

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Thomas stone

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?

PDP's can be useful to identify areas to target CPD for.

The proposed open book test would be useful to ensure everyone has read and understood the latest guidelines

Mentorship for new graduates is a real necessity and I support this part of the proposal.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

I am concerned that a system that has so far been based (successfully in my mind) on individuals taking control of their own recertification requirements is being changed for changes sake rather than because of issues that have arisen. I believe the current peer review system when practitioners are identified as being in need of extra support perhaps via complaints officers or other colleagues is a good system that works. I cannot see the evidence in this document that a problem exists with the current system (we are an evidence based profession after all) and am concerned it is being changed for reasons as yet unclear with the danger of extra work, stress and cost to dentists for little or no effect on patient safety. Our professional values have always been the guidepost for us in our daily lives and this proposal appears to take the view that we can no longer be trusted to perform our work as we always have without these changes. Our Nzda view at the last meeting was that they didn't believe there was a current problem so a review was unnecessary. I see little value in the proposed peer report as assessing another dentists competence is very subjective.

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

No,

Please explain.:

I believe the current cycle works well and some years you may have more courses of relevance to you to go to than other years but it evens out over 3 years. I don't see the point in changing it for changes sake.

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.:

Useful guide that we are up to spec on latest guidelines.

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.:

Same as recertification document that we sign every year.

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

Just resist the need to change for changes sake for a perceived rather than realistic need.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Good idea to help new practitioners to adapt to a new job/country

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**

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? **No,**
Please explain.:
If a registrant who had previously worked in nz and left for perhaps a year or two it would be excessive to need two years of mentor ship on their return to the country.
Perhaps the system could have more flexibility for such cases

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?

Sensible idea

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?

With respect to the wholesale changes being proposed, is there really any evidence that there is obvious harm to patients from the lack of robust recertification? Is this a solution looking for a problem? Does the DCNZ have stats to show a worrying increase in negligent treatment? Or are the rates pretty much the same year on year, but just more cases as there are more practitioners now than there used to be? Do not legislate just for the sake of it if the system works then leave it alone. Otherwise you risk a waste of money time and stress.
