

**THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE  
ROYAL COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGEONS OF ONTARIO**

**IN THE MATTER OF** a Hearing of a panel of the Discipline Committee of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario held pursuant to the provisions of the Health Professions Procedural Code which is Schedule 2 to the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, Statutes of Ontario, 1991, Chapter 18 (“Code”) respecting one **DR. PAMELA ZAKAROW**, of the City of Toronto in the Province of Ontario;

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *Dentistry Act* and Ontario Regulation 853, Regulations of Ontario, 1993, as amended (“Dentistry Act Regulation”).

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1990, Chapter S.22, as amended; 1993, Chapter 27; 1994, Chapter 27.

Members in Attendance:        Dr. Richard Hunter, Chair  
   Ms. Judy Welikovitch  
   Dr. Nalin Bhargava

**BETWEEN:**

**ROYAL COLLEGE OF DENTAL  
SURGEONS OF ONTARIO**

) Appearances:  
)  
) Luisa Ritacca  
) Independent Counsel for the  
) Discipline Committee of the Royal  
) College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario  
)  
) Nick Coleman  
) For the Royal College of Dental  
) Surgeons of Ontario

- and -

DR. PAMELA ZAKAROW )  
 ) Robert Barbiero for the Member  
 )

Hearing held by way of teleconference

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

This matter came on for hearing before a panel of the Discipline Committee (the “Panel”) of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario (the “College”) in Toronto on March 11, 2021. This matter was heard electronically.

### **THE ALLEGATIONS**

The allegations against the Member were contained in the Notice of Hearing, dated November 5, 2019 (Exhibit 1).

1. you committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(b.0.1) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 of the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, Statutes of Ontario, 1991, Chapter 18 in that, during the years 2015, 2016 and 2017, you failed to co-operate with the Quality Assurance Committee, contrary to s.82(1) of the Health Professions Procedural Code.

#### Particulars:

- You did not cooperate with the Quality Assurance committee as is required by s.82(1) of the Code.
- On or about June 10, 2015, you were selected to complete the College’s Practice Enhancement Tool (PET) and you were given until July 15, 2015, to do so. You did not complete the PET by this date, as was required.
- In or about the years 2015, 2016 and 2017, the Quality Assurance Committee granted you numerous deferments to complete the PET; yet, as of the date of this decision, you still have not completed the PET.
- On or about March 1, 2017, the Quality Assurance Committee offered you the opportunity to enter into an Undertaking to withdraw from practice until you completed the PET. On or about June 13, 2017, you declined to sign the Undertaking.
- Due to your lack of cooperation with the Quality Assurance Committee, on or about December 7, 2017, the Quality Assurance Committee disclosed your name and its concerns/allegations to the

Inquiries, Reports and Complaints Committee.

2. you committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 of the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, Statutes of Ontario, 1991, Chapter 18 in that, during the years 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019, you failed to complete the Practice Enhancement Tool, contrary to paragraph 48 of section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853/93, Regulations of Ontario, 1993, as amended.

Particulars:

- You did not complete the College's Practice Enhancement Tool (PET) as is required by s.82(1) of the Health Professions Procedural Code and paragraph 48 of section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853/93.
  - On or about June 10, 2015, you were selected to complete the PET and you were given until July 15, 2015, to do so. You did not complete the PET by this date.
  - You have not completed the PET since you were informed of your obligation to do so on or about June 10, 2015, and despite numerous deferments that were granted to you by the Quality Assurance Committee in or about the years 2015, 2016 and 2017.
  - As of the date of this decision, you have still not completed the PET as is required of you.
3. you committed an act or acts of professional misconduct as provided by s.51(1)(c) of the Health Professions Procedural Code, being Schedule 2 of the *Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991*, Statutes of Ontario, 1991, Chapter 18 in that, during the years 2018 and 2019, you engaged in conduct or performed an act or acts that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as disgraceful, dishonourable, unprofessional or unethical, contrary to paragraph 59 of Section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853, Regulations of Ontario, 1993, as amended.

