

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Chaitali Francis**

**Q2** Are you making this submission

**as a registered practitioner**

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents

**a registered oral health therapist**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

**Q4** What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

I like the idea of bringing dental practitioners out of isolation and also gave developmental goals will help us focus on skills and knowledge we need to update and improve on.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

I am not entirely sure about dental practitioners being able to choose their peers randomly. In order to be able to have a successful peer review process in place, we need to have peers that are engaged and willing to assist our practitioners excel. We also, need to make sure the peers themselves are not lacking in their standard of care. I believe the peers should be a selective group of individuals that are capable and willing to assist practitioners in career progression. Peers also need to be very approachable and knowledgeable about the processes involved in the recertification programme. Peers will need to be unbiased and understanding at the same time. These things need to be carefully considered before changing and implementing a new recertification programme.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**Yes**

**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.:

Completing a routine online assessment will ensure that practitioners are up to date with the on going changes in the ever changing field of Dentistry.

**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 three years** ,

Please explain.:

3 years is an appropriate amount of length to keep refreshing your knowledge in any given field. Do it any more regularly could also put pressure on the practitioners and add to their work load.

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

Please re consider how and who will be selecting the peers.

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

New registrants need extra support understanding the system and keeping in line with the acceptable practices set out by the governing body. New proposal seems to be focussing on that.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Same applies here as selecting the peers. Mentors need to have an understanding of what mentoring involves and need to be approachable, in order to be able to guide the new registrants in the right direct and help assist with their professional development. Again, I believe this has to be a set group of unbiased and willing individuals.

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

**too short,**

Please explain.:

I think a yearly cycle will be better for new registrants. First year tends to be the hardest one in finding your bearings.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**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.:

Every new registrant needs to get familiar with the acceptable practices of a new governing body and in some case get familiar with practices in a new country.

---

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

NIL

---

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?

As health practitioners it is important we are in optimum health so we can provide high quality care safely.

---

**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?

Non compliant practitioners can potentially be a hazard to the public and to the industry. The draft proposal will help address their non compliance in a timely manner.

---

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**