

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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name

**Tony Ryder**

**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?

An attempt to improve things

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

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Whats to stop a couple of hopeless cases helping each other over the line.

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

**No,**  
Please explain.:  
I propose a more intensive examination of quality

**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.:  
Anyone can talk the talk

**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 three years**

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

Why not actually do something concrete like access 100 pair of radiographs and have an expert run their eye over them. This could be done remotely in todays digital world or by scanning hard copies if that is still being used. When really poor work is being done that is where the evidence often is.

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

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

Nothing

**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?

**No**

**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?

Good start

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Like the idea of a clinical or radiograph audit. Most of the evidence you need is in there.

**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?

Depends on the ongoing quality of work being done

---

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

**Yes,**

Please explain.:

Perhaps that could be a trigger for a radiograph audit and if it is acceptable then accept as ok.

---

**Q20** Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

As already explained.

---

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?

No

---