

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Tony**

**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 would not instigate it.

## Phase two consultation on recertification

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

**No,**

Please explain.:

I strongly disagree with the implementation of a 12 month recertification cycle for Dental Practitioners. This proposed requirement assumes that there is a significant loss of competence over a twelve month period, though there is absolutely no evidence to support the proposition. As the pace of dental developments and the adoption of new treatment modalities can be measured in years rather than months, reducing the cycle time places an unnecessary burden on practitioners without providing any improvement in patient care. Experience has shown any loss of competency occurs gradually over an extended period of time coupled with long periods of professional isolation. The present recertification cycle is more than adequate at achieving the goals of keeping pace with present dental thinking and providing a platform for interaction with ones peers. It provides enough flexibility in terms of both timing and pertinent subject matter for a practitioner's continuing professional development. Useful, new or timely topics and developments do not present themselves in an orderly fashion. A longer recertification cycle allows for some variation in topics of interest and/or availability of courses relevant to practitioners. Some years can be very lean, while others are bursting with useful material. A yearly cycle would make the recertification process overly prescriptive and fails to take into account how timetabling of events could potentially create a drought of opportunities to fulfill CPD requirements. Furthermore the present four year cycle should also be retained because it provides flexibility for individuals who find they are unable to attend CDP events over several months due to personal circumstance. For example: • Those who are on maternity leave • Those who find themselves dealing with serious illness (e.g. cancer and care treatment regimes) • Those who take a short break from practice for personal and family reasons (eg work/life balance) Providing a more flexible and practical cycle time allows these practitioners to make up their CPD requirements without jeopardizing their practicing status. Finally there is a concern regarding the implications for the peer who is reviewing a practitioner's recertification programme. To what extent is the peer responsible for the appropriateness and relevance of the proposed continuing personal development? There is no doubt that it will significantly increase the amount of time to administer, again without there being any evidence that there is any benefit to patients.

## 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**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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:

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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?

**Respondent skipped this question**

**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?

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?

Respondent skipped this question

---