

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name **rob king**

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?

the programmes intent to assuring the public their oral health practitioners are competent and fit to practise ,managing practitioner competence and the prevention of competence decline , and identifying at risk or unsafe practitioners is good, eye exams for the over 40

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

No,
Please explain.:
peer review to the level suggested is difficult no-one want to review a fellow colleague would rather it be by a third party where it was more black and white

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

No,
Please explain.:
prefer two years, a year goes very fast to plan and the appropriate courses may not be available

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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.:
because it is open book

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

no

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

lots of support

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
i think best mentoring is done through an institution like the dental school

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

just right,
Please explain.:
depends on the person, so as an average this is good

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.:
dont know all the circumstances that may arise

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

no

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?

eye test

Phase two consultation on recertification

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

Yes,

Please explain.:

experience is the most important thing so age is not an issue to me if health is failing its pretty obvious so leave the older experienced practitioners alone!

Q17 Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

no

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.

no

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?

a little extra checks and balances is fine but the draft proposal is just too cumbersome and extra workload for practitioners