Particulars:

- You did not cooperate with the Quality Assurance committee as is required by s.82(1) of the Code.
- You did not complete the College's Practice Enhancement Tool (PET) as is required by paragraph 48 of section 2 of Ontario Regulation 853/93.
- In or about the years 2018 and 2019 you did not complete the College's mandatory annual renewal questionnaire, which relates to the reporting of mandatory information to the College and includes a question of whether a dentist is in compliance with the requirements of the College's Quality Assurance Program, which you are not.

## **THE MEMBER'S PLEA**

The Member admitted the allegations of professional misconduct as set out at paragraphs 1 and 2 in the Notice of Hearing. With respect to the allegations set out at paragraph 3, the Member admitted that her conduct would reasonably be regarded by members of the profession as unprofessional.

The Panel confirmed with the Member that she understood the effect of pleading to the misconduct and as such was satisfied that Member's admissions were voluntary, informed and unequivocal.

## **THE EVIDENCE**

On consent of the parties, the College introduced into evidence an Agreed Statement of Facts (Exhibit 3) which substantiated the allegations. The Agreed Statement of Facts provides as follows:

### **Allegations of Professional Misconduct**

#### **Background**

1. The allegations of professional misconduct against Dr. Pamela Zakarow are set out in the Notice of Hearing dated November 5, 2019.

#### **Background**

2. Dr. Zakarow first registered with the College in May 1987. Her certificate of registration was suspended in February 2020 for non-payment of fees. She remains suspended at this time.
3. Dr. Zakarow has no record of prior discipline with the College.

#### **Failure to Complete Practice Enhancement Tool (PET)**

4. On or about June 10, 2015, Dr. Zakarow was selected randomly to complete the Practice Enhancement Tool (PET), a feature of the Quality Assurance Program set out in the College's Quality Assurance Regulation, O.Reg. 27/10. Dr. Zakarow was directed to commence the PET by July 15, 2015 and to complete it within 30 days of the start date.
5. The PET is described by the College as an online self-assessment program designed to permit dentists to evaluate and assess their practice, knowledge, skill and judgment based on peer-derived standards. The assessment consists of 200 multiple choice and

case-study questions based on the foundational knowledge expected of all dentists. The PET program took effect in January 2013.

6. Dr. Zakarow did not start the PET by July 15, 2015, nor did she complete it within 30 days from that date.
7. College staff contacted Dr. Zakarow regarding the PET in September 2015. At that time, Dr. Zakarow requested that the start date be extended to April 2016 due to personal issues relating to the breakdown of her marriage. In November 2015, the Quality Assurance Committee (“QAC”) accepted Dr. Zakarow’s request and the deadline for starting the PET was extended to April 15, 2016.
8. Dr. Zakarow did not start the PET by April 15, 2016. On that date, Dr. Zakarow requested a further extension to October 31, 2017. The QAC decided in April 2016 that it would not grant Dr. Zakarow’s request but did agree to extend the time for starting the PET to January 15, 2017.
9. Dr. Zakarow did not start the PET by January 15, 2017. On that date, Dr. Zakarow requested a further extension to November 2017. Dr. Zakarow also advised that she was not seeing patients and was selling her practice but did not wish to surrender her certificate of registration.
10. In February 2017, the QAC declined Dr. Zakarow’s request to extend the time to start the PET. Noting Dr. Zakarow’s express wish that she retain her licence despite not seeing patients, the QAC proposed to Dr. Zakarow in March 2017 that she withdraw from the practice of dentistry as a voluntary term, condition or limitation on her certificate of registration that would remain in effect until she completed the PET, pursuant to a formal undertaking.
11. In April 2017, Dr. Zakarow declined the offer that she enter into an undertaking not to engage in the practice of dentistry until she had completed the PET. Instead, Dr. Zakarow requested again that the PET be deferred in light of her personal circumstances.
12. In response, the QAC refused Dr. Zakarow’s request to defer the PET but instead advised her that it had serious concerns regarding her failure to complete the PET as required and that it had formed the intention to notify the Inquiries, Complaints and Reports Committee (“ICRC”) regarding her failure to cooperate with the QAC.
13. In June 2017, Dr. Zakarow again requested that the PET be deferred due to personal circumstances. She again declined to enter into an

undertaking not to practise dentistry until the PET had been completed. The ICRC granted Dr. Zakarow's request to defer the PET to October 15, 2017.

