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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name	catherine lawson
Q2 Are you making this submission	as a registered practitioner
<b>Q3</b> 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	
<b>Q4</b> What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?	Respondent skipped this question
<b>Q5</b> Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change?	Yes, Please explain.: I think there is too much written reflection statements. I think most conscientious practitioners reflect everyday on what went well, and what to improve on. I think it would be more beneficial to pit a structure on the CPD requirements ie 5 hours of learning on endodontics, oral surgery, cross infection control every cycle.
<b>Q6</b> Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months?	Yes
<b>Q7</b> 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?	Νο

<b>Q8</b> 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?	Annually	
<b>Q9</b> 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 propos	als for supporting new registrants?	
I think more should be done for new registrants. The UK do an excellent first year for new graduates that helps to fill-in gaps in knowledge from dental school - fixed income for the year, a supervising dentist to help, and weekly study sessions with other new grads.		
<b>Q11</b> Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?	Respondent skipped this question	
<b>Q12</b> Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:	just right	
<b>Q13</b> 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	
<b>Q14</b> 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		
<b>Q15</b> What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?	Respondent skipped this question	
<b>Q16</b> Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?	No	
<b>Q17</b> 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

<b>Q18</b> What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?	Respondent skipped this question
<b>Q19</b> Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?	Νο
<b>Q20</b> 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