

Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

**SFA**



**BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986  
TDD: (517) 373-0543

House Bill 5924 (Substitute H-1 as reported with amendment)  
Sponsor: Representative Michael J. Griffin  
House Committee: Health Policy  
Senate Committee: Health Policy and Senior Citizens

Date Completed: 11-19-98

### **RATIONALE**

Under the Public Health Code, the Board of Dentistry may issue a health profession specialty certification to a licensed dentist who has advanced training beyond what is required for initial licensure and who has demonstrated competency through an examination or another evaluative process in one or more of the following specialty fields: prosthodontics, endodontics, oral and maxillofacial surgery, orthodontics, pediatric dentistry, periodontics, or oral pathology. The Code also had created a dental specialty task force, which advised the Board of Dentistry on matters relating to dental specialties. The task force performed these functions until March 1996 when its statutory authority and responsibilities were transferred from the former Department of Commerce to the Director of the Department of Consumer and Industry Services under Executive Order 1996-2. Subsequently, the Board of Dentistry voted to change the examinations administered to persons seeking a specialty certification. The decision apparently was made without advice from the task force since it no longer existed. There is concern that members of the Board of Dentistry may not be qualified to make decisions on dental specialties because the composition of the Board at any given time might not include dentists who are certified in a dental specialty. Some people recommend revising the membership of the Board to include at two dentists with a specialty certification.

### **CONTENT**

**The bill would amend the Public Health Code to add two dentists with a specialty certification to the Michigan Board of Dentistry.** Currently, the 13-member board consists of seven dentists, two dental hygienists, two dental assistants, and two public members. The bill would add two dentists who had been issued a health profession specialty

certification under the Code (as described above). In addition, of the seven other dentists, one or more could have a specialty certification. A dentist who was a member of the board as of the bill's effective date could serve out his or her term.

Currently, at least 10 board members must concur in board meeting dates and times. The bill would increase that number to 12.

MCL 333.16621

### **ARGUMENTS**

*(Please note: The arguments contained in this analysis originate from sources outside the Senate Fiscal Agency. The Senate Fiscal Agency neither supports nor opposes legislation.)*

#### **Supporting Argument**

When Executive Order 1996-2 transferred all the duties and powers of the dental specialty task force to the Director of the Department of Consumer and Industry Services, the expertise in various dental specialties that task force members possessed was lost. The task force served an important role in advising the Board of Dentistry in matters relating to specialty certification. Under the Code, the Board's membership includes seven dentists. At any given time, however, there might not be a dentist serving on the Board who is qualified in a dental specialty. Since the task force was abolished, the Board voted to change the examination used to test persons seeking certification in a dental specialty. There is concern that Board members serving at that time may not have been qualified to evaluate the specialty examinations. By requiring that at least two of the members hold a specialty certification, the bill would ensure that the Board would include members who could advise it in these areas.

Legislative Analyst: L. Arasim

**FISCAL IMPACT**

According to the Department of Consumer and Industry Services, the Board of Dentistry meets about four to six times each year, so the total cost of per diem payments for two additional members could be \$400 to \$600 annually.

The bill would have no fiscal impact on local government.

Fiscal Analyst: M. Tyszkiewicz

H9798\S5924A

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.