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

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name Aftab Moosa

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?

Mandatory mentoring for new grads. Great way to build good habits.

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

## Yes,

Please explain.:

The emphasis on peer review, peer assessment, the annual cycle which adds a lot of admin work to something which can be applied to for 3-4 year cycles and be as effective. The need to nominate a peer is a real waste of time as they are usually as busy as the rest of us. And if they aren't- should we really rely on them?

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

#### No.

Please explain.:

Far too short a time, our profession doesn't shift paradigm that quickly to justify it.

### 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.

Please explain.:

This is a good controlled idea.

**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

Please explain.:

Often enough to stay relevant and not something you roll your eyes at.

**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?

Two years mentorship.

**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,

Please explain.:

Long enough to learn good

habits.

**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. It's a good equaliser.

**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

# Phase two consultation on recertification

<b>Q16</b> Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?	No
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-complian	t practitioner behaviours
<b>Q18</b> 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	No
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	Respondent skipped this question