

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Charlie Meade**

**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.:  
Everything, I believe the current system is completely adequate. The proposed changes appear to place a large and unnecessary burden on the vast majority of competent, proficient practitioners, in an effort to deal with the tiny minority of dentists who apparently create the majority of complaints to the Council.

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
The frequency of the cycle has already been recently changed, and I see no need to further change it - the current yearly declaration on the APC, coupled with random audits should be able to identify those at risk to the public.

## 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?

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

This is perhaps a reasonable requirement but not annually

**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.:

Despite assurances from Dr Andrew Gray at the recent roadshow meetings that the aim is to make things easier for dentists, nothing in his presentation or the discussion document suggests that is likely to be the case. If there is to be an additional burden, then once every three years would be acceptable.

**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?

All quite reasonable proposals

**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 long** ,

Please explain.:

I feel 1 year would be quite adequate

**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**

**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?

Some aspects

---

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

The vision requirement - surely it should be checked regularly from an earlier age than forty? The implication that those over 65 are somehow declining in performance - a little offensive to those of us already in that age bracket

---

**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?

My wife, who is a Registered Nurse, gave up nursing a few years ago, long before she wanted to, primarily because of ongoing requirements in that profession for reflective thinking, annual portfolios, peer review and other requirements very similar to what Council is requiring. She found the process hugely time consuming and of little value. I believe that if the current Council proposals go ahead in the suggested form, then the profession will lose many of its more senior members who have no wish to retire but may do so prematurely to avoid the new regime.

---