

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Page 2: Your demographics

Q1 Your details

Name	Navin
Company/organisation	[Redacted]
City/town	[Redacted]
Email	[Redacted]

Q2 Your submission is in the capacity as **oral health therapist**

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 agree**

Page 4: Your support

Consultation on the age limit for restorative activities in the oral health therapy scope of practice

Q4 Please describe why you support the proposal

As a New Zealand trained Therapist/Hygienist, I believe there is a huge gap between public and private sectors providing care for patients.

With any profession, a practitioner has the legal, moral and ethical responsibility of providing treatment within their scope of practice. I believe this should be the same with the DT/DH profession. Where appropriately trained, I believe there is very limited risk to patient care. The only risk may be when a practitioner works outside their scope of practice.

In terms of training, I believe it is best for DT's to have a graduate certificate level of training at least, after having 2 years of post-graduate clinical experience. I believe that CPD courses may provide SOME additional theory but the clinical component is far more important.

On a whole, I fully support the proposal.

I would suggest a graduate certificate level of training, after 2 years of clinical experience. University of Melbourne as a clear example.

Page 5: Your concerns

Q5 Please describe your specific concern/s with the proposal

Respondent skipped this question

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? **Yes**

Page 7: Specific comments on the proposal

Q7 Please provide us specific comments related to the OHT scope, qualifications and competencies.

I think the removal of age restriction is the most important aspect. Everything else under the scope of practice should remain the same as "as per training" students may have had different learning at University

Page 8: Anything else

Q8 Do you have any further comments on the proposal?

Yes

Page 10: Last thoughts

Q9 Please provide us your feedback

On a whole, the public community will be at an advantage. In most cases dental treatment is treatable and preventable. Allowing more access to treatment will mean less usage of hospital resources which in turn means other health cases can be attended to, as well as the financial savings for the taxpayer/government
