be worked out. Later on the period could perhaps be perhaps shortened to an annual test if there is felt to be a benefit.

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 think that this a very good idea. New professionals will gain support and assistance as they enter the profession.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Who should be responsible for identifying and selecting suitable mentors? Is it reasonable to expect new registrants to have the knowledge and skills to select a suitable mentor? Either the Council should provide suitable guidance on this for the new registrants, or perhaps make it a responsibility of their employers who should be in a better position to identify and make available suitable mentors.

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

just right,

Please explain.:

Longer than 2 years is unreasonable I think, while shorter than 1 year I have concerns would be insufficient.

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.:

I think a mentoring programme is very important for the profession. Perhaps a shorter period of mentoring might be suitable for some new registrants, but I strongly believe all new registrants should be mentored.

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

I feel that the council should consider listing minimum requirements for being a mentor.

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 like the idea of vision checks for practitioners.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Vision problems are of concerns at any age. A regular check for practitioners regardless of their age, could be a proactive health measure for the profession, identifying and alerting to problems early is important in enabling corrective measures.

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

Q18 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?

I agree with them, it is important for the profession and the public's opinion of the profession, for us to have suitable mechanisms in place.

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
