

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

JONATHAN COLE

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

there is too much burden on the busy GDP and you are proposing to use a massive filter to weed out some small percentage of incompetent practitioners but you are PENALISING us all. The tools proposed are not consistent for assessing competence. ATTESTATION is a new term but does not stand up to the merit of its purpose there are 2600 dental practitioners and I understand you had 146 complaints last year and that 142 were cleared. You are proposing a monstrous instrument to swat a small insect! Ask the auditor to detail how they think you should target the small percentage of incompetent prtactitioners It seems to me that you have admiitted to undertaking this reveiw so as to placate the auditor general. Utilising a peer colleague will only result in buddying up to a mate and working the system in ordre totick boxes and achieve a green light. The compliance costs to each practitioner and the council will be huge and burdensome. What you are proposing is disrespsectful and intrusive to many practitioners who dligently go about their business in a difficult market place annd battle stress at every corner; We talk about health and wellbeing as an issue and the DC is proposing to significantly increase the burden and stress

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

happy with 12 months but that s got to be co related to hours per year of CPD achioeved and peer contact--not diffuicult to get 20 hours per year.

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.:

this will prove nothing and is not relavent to every day practice If you hav econcerns about certain individulas TARGET them and make sure they are competent using these tools

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.:

do not support for every practitioner

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

Respondent skipped this question

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

sounds good

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

Respondent skipped this question

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,
Please explain.:
all new regsitarnyts should be part of a mentoring programme from respected practitioners

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?

accept that eye testing is a good idea every 2 years

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
practitioners should be incentivised to use magnification after the age of 40

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?

yes target the recidivists

Q19 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

No

Phase two consultation on recertification

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