

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Simon Ma

Q2 Are you making this submission

as a registered practitioner

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

a registered clinical dental technician

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

I do not agree with the proposed core recertification programme as it doesn't seem to fairly represent the whole spectrum of the dental field. This is an attempt for a one size fits all when clearly each scope differs significantly in both responsibilities, knowledge and skills/expertise.

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I would rather keep the existing system in place as I feel that the proposed programme only further complicates matters and overburdens practitioners.

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

No,

Please explain.:

There is no sense in adding extra pressures to the already busy schedules of each practitioner.

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 believe that our hard earned degrees/diplomas/qualifications already proves that we have achieved the appropriate foundations to our respective scopes of dentistry. Furthermore, attending certified courses, lectures/meetings and day to day practical experiences is more than enough to continue our professional development and prove that we are capable as practitioners.

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.:

Don't believe in the need online assessments

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

You shouldn't be basing a dental model from a medicine model and from a different country

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Unnecessary for the field of dental technology to make mentoring official as new registrants will very likely be mentored in lab anyways as all employers teach their methods and practises. The field of dental technology differs in dynamics and systems in comparison to dentists.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Forcing practitioners in field of dental technology to have eye tests after age of 40 is unnecessary as we are capable enough to decide whether we have problems with sight or not. If we have problems with sight and continue to fabricate dental prosthetics, the work will show for itself whether it suffers or not and the respective dentist/client will decide whether to continue or not.

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

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Please provide proof of submissions where you say 500 odd people have disagreed with the current recertification system. It seems like you're trying to fix something that isn't really broken and the proposed programme seems over the top and not fairly representing the entire spectrum of dentistry. This just doesn't work for each individual scope as it is excessive for some. I vote NO to this proposal