

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Wendy Lidgard

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.:

What is the purpose this proposal is trying to fix? the goal is surely a dental profession of the highest quality dentists who feel able and supported to work in the profession for as long as possible or until they retire. The best career development will come from having a high quality and peer reviewed development of a dentists career in their first years of graduating followed by a continuing development education system that encourages and rewards dentists continuing to develop their skills. Little of what is proposed is going to achieve these outcomes. In fact I would suggest that it will have the opposite effect. It may encourage cheating and manipulation of a poorly thought out proposal with the net effect of decreasing the quality of practicing professionals. There is no other profession in the world where one registered, professionals are peer reviewed by their competitors or colleagues. Market forces will largely achieve this result anyway. Good dentists are always busy. An increase in CPD hours has led to greater participation in branch meetings and courses which in turn,

Phase two consultation on recertification

leads to greater peer contact and discussion. The current CPD scheme encourages collegiality and time spent talking to colleagues of differing experiences. The new proposed peer buddy system would cut out all of this. Therefore I am strongly opposed to its introduction. Working in a small community with only a few colleagues locally, I wonder how this would work. Every dentist has a different philosophy and way of working and may provide different solutions to the same problem. This does not mean that it is wrong. If you have a buddy with a different philosophy or way of working to you, this could make life very stressful/ostracizing. I feel that the proposal is ludicrous and unworkable in its current form. The problem we may be facing could be at graduate level. The way to make a dentist good is to ensure that they start off as a good dentist. I feel that there is a need for a Registrar system, similar to medicine or many other professions, that new graduates are not fully qualified as soon as they graduate, but only after they have spent a period of time working with supervision and then audited and interviewed to ensure they can be capable of being a registered dentist. This would allow further restriction on NZDREX qualified dentists (who, I understand, cannot practice on patients while at dental school unless they are NZ residents) to assess their level of expertise thus providing assurance to the public that they are receiving good care. I have employed a number of new and recent graduates and there are holes in their basic knowledge and huge variation in their skill and knowledge. I had a new graduate, who graduated with distinction without basic skills needed for general practice. And another with merit which I frankly question. A formal registrar system would highlight short comings in a graduates education and early career development and highlight bad bosses who exploit new graduates. I know of a new graduate who has been left to practice on their own which I feel, is unacceptable, both for the graduate dentists professional development at a critical time, and the professionalism and suitability as an employer of the employer dentist. Mentoring addresses this in part. Support is vital for new graduates as they do need a lot of help and guidance in their first few years of practice. Mentorship allows support by a third party to help augment this process but ideally new graduates need to have an employer acting as a mentor as well as a third party if for some reason they are not being treated fairly. The other problem I can see with the mentorship programme is that it is voluntary. New mentors need to be found every year and again, trying to find the number of experienced practitioners willing to do this is going to be very difficult.

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

No,

Please explain.:

The recertification cycle being 12 monthly does not allow for life events to happen, such as illness, pregnancy, caregiving, changes in circumstance.

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

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.

see above response to question 5

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

Bringing in a registrar system similar to medicine may address this (see answer to question5)

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?

Yes,

Please explain.:

I feel all new registrants benefit from some sort of mentorship - again surely having a supportive employer is critical.

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?

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?

Respondent skipped this question