14. Dr. Zakarow did not start the PET by October 15, 2017.
15. In November 2017, the QAC extended the deadline to complete the PET to November 14, 2017. Dr. Zakarow was advised that no further extensions would be given.
16. Dr. Zakarow did not complete the PET by November 14, 2017, or at anytime thereafter.

### **Report to ICRC**

17. In December 2017, the QAC reported Dr. Zakarow's failure to comply with the Quality Assurance Program to the ICRC.

### **Investigation**

18. At the request of the ICRC, the Registrar appointed an investigator to inquire into the conduct of Dr. Zakarow in relation to the QAC on January 17, 2018
19. The Registrar's Report regarding Dr. Zakarow was issued on January 10, 2019.
20. Dr. Zakarow was provided with a copy of the Registrar's Report with correspondence dated January 11, 2019. She was invited to make submissions in response to the Registrar's Report by February 15, 2019.
21. Dr. Zakarow did not provide her submissions in response to the Registrar's Report by February 15, 2019. However, submissions on her behalf were made by legal counsel (not her current legal counsel) on February 28, 2019. According to prior counsel, Dr. Zakarow proposed that she complete the PET by May 31, 2019.
22. Dr. Zakarow did not complete the PET by May 31, 2019. At the time of inquiries by College staff on July 18, 2019, Dr. Zakarow had still not completed the PET.
23. The College again proposed to Dr. Zakarow on July 31, 2019 that she enter into an undertaking not to practise dentistry and not to return to the practice of dentistry except with the consent of the College, on condition she complete the PET and the College's renewal questionnaire
24. On September 16, 2019, Dr. Zakarow advised that she did not have a lawyer and that all correspondence should be sent to her. She did

not agree to the proposed undertaking and she had not completed the PET.

25. College staff confirmed that Dr. Zakarow had not completed the PET effective October 22, 2019.

### **Personal Circumstances**

26. In 2012, Dr. Zakarow voluntarily withdrew from the practice of dentistry so that she could devote her time and energy to personal matters. In so doing, she thought that she was doing the right thing from a professional standpoint, i.e. she put her career as a dentist on hold while she attended to personal matters. In particular, since 2012, Dr. Zakarow has been preoccupied with:
- a. very conflictual and lengthy matrimonial litigation with her now ex-husband;
  - b. caring for her children; and
  - c. caring for ill family members.
27. Dr. Zakarow has not rendered dental treatment to any individual since 2012.
28. If she testified, Dr. Zakarow would state that she was preoccupied with the breakdown of her marriage, highly contentious litigation about the division of family property, and concerns for her children during the period she was supposed to complete the PET. As well, she was not practising dentistry at the relevant time so she did not consider the PET to be high priority for her. Dr. Zakarow now recognizes, however, that she should not have disregarded her obligations as a member of the profession regarding the requirements, including the PET, of the Quality Assurance Program.

### **Decision of the ICRC**

29. At its meeting on October 23, 2019, the ICRC decided to refer allegations of professional misconduct against Dr. Zakarow to the Discipline Committee. The allegations of professional misconduct are set out in the Notice of Hearing dated November 5, 2019.

### **Quality Assurance Program**

30. The College is required to make regulations regarding a Quality Assurance Program under the Health Professions Procedural Code (“Code”), section 80. The minimum standards, requirement of members to cooperate and other details regarding the Quality Assurance Program are provided in the Code, sections 80-83.1. As

noted above, the College's Quality Assurance Program is set out in O.Reg. 27/10 under the Dentistry Act, 1991.

31. The Code, section 82(1) requires every member of the College to cooperate with the Quality Assurance Committee. Amongst other things, a member must "participate in a program designed to evaluate the knowledge, skill and judgment of the member, if requested to do so by the [Quality Assurance] Committee", pursuant to the Code, section 82(1)(e).
32. O.Reg. 27/10, section 4(1) provides that "the purpose of the Practice Enhancement Tool [PET] is to permit a member to review his or her practice, knowledge, skill and judgment and ensure his or her continued competence." O.Reg. 27/10, section 4(2) stipulates that every member must complete the PET at least once every five years.

