

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Tania Stuart**

**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 like the fact that it has several components

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

1. This is a comprehensive change to the 80 hours CPD. Therefore such a change should be piloted in a smaller group of practitioners first before rolling out to the whole profession. 2. Peer attestation is a major problem, in a one- on-one format. Collegial study groups would be a far better way to achieve this same outcome, but with less bias and more accountability. 3. If the DCNZ had a less adversarial ( legal focused) and more collaborative relationship with each professional group there would be better and honest reporting of issues relating to individual competency. 4. Reflective statement- The further from graduation a present practitioner is the more resistant they will be to such a requirement. This notion is foreign to them, and certainly such approaches were not used during their undergraduate years. I suggest a this be required for only practioners with the first 15-20 years of practice

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

Personal development plans may require several years to achieve. I appreciate that we renew our APC annually but the current tick box format would necessarily continue unless the council were check each PDP each year. This implies high compliance costs.

**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.:

At least practitioners might read them then.

**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?

**Annually,**

Please explain.:

Different standards each time

**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?

**No**

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

**just right,**

Please explain.:

But who will do this mentoring? Will they be recompensed for their time? How will the mentor's performance be tested?

**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**

**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

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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?

No

---

**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?

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?

This is very developed in some facets but under-developed in other. Much more prescriptive and regular ( annual ) than can be implemented in a cost effective way, for both the DCNZ and the practitioners.

---