

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Sophie McKenna

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.:

I cannot see that 'peer' review will have any point. I suggest that a dentist might urgently contact a 'mate' to call on his or her written review as required for Dental Council. This might be rapidly written between the two, simply to tick boxes for Dental Council, and be worth no more than the paper it's written on. I suggest that current CPD requirements were more specific regarding allotted hours that would be required to be spread across all aspects of dentistry, so that, for example, a practice management course would only be able to be a part of the hours claimed, whilst regular dentistry areas would be required to be the majority of the hours claimable.

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

No,

Please explain.:

Once every four or five years seems often enough to remain current

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?

Yes

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 two years

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

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

good idea, they need support

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

No

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
should

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?

No

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

Self reflection etc will be a complete waste of time, i suggest most practitioners will dash off something they think looks right, just before the forms are due in.
