

Consultation on a proposed revised Scope of practice registration standard and Guidelines for scope of practice

General feedback – *Option 2 is my preference. I believe that the Board has responsibly considered and balanced the needs of the dental professions and the public. The change is welcome and simpler.*

1. From your perspective, how is the current registration standard and guidelines working?

*Scope of Practice is confusing currently. A clearer guideline is needed. Many professionals seem confused about their scope of practice requirements. I agree with this statement as the mainstay of all guidance by the Dental Board*

***“ the main requirement of the registration standard, at the start of the National Scheme, and which continues to be the salient feature, is that all dental practitioners must only perform dental treatment for which they have been educated and trained, and in which they are competent.”***

2. Are there any issues that have arisen from applying the existing registration standard and guidelines?

*The public is restricted by the current guidelines, inhibiting freedom of choice to choose both their dentist and dental hygienist or oral health therapist or dental therapist. Many people are comfortable being treated by members of the same business, but some prefer choice.*

*Also in country areas, a mobile dental hygienist (or OHT) can offer more flexibility for the public where limited but valuable services can be offered cheaply in a number of smaller settings and the patient then only has to travel to the larger town for dental work needing to be performed by a dentist. This is particularly important for patients who have mobility or transport restrictions, either physical or financial. The DH or OHT or DT visit can be significantly more convenient, less traumatic and cost effective. As part of a dental team, the visiting DH/OHT/DT can path the way for acceptance of dental treatment which may significantly increase attendance at dental offices when needed. Referral from a trusted professional ,who “comes to you”, has a powerful influence in country areas.*

3. Is the content and structure of the proposed revised registration standard and guidelines helpful, clear, relevant and more workable than the current registration standard and guidelines?

*Yes. Simple and clear.*

4. Is there any content that could be changed or deleted in the proposed revised registration standard and guidelines?

*No*

5. Do you think that a review period of at least every five years (rather than three) is appropriate? Why or why not?

*No, three years is adequate.*

6. Do you have any other comments on the proposed revised registration standard and guidelines?

*Fear of changing these guidelines seems irrational in the light of the minimal complaints received by the conduct committee regarding DH/OHT/DT adherence to our scopes of practice. To embrace change and offer mentoring support to other team members seems a logical step.*

7. Is the content and structure of the new reflective tool helpful, clear and relevant?

*I was unable to access it.*

8. Is there anything missing that needs to be added to the new reflective tool?

Thank you,

Wendy Sih

RDH DEN0001412082