

Government Relations

Claudia Pohl

November 2018

Well, the Dental Assisting Council (DAC) and Dental Board of California's (DBC) most recent meeting was a busy one! Lots of items of interest to dental assisting educators. For more information or to access the Dental Board Materials, go to the website/Calendar/meeting date/meeting materials.

(https://www.dbc.ca.gov/about_us/calendar.shtml)

Proposal to Remove Coronal Polishing and Sealants from RDA Programs

DBC staff reported that there is confusion in dental offices about unlicensed DA's performing these functions before they are licensed. Therefore, they brought a proposal to remove these courses from RDA Programs and instead require the courses be completed after licensure.

This proposal was brought to the DAC (Dental Assisting Council). After much discussion and questions from the DAC and stakeholders, the DAC voted not to forward the proposal to the DBC. When the DBC discussed this item during their meeting, there was again discussion, but the DBC voted to also reject the proposal from staff. **The consensus was that this is an enforcement issue and that is how this will be addressed.** However, the Dental Board and Enforcement is complaint-driven. It is our obligation to be compliant and work within our scope of practice. We are responsible for knowing what our scope of practice includes. If you are aware of any auxiliaries or other practitioners who are working outside their scope of practice, a complaint should be filed. Illegal practice is just that, illegal. In order for the DBC to enforce the law, the DBC needs to be notified. We all need to take responsibility in maintaining the integrity of our profession. Complaints can be filed anonymously. To file a complaint, go to

https://www.dbc.ca.gov/formspubs/form_complaint.pdf

RDA Program Re-Evaluations

As previously reported, the DBC is reevaluating RDA programs. Many programs have not been reevaluated since their original approval. The current process allows 6 weeks to provide documentation, however the DBC is allowing for extensions *on a case-by-case basis*. The first stage of reevaluation includes 50 programs were chosen based on the findings of the Law & Ethics and RDA Written Exam school statistics and the year the program was given full approval. Five letters are being sent each month. SMEs are then given the documentation for evaluation, which can take between 60-90 days. The Board is doing site visits on a *case-by-case basis*.

Of the 45 programs that have received letters, 8 have closed their program, five have been re-approved, 3 programs have not responded. More information can be found in

Meeting Materials for October 29, 2018 on the DBC calendar.

RDA Written Exam Pass / Fail Rate

It was reported in the Board Materials that the pass rate continues to average 55%. This will be a topic of conversation at the February DAC meeting (they were unable to discuss it as it had not been agendaized). As an educator, do you have any feedback or concerns about your students' pass rates on the new combined exam? If so, what are they? We will pass on your feedback during this discussion.

Adding Eligibility Pathway for Educational Programs – RDA and RDAEF

The FADE also brought a proposal in the form of statutory language to be included in the Sunset Review. While the benefit and discussion centered around the RDAEF programs, this proposal included both programs. This would allow students to remain as enrolled in a program until such time as they successfully complete the licensing examination, creating a port-folio-type model. There was much discussion about this; the DAC voted to table the proposal and refer it back to DBC staff for further investigation. Because of that action, the DBC didn't take any action on it.

RDAEF Exam Sites

The RDAEF clinical/practical exam is given about 8 times per year with about 25 candidates at each test. However, staff state that the pool of Examiners is low and difficult to sustain and the cost for site rental is increasing. There are 4 RDAEF Programs that have been approved in the last two years (up from 8). As a result, staff brought forward a proposal to *“research alternative examination resources (including regional testing vendors) to assist in the administration of the RDAEF clinical and practical examinations.”*

The Dental Board discussed this and decided to move it forward with a recommendation that staff work with OPES to *“research alternative examination resources (including regional testing vendors) to assist in the administration of the RDAEF clinical and practical examinations.”*

If you are an RDAEF/RDAEF2 and/or if you have opinions about this and what this decision might mean, [please let us know!](#)

Use of Materials and Devices - RDAEF

The FADE brought a proposal in the form of statutory language to be included in the Sunset Review. This language would mirror that of the RDH language which would allow RDAEF's to use any materials or devices in the performance of their scope of practice without being prescriptive as to how it is done. For instance, it would no longer be called packing cord, but tissue

management. This would not change the scope of practice, but there is concern about the potential use of lasers and other similar items. The DAC voted to forward it to the DBC; the DBC passed this, but not unanimously. It may or may not be included in the Sunset Review Language.

Scope of Practice – RDAEF’s (Local Anesthesia and Nitrous Oxide)

Joan Greenfield again brought a proposal to the DAC, which included a survey and more data (see Board Materials). There was again much discussion about this proposal, including many from stakeholders. One of the main concerns stated was not the education, but *whether there was a need for this duty*. Another concern was creating another layer of certification with this category, so the decision by the DAC was to form a focus group following the guidelines of the OPES and to investigate simplifying the categories of the EF.

If you are an RDAEF/RDAEF2 and/or if you have opinions about this and what this decision might mean, please [let us know!](#)