

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name **S 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? **Respondent skipped this question**

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
There was no evidence presented to show the current recertification system is inadequate. There was also no evidence presented to show that the proposed changes will increase competence in practice or reduce the numbers of complaints received by the council. Details in the forum were extremely vague.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

12-month recertification cycles are not practical or realistic and there is no evidence to show that the current 4-year cycle requires modification. Women on maternity leave or practitioners dealing with illness may not meet the recertification criteria within a 12-month cycle. This does not reflect their fitness to practice and they may easily be able to make up the number of required hours over a 4-year cycle instead. The 12-month cycle unfairly prejudices against these people.

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.:

There is no evidence to say that this will protect the public from unsafe and risky practices.

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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?

Respondent skipped this question

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.

The NZDA already provides support systems and mentoring for new graduates, does this really need changing?

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?

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.

There is not a requirement for eye examinations in other health professional certification bodies in New Zealand so it does not make sense to change this only for dental practitioners.

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.

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?

Peer review

- Concerns about matching practitioners especially as specialists
- What happens when a practitioner moves or retires and the remaining peer does not have someone to buddy up with?
- What happens if there is a relationship breakdown between the peers?

Attestations

- Will these statements be held against practitioners by DCNZ or other authorities? This has happened in the UK and would inhibit open reflection of cases/incidents as a learning experience
-