

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

James Dawson

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.:

Needs accountability in the peer groups. Need to ensure that the continued education is current and up to date otherwise groups have the tendency to isolate themselves and not keep up to date. Also, who is going to do the peer groups? Need to make sure there are enough mentors. Also, as a registered specialist what would I do if I felt the dentist was not up to my level? Am i attesting to their ability as a peer (ie specialist level) or general dentist level. Also if I have not seen their clinical work how can I attest to their competency? It is a very subjective measure, needs objective measurement.

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

Yes

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.:

What does this achieve? open book of technical skill? how is this feasible?

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.:

Do not agree with an 'open book' test

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

Clinical audit of practitioners on a random basis. All practitioners have to comply with the CPD requirement as it is now, and then are randomly audited on clinical competency - cases, record keeping etc. Feedback can be given

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

I agree mentorship is good

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

Can mentors have ability to halt the registration or increase the length of mentorship if they have concerns

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

just right

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.

Need to have authority to initiate ongoing education if mentors have concerns regarding competency

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?

No issues, but is this necessary to include in the certification requirements. people do this anyway?

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?

Need to have more ability to require clinicians adapt/ comply

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?

unsure how this proposal will address the problematic practitioners who are practicing out of the known and recognized clinical standards. Also this proposal is incredibly vague with a lot of interpretation rather than specification. would need tidying up before could be accepted.