#### **Admissions of Professional Misconduct**

33. In view of the foregoing, Dr Zakarow admits that she committed acts of professional misconduct in 2015-2019, as alleged in the Notice of Hearing dated November 5, 2019. In particular, Dr. Zakarow admits that she:
  - failed to cooperate with the Quality Assurance Committee as required by the Code, section 82(1), as alleged in paragraph 1 of the Notice of Hearing;
  - failed to complete the PET as required by the Code, section 82(1)(e) and O.Reg. 27/10 section 4(2), as alleged in paragraph 2 of the Notice of Hearing; and
  - engaged in conduct that, having regard to all the circumstances, would reasonably be regarded by members as unprofessional, as alleged in paragraph 3 of the Notice of Hearing.



## **DECISION AND REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Panel finds that the Member engaged in professional misconduct as set out in the Notice of Hearing and the Agreed Statement of Facts.

Dr. Zakarow pled guilty. She did not dispute the allegations, particulars or facts presented in the Agreed Statement of Facts submitted by College Counsel.

The Panel was of the view that the evidence contained in the Agreed Statement of Facts clearly substantiates the allegations and demonstrates the Member's disregard for the Quality Assurance Committee's authority and direction to complete the PET exam within a specified period of time.

## **PENALTY SUBMISSIONS**

The parties presented the Panel with a Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs (Exhibit 4), which provides as follows.

1. The Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario ("the College) and Dr. Pamela Zakarow ("the Member") respectfully submit that, in view of the findings of professional misconduct by the Panel of the Discipline Committee and the circumstances described in the Agreed Statement of Facts, the Panel should make the following Order:
  - (a) requiring the Member to appear before the Panel of the Discipline Committee to be reprimanded within ninety (90) days of this Order becoming final or on a date fixed by the Registrar;
  - (b) directing the Registrar to suspend the Member's certificate of registration for a period of two (2) months, to be served consecutively, such suspension to commence within thirty (30) days of this Order becoming final or the date the Member renews her registration, whichever date is later;
  - (c) directing the Registrar to impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's certificate of registration (the "Suspension Conditions"), which conditions shall continue until the suspension of the Member's certificate of registration as referred to in subparagraph 1(b) above has been fully served, namely:
    - (i) while the Member's certificate of registration is under suspension, the Member shall immediately inform the following people about the suspension:
      - a. staff in the offices or practices in which the Member works, including other regulated professionals and administrative staff,

- b. dentists with whom the Member works, whether the Member is a principal in the practice or otherwise associated with the practice,
  - c. dentists or other individuals who routinely refer patients to the Member,
  - d. faculty members at Faculties of Dentistry, if the Member is affiliated with the Faculty in an academic or professional capacity,
  - e. owners of a practice or office in which the Member works, and
  - f. patients who ask to book an appointment during the suspension, or whose previously booked appointment has been rescheduled due to the suspension. The Member may assign administrative staff to inform patients about the suspension. All communications with patients must be truthful and honest;
- (ii) while suspended, the Member must not engage in the practice of dentistry, including but not limited to:
- a. acting in any manner that suggests the Member is entitled to practice dentistry. This includes communicating diagnoses or offering clinical advice in social settings. The Member must ensure that administrative or office staff do not suggest to patients in any way that the Member is entitled to engage in the practice of dentistry,
  - b. giving orders or standing orders to dental hygienists,
  - c. supervising work performed by others,
  - d. working in the capacity of a dental assistant or performing laboratory work, or
  - e. acting as a clinical instructor;
- (iii) while suspended, the Member must not be present in offices or practices where the Member works when patients are present, except for emergencies that do not involve patients. The Member must immediately advise the Registrar in writing about any such emergencies;
- (iv) while suspended, the Member must not benefit or profit, directly or indirectly from the practice of dentistry, subject to the following:
- a. the Member may arrange for another dentist to take over their practice during the suspension period. If another dentist

