

PRIVATE HEARING**Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing****2 October 2026****Name:** AYDON, Ashley Alexandra**Registration number:** 216684**Case number:** CAS - 201193-P7F5W1

General Dental Council: Stuart Brady, Counsel
Instructed by Jalpa Patel, IHLPS**Registrant:** Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspension extended (with a review)**Duration:** 12 months

Committee members: Matthew King (Chair, Dentist Member)
John Marley (Lay Member)
Katarzyna Richards (Dental Care Professional Member)**Legal adviser:** Valerie Paterson**Committee Secretary:** Jenny Hazell

Miss Aydon,

1. This is a resumed hearing of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The purpose of today's hearing is to review a substantive direction of suspension imposed on your registration by the PCC in April 2026. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

2. You are present at this hearing, unrepresented. Mr Brady, Counsel, appears on behalf of the GDC.

Preliminary application

3. At the outset, Mr Brady made a joint application for the whole hearing to take place in private, or in the alternate, for part of the hearing to take place in private in accordance with Rule 53(2) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules). In support of that application Mr Brady submitted that there is reference to your health in some of the pages of the bundle, the nature of which should be held in private. You supported this application. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules.

4. The Committee determined that the whole hearing should be held in private and therefore acceded to the GDC's primary application under Rule 53(2).

5. The content of the written determination was such that only a public determination was required.

Background to the case – PCC hearing April 2026

6. In April 2026 the PCC held an inquiry in relation to allegations about your fitness to practise. You were present at that initial hearing and you represented yourself. The allegations against you related to clinical governance and probity in your role as the practice manager at a BUPA practice (the Practice). At the outset of that hearing you admitted charges 1 to 10, which encompassed a number of failures, which put patients and/or staff safety at risk. They including the following:

- Failure to ensure that Practice's fire logbook was fully completed
- Failure to ensure all cupboards and/or drawers within Practice were adequately cleaned, on or around 12 January 2022.
- Failure to ensure that staff were familiar with the BUPA's "Winter Covid SOP" and that it was being implemented fully.
- Failure to ensure that Practice had a written complaints procedure, that it was on display and that staff members were aware of it.
- Failure to ensure that Practice's sharps safety posters and safeguarding charts were up to date.
- Failure to ensure that the medicines at Practice were being appropriately managed.
- Failure to ensure that equipment at Practice was appropriately maintained.
- Failure to ensure that staff at Practice were appropriately trained and/or competent to fulfil the rolls assigned to them.

- Failure to adequately respond by 27 January 2022 to all of the areas of concerns highlighted by Witness 1 following their visit on 12 January 2022.

7. In addition, the PCC found proved that on 27 January 2022 you told Witness 2 (an investigator) that you had discussed BUPA's winter Covid Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) during a team meeting in December 2021, or words to that effect, when you knew that what you told Witness 2 was incorrect. The PCC accepted the evidence of Witness 2 that on 27 January 2022 she found you creating minutes for the Winter Covid 19 SOP roll meeting with staff. The PCC concluded that your conduct was misleading, lacking in integrity and dishonest.

8. Finally, you accepted that from 25 April 2023 to 18 October 2023, you failed to co-operate with the GDC's investigation, in that you did not return a completed 'consent for health assessment' form to the GDC.

9. At stage 2 of the hearing in April 2026 you told the PCC that you deeply regretted your conduct. You also referred to personal matters at the time of the events in question and how this impacted on you at work. You explained that you now realise the importance of engaging with the GDC. The PCC heard that you had undertaken several recent CPD courses to deal with the matters engaged in the case. On your account, you explained that you realised that you were not appropriately prepared for the role of practice manager. You indicated that you had no plans to return to dentistry, albeit you would like to return to the role of dental nurse or in dental triaging rather than as a practice manager. You confirmed that you had not worked in any leadership roles recently.

