

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

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name

Firas

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?

I like the way that you are trying to identify the risky practitioners

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

Yes,
Please explain.:
..why is there a need for this peer review process?... if the peer review holds no merit ... and there are no legal or enforceable consequences of an incorrect or inaccurate or inappropriate peer review

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

Yes

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.:
open book exam is not going to solve the problem of the risky dentists ,as they can prepare for this,and pass it in easy way,and it does not show how good or bad dentistry you are achieving in you practice ,auditing in my opinion is more efficient way of judging clinical knowledge .

Phase two consultation on recertification

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?

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

Phase two consultation on recertification

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