- assumes the practice, all of the billings of the practice during the suspension period belong to that dentist. The Member may be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred in respect of the practice during the suspension period,
- b. the Member is permitted to sign and/or submit insurance claims for work that was completed prior to the suspension, and
  - c. the Member must not sign insurance claims for work that has been completed during the suspension period;
- (v) the Member shall cooperate with any office monitoring which the Registrar feels is needed to ensure that the Member has complied with the Suspension Conditions. The Member must provide the College with access to any records associated with the practice that the College may require to verify that the Member has not engaged in the practice of dentistry or profited during the suspension; and
- (d) directing the Registrar to impose the following additional terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's certificate of registration (the "Practice Conditions"), namely,
- (i) the Member shall not engage in the practice of dentistry until she has completed successfully the Practice Enhancement Tool to the satisfaction of the Quality Assurance Committee, and
  - (ii) the Practice Conditions imposed by virtue of subparagraph 1(d)(i) above shall be removed from the Member's certificate of registration upon receipt by the College of confirmation in writing acceptable to the Registrar that the program described in subparagraphs 1(d) above has been completed successfully; and
- (e) requiring the Member to pay costs to the College in the amount of \$5,000.00 in respect of this discipline hearing, such costs to be paid in full within thirty (30) days of this Order becoming final.
2. The College and the Member further submit that, pursuant to the Code, the results of these proceedings must be recorded on the Register of the College and any publication of the Decision of the Panel would therefore occur with the name and address of the Member included.

3. The joint submission on penalty and costs was reached as a result of a pre-hearing conference held with respect to these matters and it received the endorsement of the pre-hearing conference president.
4. Dr. Zakarow has not previously appeared before the Discipline Committee of the College.

## **PENALTY DECISION**

The Panel accepts the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs and orders that:

- (a) The Member appear before the Panel of the Discipline Committee to be reprimanded within ninety (90) days of this Order becoming final or on a date fixed by the Registrar;
- (b) The Registrar is directed to suspend the Member's certificate of registration for a period of two (2) months, to be served consecutively, such suspension to commence within thirty (30) days of this Order becoming final or the date the Member renews her registration, whichever date is later;
- (c) The Registrar is directed to impose the following terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's certificate of registration (the "Suspension Conditions"), which conditions shall continue until the suspension of the Member's certificate of registration as referred to in subparagraph 1(b) above has been fully served, namely:
  - (i) while the Member's certificate of registration is under suspension, the Member shall immediately inform the following people about the suspension:
    - a. staff in the offices or practices in which the Member works, including other regulated professionals and administrative staff,
    - b. dentists with whom the Member works, whether the Member is a principal in the practice or otherwise associated with the practice,
    - c. dentists or other individuals who routinely refer patients to the Member,
    - d. faculty members at Faculties of Dentistry, if the Member is affiliated with the Faculty in an academic or professional capacity,
    - e. owners of a practice or office in which the Member works, and

- f. patients who ask to book an appointment during the suspension, or whose previously booked appointment has been rescheduled due to the suspension. The Member may assign administrative staff to inform patients about the suspension. All communications with patients must be truthful and honest;
- (ii) while suspended, the Member must not engage in the practice of dentistry, including but not limited to:
    - a. acting in any manner that suggests the Member is entitled to practice dentistry. This includes communicating diagnoses or offering clinical advice in social settings. The Member must ensure that administrative or office staff do not suggest to patients in any way that the Member is entitled to engage in the practice of dentistry,
    - b. giving orders or standing orders to dental hygienists,
    - c. supervising work performed by others,
    - d. working in the capacity of a dental assistant or performing laboratory work, or
    - e. acting as a clinical instructor;
  - (iii) while suspended, the Member must not be present in offices or practices where the Member works when patients are present, except for emergencies that do not involve patients. The Member must immediately advise the Registrar in writing about any such emergencies;
  - (iv) while suspended, the Member must not benefit or profit, directly or indirectly from the practice of dentistry, subject to the following:
    - a. the Member may arrange for another dentist to take over their practice during the suspension period. If another dentist assumes the practice, all of the billings of the practice during the suspension period belong to that dentist. The Member may be reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred in respect of the practice during the suspension period,
    - b. the Member is permitted to sign and/or submit insurance claims for work that was completed prior to the suspension, and
    - c. the Member must not sign insurance claims for work that has been completed during the suspension period;

