

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Robert Max**

**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.:

1) - The Council has not satisfactorily explained the need for change. "If it ain't broke, why fix it"? 2) - The practitioners who are presently using "marketing" as opposed to evidence based principle in their practices, would be reviewed by their 'peers', without expert assessment. 3) - The changes lead to significant time and cost increases with no evidence that the public will be any safer or better off.

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

It can happen that any practitioner may have issues in his or her life which can mean that in a 12 month period there may not have been the opportunity for meaningful continuing education attendance but it canm be balanced out over a four year cycle

## 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.:

Significant cost and unnecessary stress to no benefit - unless it were to be required every say, four to five years.

**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**

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

Please go back to the beginning and plan a process which is more appropriate

### Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

**Respondent skipped this question**

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Everything - as explained above

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

**too short**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Everything - as explained above

**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,**  
Please explain.:  
Recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours are the one area in the proposals which may be appropriate. Assessment however, should not be restricted to 'peers'.

**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?

Please start again from the premise is that 'Compliant Practitioners' are not the problem!