10. In considering whether the facts found proved amounted to misconduct, the PCC set out its conclusions in relation to each of the three areas identified in this case – namely clinically governance, the probity matters and your failure to co-operate with the GDC's investigation. It considered that the clinical governance issues had been sustained over a period of time and amounted to a breach of a number of the GDC's standards for the dental team. The PCC took the view that the probity matters were serious, which had an overarching impact over a significant period of time. In the PCC's judgement, you attempted to cover up some of your clinical governance breaches through dishonest means and your behaviour fell far below the standard expected of a registered practitioner. Further, the PCC considered that you had a duty to co-operate with the GDC with its investigation into your fitness to practise and that your failure to do so was a breach of one of the GDC's standards for the dental team standards.

11. The PCC determined that the facts found proved in relation to each of the three areas identified in this case amounted to misconduct.

12. The PCC considered whether your fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of your misconduct on the grounds of the protection of patients and/or is in the wider public interest.

13. Firstly, it considered the clinical governance issues. The PCC considered that there appeared to be a major problem in your leadership, and that you had provided little evidence of remediation. It also considered that there had been sustained misconduct over a period of time, noting that even after 3 visits to the Practice and you being placed on various formal and informal performance improvements plans, your management of Practice did not improve.

14. The PCC further noted that you had moved out of the dental profession and therefore you had not demonstrated your ability to work in this kind of role since the misconduct took place. It concluded that there was a risk of repetition in your actions and therefore a continued risk of harm to the public. A finding of current impairment on the grounds of misconduct was necessary for the protection of the public. The PCC determined that a finding of current impairment was necessary in the wider public interest given the multiple failings in clinical governance and the consequential risks to patients and staff.

15. Turning to the matter relating to your probity, the PCC considered that your dishonesty appeared to be a momentary lapse of judgement and was a single incident which was out of character. The PCC was satisfied that there was a low risk of repetition and that a finding of current impairment was not required on the grounds of public protection. However, the PCC took the view that your dishonest conduct showed a serious lack of professional standards. The PCC concluded that public confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore it found impairment solely on the grounds of the public interest.

16. Accordingly, the PCC determined that your fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of your misconduct on the grounds of the protection of the public and the public interest to for the reasons set out above.

17. The PCC considered that your failure to co-operate with the GDC from April 2023 until October 2023 was a serious matter. However, it noted that you had co-operated at this hearing and had provided evidence of relevant CPD. The PCC therefore concluded that there was no current impairment in respect of this matter.

18. The PCC considered what sanction, if any, to impose on your registration. In so doing, it had regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors in the case. The PCC determined that given the seriousness of the clinical governance failings, which stemmed over a lengthy period of time, and eventually led to the closure of Practice, as well as the proven dishonesty, anything less than the sanction of suspension would not be sufficient for the protection of the public or satisfy the public interest. Further, in respect of conditions, the PCC noted that you were not working in dentistry at that time and therefore you would not be able to comply with them. It also noted that it would be difficult to formulate workable conditions that specifically related to the role of practice manager, even though you had indicated that you did not wish to return to this role.

19. The PCC directed that your registration be suspended for 6 months with a review shortly before the expiry of the 6 month period. The PCC considered that you had “only shown some insight, and that since you are not practising you cannot currently demonstrate any insight that you may have developed”. It concluded that 6 months was sufficient and proportionate in relation to the conduct that had been found proved.

Today's review Hearing

20. This Committee has reviewed the order today. In so doing, the Committee has considered all the evidence presented. This included a copy of the GDC's main hearing bundle. You chose not to give evidence at the hearing but instead you read out a one page statement dated 2 October 2026 which you had prepared on the morning of the hearing. It took account of the submissions made by Mr Brady on behalf of the GDC as well as your own representations. The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

21. The Committee has had regard to the GDC's Guidance document, 'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees' (6 January 2026) (the GDC's Guidance). The Committee reminded itself that, at this review, the persuasive burden is on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

22. Mr Brady submitted that there is no information before the Committee as to your future plans in dentistry, the lack of insight into the matters found proved and the lack of any evidence of remediation such that you no longer pose a risk to the public. Mr Brady drew the Committee's attention to the numerous breaches of the GDC's standards as well as the aggravating features identified by the PCC in April 2026. He submitted that the statement you read out today is not sufficient to persuade the Committee that you have addressed the clinical concerns or that you would be safe to return to clinical practice. The GDC submits that you remain impaired by reason of your

misconduct, both on the grounds of the public protection and the wider public interest. Mr Brady submitted that the appropriate sanction in this case is to extend the current order of suspension for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place before its expiry.

