

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name **Gareth**

**Q2** Are you making this submission **as a registered practitioner**

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents **a registered clinical dental technician**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

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

The mentoring of new registrants.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Peer reviewing seems like a very flawed way of monitoring practitioners and I would like to know what you are to do if you do not have a peer in your town? I believe it will only cause issues, why try to fix the current system? Vision testing also seems to be a non issue so why introduce mandatory testing?

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

I feel that this is creating an even bigger workload for practitioners in an already high stress industry.

## 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.:

I believe that there are so many techniques and materials and different ways in which different practitioners use these materials and techniques that there is no way that you could possibly test this in an online assessment.

**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?

Please explain.:

I don't think it should be supported.

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

I believe the proposed changes will not work and you should look at modifying the current APC/CPD system if you are looking to change anything.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

I think it is a good idea, however each case should be looked at on a case by case situation as some people may have more experience than others.

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Changing it from two years to looking at the time they should be mentored case by case.

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

**too ,  
long**

Please explain.:

Someone who is moving countries and experienced would most likely not need to be mentored for two years.

**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.:

It would benefit every new registrant, however the time frame needs to be looked at.

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

What would the parameters be around this, such as a framework of some sort?

---

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?

I would like to know what the health issues are that need to be addressed as I see this as a non issue.

---

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
I don't see any need to have mandatory eye testing.

---

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

---