

## Proposal Summary/ Overview

To be completed by proposal sponsor. (500 Word Count Limit for this page)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_BRIDGETT ANDERSON\_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_MN BOARD OF DENTISTRY \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_612 548 2127\_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_[bridgett.anderson@state.mn.us](mailto:bridgett.anderson@state.mn.us)\_\_\_\_\_

*Is this proposal regarding:*

- *New or increased regulation of an existing profession/occupation? If so, complete this form, Questionnaire A.*
- *Increased scope of practice or decreased regulation of an existing profession? If so, complete Questionnaire B.*
- *Any other change to regulation or scope of practice? If so, please contact the Committee Administrator to discuss how to proceed.*

1) State the profession/occupation that is the subject of the proposal.

- Dentists

2) Briefly describe the proposed change.

- Remove a clause in the “specialty” part of our licensing rules that is both a technical change (it doesn’t belong in this section) and also it removes a policy barrier for dentists that hold a full license.

3) If the proposal has been introduced, provide the bill number and names of House and Senate sponsors. If the proposal has not been introduced, indicate whether legislative sponsors have been identified. If the bill has been proposed in previous sessions, please list previous bill numbers and years of introduction.

- SF3500/ HF3612

## **Questionnaire A: New or increased regulation (adapted from Mn Stat 214.002 subd 2 and MDH Scope of Practice Tools)**

This questionnaire is intended to help legislative committees decide which proposals for new or increased regulation of health professions should receive a hearing and advance through the legislative process. It is also intended to alert the public to these proposals and to narrow the issues for hearing.

This form must be completed by the sponsor of the legislative proposal. The completed form will be posted on the committee's public web page. At any time before the bill is heard in committee, opponents may respond in writing with concerns, questions, or opposition to the information stated and these documents will also be posted. The Chair may request that the sponsor respond in writing to any concerns raised before a hearing will be scheduled.

A response is not required for questions which do not pertain to the profession/occupation (indicate "not applicable"). Please be concise. Refer to supporting evidence and provide citation to the source of the information where appropriate.

New or increased regulation of health professions is governed by Mn State 214. Please read and be familiar with those provisions before submitting this form.

While it is often impossible to reach complete agreement with all interested parties, sponsors are advised to try to understand and to address the concerns of any opponents before submitting the form.

### **1) Who does the proposal impact?**

- a. Define the occupations, practices, or practitioners who are the subject of this proposal.
  - Dentists holding a full dental license and primarily practice in a specialty area
- b. List any associations or other groups representing the occupation seeking regulation and the approximate number of members of each in Minnesota
  - The Minnesota Board of Dentistry is pursuing this statutory change.
- c. Describe the work settings, and conditions for practitioners of the occupation, including any special geographic areas or populations frequently served.
  - Dentists provide treatment all over the state of MN

- d. Describe the work duties or functions typically performed by members of this occupational group and whether they are the same or similar to those performed by any other occupational groups.
- Dental treatment

**2) Specialized training, education, or experience (“preparation”) required to engage in the occupation**

- a. What preparation is required to engage in the occupation? How have current practitioners acquired that preparation?
  - Pre-requisites include biological sciences, chemistry, typically an undergraduate degree in sciences
  - Four years of dental school at an accredited university
- b. Would the proposed regulation change the way practitioners become prepared? If so, why and how? Include any change in the cost of entry to the occupation. Who would bear these costs?
  - No it would not change
- c. Is there an existing model of this change being implemented in another state? Please list state, originating bill and year of passage?
  - Most states do not have a “specialty license” We have had this for some time, but we want the clause removed because it does not apply here
- d. If current practitioners in Minnesota lack any training, education, experience, or credential that would be required under the new regulation, how does the proposal address that lack?
  - N/A
- e. Would new entrants into the occupation be required to provide evidence of preparation or be required to pass an examination? If not, please explain why not. Would current practitioners be required to provide such evidence? If not, why not?
  - They already have examination or residency requirements. Yes, evidence is provided to consider for licensure.

**3) Supervision of practitioners**

- a. How are practitioners of the occupation currently supervised, including any supervision within regulated institution or by a regulated health professional? How would the proposal change the provision of supervision?
  - Dentists are not supervised by other professionals. They are regulated by the Board of Dentistry.
- b. Does a regulatory entity currently exist or does the proposal create a regulatory entity? What is the proposed scope of authority of the entity? (For example, will it have authority to develop rules, determine standards for education and training, assess practitioners' competence levels?) Has the proposed change been discussed with the current regulatory authority? If so, please list participants and date.
  - Minnesota Board of Dentistry currently regulates all licensed dental professionals in the state of MN
- c. Do provisions exist to ensure that practitioners maintain competency? Describe any proposed change.
  - Already exists

**4) Level of regulation (See Mn Stat 214.001, subd. 2, declaring that “no regulations shall be imposed upon any occupation unless required for the safety and well-being of the citizens of the state.” The harm must be “recognizable, and not remote.” Ibid.)**

- a. Describe the harm to the public posed by the unregulated practice of the occupation or by the continued practice at its current degree of regulation.
  - This question does not apply to our change
- b. Explain why existing civil or criminal laws or procedures are inadequate to prevent or remedy any harm to the public.
  - This question does not apply to our change

- c. Explain why the proposed level of regulation has been selected and why a lower level of regulation was not selected.

- This change is a change that removes a barrier, thus a lower level of regulation

**5) Implications for Health Care Access, Cost, Quality, and Transformation**

- a. Describe how the proposal will affect the availability, accessibility, cost, delivery, and quality of health care, including the impact on unmet health care needs and underserved populations. How does the proposal contribute to meeting these needs?

- This change allows for dentists holding a full dental license to practice in a specialty area and also perform general dentistry for patients in need. This has the ability to increase access to care.

- b. Describe the expected impact of the proposal on the supply of practitioners and on the cost of services or goods provided by the occupation. If possible, include the geographic availability of proposed providers/services. Cite any sources used.

- This change should provide an increase in supply of practitioners performing general dentistry.
- Here is a geographical map of the distribution of dentists

- c. Does the proposal change how and by whom the services are compensated? What costs and what savings would accrue to patients, insurers, providers, and employers?

- NA

- d. Describe any impact of the proposal on an evolving health care delivery and payment system (e.g., collaborative practice, innovations in technology, ensuring cultural competency, value-based payments)?

- The proposal would allow qualified and licensed providers to treat patients outside of their designated specialty when they see fit because they are fully licensed in MN to provide dental services.

- e. What is the expected regulatory cost to state government? Is there an up-to-date fiscal note for the proposal? How are the costs covered under the proposal?
  - No fiscal impact

**6) Evaluation/Reports**

Describe any plans to evaluate and report on the impact of the proposal if it becomes law, including focus and timeline. List the evaluating agency and frequency of reviews. NA

- The Board of Dentistry already regulates licensees.

**7) Support for and opposition to the proposal**

What organizations are sponsoring the proposal? How many members do these organizations represent in Minnesota?

- The Minnesota Board of Dentistry is bringing the proposal forward.

List organizations, including professional, regulatory boards, consumer advocacy groups, and others, who support the proposal.

- The state dental association also supports this change to regulation. They represent around 70% of all licensed dentists in the state. We have shared a formal letter of support.

List any organizations, including professional, regulatory boards, consumer advocacy groups, and others, who have indicated concerns/opposition to the proposal or who are likely to have concerns/opposition. Explain the concerns/opposition of each, as the sponsor understands it.

- No opposition known

.

- What actions has the sponsor taken to minimize or resolve disagreement with those opposing or likely to oppose the proposal? N/A