- (v) the Member shall cooperate with any office monitoring which the Registrar feels is needed to ensure that the Member has complied with the Suspension Conditions. The Member must provide the College with access to any records associated with the practice that the College may require to verify that the Member has not engaged in the practice of dentistry or profited during the suspension; and
  - (d) directing the Registrar to impose the following additional terms, conditions and limitations on the Member's certificate of registration (the "Practice Conditions"), namely,
    - (i) the Member shall not engage in the practice of dentistry until she has completed successfully the Practice Enhancement Tool to the satisfaction of the Quality Assurance Committee, and
    - (ii) the Practice Conditions imposed by virtue of subparagraph 1(d)(i) above shall be removed from the Member's certificate of registration upon receipt by the College of confirmation in writing acceptable to the Registrar that the program described in subparagraphs 1(d) above has been completed successfully; and
  - (e) requiring the Member to pay costs to the College in the amount of \$5,000.00 in respect of this discipline hearing, such costs to be paid in full within thirty (30) days of this Order becoming final.
2. The College and the Member further submit that, pursuant to the *Code*, the results of these proceedings must be recorded on the Register of the College and any publication of the Decision of the Panel would therefore occur with the name and address of the Member included.
  3. The joint submission on penalty and costs was reached as a result of a pre-hearing conference held with respect to these matters and it received the endorsement of the pre-hearing conference president.
  4. Dr. Zakarow has not previously appeared before the Discipline Committee of the College.

## **REASONS FOR PENALTY DECISION**

The Panel is aware that joint submissions should be respected unless they fall so far outside the range of an appropriate sanction that they would bring the administration of justice at the College into disrepute, or are otherwise contrary to the public interest.

After deliberation, the Panel concluded that the proposed penalty was appropriate in all circumstances of this case. It therefore accepted the Joint Submission on Penalty and Costs and ordered its terms be implemented.

The Panel was satisfied that a reprimand and a two (2) month suspension are warranted in this situation due Dr. Zakarow's failure to cooperate with the QA Committee. The Member did not comply with the QA Committee's requirement to complete the PET, despite having multiple extensions to do so. Should Dr. Zakarow wish to be reinstated she must successfully complete the PET. This will assist with remediation as well as act as a deterrent. The publication of these proceedings on the College's website will act as both a specific and general deterrent.

The Panel considered the seriousness of the misconduct. Although no patients were at risk the College will not tolerate noncompliance of its rules and regulations which act to protect the public by members of the profession.

The Panel considered the following mitigating factors:

- This was Dr. Zakarow's first appearance before a Discipline Panel.
- She wisely chose to put her priorities on her family during a difficult personal time.
- She chose not to treat patients since 2012 therefore patients were not at risk.
- She accepted responsibility and entered a guilty plea which help prevent a lengthy and costly hearing.

The Panel accepted the costs as appropriate in this case.

I, Dr. Richard Hunter, sign these Reasons for Decision as Chairperson of this Discipline Panel.



March 15, 2021

---

Date

**RCDSO v. Dr. Pamela Zakarow**

Dr. Zakarow, as you know, this Discipline panel has ordered you be given an oral reprimand as part of the sanction imposed upon you. The reprimand should impress upon you the seriousness of your misconduct.

The fact that you have received this reprimand will be part of the public portion of the Register and, as such, part of your record with the College.

You will be given an opportunity to make a statement at the end of the reprimand if you wish.

The panel has found that you have engaged in professional misconduct, in that you failed to cooperate with the Quality Assurance Committee as required by the Code; and failed to comply with the QA Committee's requirement to complete the PET within a specified time period or at all.

The effect of your conduct would reasonably be regarded by members as unprofessional.

The panel acknowledges that you were experiencing extreme personal circumstances during the relevant period, nevertheless your professional misconduct is a matter of serious concern. It is completely unacceptable to your fellow dentists and to the public. You have brought discredit to the entire profession and to yourself. Public confidence in this profession has been put in jeopardy. It is the responsibility of all members to meet their obligations and to be respectful of the College's role and requirements.

Of special concern to us is the fact that the professional misconduct in which you engaged has involved your failure to cooperate with the QA Committee or to comply with its requirement to complete the PET, despite having received multiple extensions to do so.



As I advised earlier, you will now be given an opportunity to make a comment if you wish to do so. This is **not** an opportunity for you to debate the merits or the correctness of the decisions we have made.

Do you have any questions or do you wish to make any comments?

*(Hear the Member's comments at this point)*

Thank you for attending today. We are adjourned.