

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

---

Page 2: Your demographics

**Q1** Your details

Name	Ngahina Gillies
Company/organisation	[Redacted]
City/town	[Redacted]
Email	[Redacted]

---

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

---

Page 3: The proposal

<b>Q3</b> 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).	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
---	--------------------------

---

Page 4: Your support

<b>Q4</b> 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

My experience working with recent graduates over the past 5 years and also a range of referrals from OHT's working in the local area leaves me with a sense of frustration and at times greatly concerned. I am sometimes less than inspired and underwhelmed with the skills and knowledge base that a lot of these qualified clinicians have. Which leads me to believe that increasing the current scope of OHT's is not a good idea.

The safety of the general public (most likely those at higher risk with more complex and multilayered treatment needs) will be put at risk by an under trained work force. The communication skills needed with adults are very different than those needed with children and require a broad and comprehensive knowledge base to be able to affectively convey comprehensive diagnosis and treatment needs – compromising patient care and efficient management.

The current workforce has no shortage of dentists to treat adults, infact some dentists with less experience struggle to find full time work. It will be taking away from a sector where there is already huge unmet and under resourced treatment need. The stats from the most recent NZ oral health survey speak for themselves surely?? I do not believe that the proposed changes will serve to relieve the unmet treatment need of NZ adults rather it will potentially create a situation of 'supervised' neglect. Where OHT's with proposed adult scope may not even realise they are misdiagnosing or completely missing treatment needs in their adult patients. Education of children and their families, preventative treatments + interventions and the treatment of dental caries in children should be the primary concern for OHTs. The proposal shows no indication of direct supervision from a dentist which is worrying to say the least.

The potential increase in scope for OHT's is likely to undermine an already strained public opinion of dentists and the associated cost dental care in New Zealand. It will not make a significant change to the equipment, compliance, staffing and materials costs associated with day to day running of a dental practice.

---

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**

---