

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Page 2: Your demographics

Q1 Your details

Name	Ellie Knight
City/town	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]

Q2 Your submission is in the capacity as **dentist or dental specialist**

Page 3: The proposal

Q3 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove the 18-year age limit for restorative activities from the OHT scope of practice including: accredited, gazetted programmes allowing oral health therapists to perform restorative treatment on patients 18 years and older an exclusion, such as "Restorative treatment on patients 18 years and older", being placed on oral health therapists' scopes of practice until they complete an accredited adult restorative programme which will allow them to apply to have the exclusion removed (noting that the activities registered oral health therapists can currently perform within their scope of practice remain unchanged).

Strongly disagree

Page 4: Your support

Q4 Please describe why you support the proposal **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 5: Your concerns

Q5 Please describe your specific concern/s with the proposal

I am concerned largely on three points, as listed below:

1. Strong emotive/political-drive of the proposal: The high cost of seeing a dentist has always been a contentious topic among the public. However, this high cost is also driven by the demands of running a practice (consumables, equipment, staff etc). It is also a high stress occupation due to the exacting nature of the work. This is what is unseen by the public. The same issue will (eventually) be encountered by the OHT and the costs will have to be passed on to the public.

2. Safety of the public: The training of the OHT is already short; it is inconceivable that the training will also include the very heart of any provision of treatment, which is to robustly understand the fundamental science, in order to increase the scope of practice. A deep understanding of the fundamental science is the corner-stone of clinical practice; there is simply no time allowed in their training to provide this.

3. Unmet needs of under 18 year-olds: It has come to the light that there is an enormous volume of children and adolescents under the age of 18 who are under-served. It does not make sense to then place more workload on the OHT, instead of focusing the effort on further prevention and assisting of those still in need.

Page 6: Details about OHT scope, qualifications and competencies

Q6 Do you have any specific feedback on the proposed amendments to the OHT scope of practice, prescribed qualifications or competencies as set out in appendices 1 & 2? **No**

Page 7: Specific comments on the proposal

Q7 Please provide us specific comments related to the OHT scope, qualifications and competencies. **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 8: Anything else

Q8 Do you have any further comments on the proposal? **No**

Page 10: Last thoughts

Q9 Please provide us your feedback **Respondent skipped this question**