23. In your statement you set out that for the past six months you have taken the time to work on yourself and maintaining a healthier work life balance. You explained that you now feel able to deal with certain challenges that you could not previously and you feel able to recognise when working under pressure and to take appropriate steps. You accepted that you had not completed any CPD within the past 6 months but you have remained with social media forums. You state that you recognise that CPD is important and that if you were allowed to return to practice you would be committed to carrying out the relevant development that is needed. You stated that you do not feel that returning to practice is the right step for you at present and that when you do return, it should be at a pace that is safe and appropriate. However, you indicated that were you permitted to return to clinical practice, you would be interested in carrying out dental triaging.

Decision on current impairment

24. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct. In doing so, it exercised its independent judgement. It had regard to the overarching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.

25. The Committee has borne in mind the wide-ranging nature of the findings against you, which includes a finding of dishonesty. It has taken into account the limited evidence it has received in respect of your remediation and insight. This amounts to a written statement produced at the start of the hearing, which mainly focuses on the changes you feel about managing your work life balance over the last six months. There are no reflections on how the clinical governance shortcomings impacted on patient safety or how the dishonesty finding impacts on the wider profession. Further, there is no information as to what steps you would take to reduce the risk of repetition of the matters found proved. You chose not to give oral evidence under oath and therefore the GDC was not able to cross-examine you. The Committee considers that your insight is still developing and the evidence of your remediation is insufficient for it to conclude that a repeat of your misconduct is now highly unlikely. Accordingly, the Committee has determined that a finding of current impairment on the grounds of misconduct is necessary for the protection of the public.

26. The Committee is also satisfied that a finding of current impairment on the grounds of misconduct is necessary in the wider public interest given that there is no evidence that the dishonest conduct has been satisfactorily addressed.

Decision on sanction

27. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to revoke the suspension, or to replace the suspension with a direction of conditional registration.

28. The Committee considered that revoking the suspension would place the public at unwarranted risk of harm, and would also not be sufficient to safeguard the wider public interest considerations that it has identified. The Committee also considered that conditions cannot adequately meet the risks to the public and the public interest given the limited insight and reflection provided at this stage.

29. The Committee then went on to consider whether to extend the order of suspension. The Committee determined that a further period of suspension is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in the current circumstances of this case. The Committee considers that your

steps to remediation are at an early stage, with limited progress having been made in the last six months. It is therefore satisfied that a suspension for a period of 12 months is necessary to protect the public, and is also needed to meet the wider public interest.

30. Although this Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the Committee which will review the suspension, it considers that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by the following:

- A detailed reflective statement specifically addressing the original committee's findings of dishonesty and misconduct and the impact of this on the dental profession.
- Evidence demonstrating insight into the impact of your conduct on public confidence, professional standards, and patient safety.
- Evidence of relevant CPD and any professional learning undertaken during the period of suspension.
- Any testimonials or references addressing your integrity, good character, and professionalism.
- Any further relevant evidence regarding your personal circumstances and how any ongoing issues, if applicable, are being appropriately managed in relation to future practice.

31. The Committee hereby directs that your registration be suspended for a further period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of extended suspension.

32. Unless you exercise your right of appeal within the next 28 days, the suspension order will be extended by a period of 12 months. The existing suspension order will continue in the intervening period. In the event that you do exercise your right of appeal, the current order of suspension will remain in place until the resolution of the appeal.

33. That concludes this case for today.