

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name **Andrew Chang**

**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?

None

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Current or amended version of present cpd requirements well accepted and effective for majority.

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
At least 2 yearly preferred.

**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.:  
Will in no way demonstrate real world competence or fitness to practice.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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?

**Every five years** ,

Please explain.:

Will not give meaningful indication of competence.

Frequency does not improve sought outcome.

---

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

Specific, subscribed requirements eg numbers and types of hands on courses or other verifiable attendance requiring peer contact are fine. These are easy to implement & achieve specific learning objectives that are beneficial.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Generally agree.

---

**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:

**too short,**

Please explain.:

Longer period assures better identification & addressing of concerns that would set lifetime habits.

---

**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.:

Best opportunity to identify & help prevent potential problems.

---

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

Stringent high standards must be strived for & demonstrated. Will likely identify unfit practitioners. If consistent & objective, will not unfairly disadvantage new registrants.

---

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?

Generally agree

---

**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.

Medical health checks periodically.

---

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?

Generally agree.

---

**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.

The worst offenders need the most enforcement for the public good. Retraining, mentoring or restricting scope of practice may not change repeat offending. Withholding APC will.

---

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**

---