

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Warwick Ross

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?

It makes CPD more valuable

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

No,

Please explain.:

While it seems onerous at first reading, this regime should be easily managed and maintained by any practitioner interested in maintain his/her skills and abilities

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

an annual recertification cycle will keep this aspect of practising life closer to the front of mind, with attendant wish to be thinking critically about all that one does in the practise context

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.:

Until a suitable vehicle for this can be developed with required knowledge and understandings being immediately relevant to the wide gamut of NZ practising environments this assessment may unfairly and unintentionally prejudice some groups. The general idea is sound and I can foresee a time when it might be appropriate....but not just now. The time when it might be appropriate would be after the development of a recognisably fair spread of emphases for the questions. Also....'open book'....what book; or is this a reference to any suitable text and the presumption that every practitioner has these particular books. Who would be prescribing them or compiling the body of material from which the questions are drawn.

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?

no

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

consideration will need to be given to the pool of mentors and what up-skilling may be required to fit them for the task

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

The accusation of unfairness in this area would be too easily made. The very fact of there being different mentors for different practitioners would ensure that this is not just a 'one size fits all' situation

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

being a peer as well as as a mentor would possibly be a big load for a practitioner already working on his/ her own recertification. Mentors and possibly peers may need to be drawn from the recently retired workforce.

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?

They simply make sense

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
add hearing
loss

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?

The whole approach is to be commended. The present regime for CPD has always been subject to some form abuse, even by those who would ordinarily be appropriate seen as ethical and well meaning practitioners. The new scheme will oblige more 'buy in' and hopefully the payoff will be greater value for each unit of effort applied. I am concerned that there will be a shortage of persons fit and able to perform the tasks of peer and mentor. It is on these people that the system will depend for success