

**College of Dental Technologists of Alberta (“College”)**

**Agreement & Undertaking Summary**

**In accordance with the *Health Professions Act*<sup>1</sup> (HPA)**

**December 2024**

On March 14, 2024, the College of Dental Technologists Alberta received information from a Health Regulatory College about a dental technician who had applied to be assessed through the substantial equivalence pathway.

The application included a job description from a dental clinic that mentioned the fabrication and fitting of both removable and fixed partial dentures. However, the Registrar noted that the dental technician’s credentials listed on the general registry authorized them only to fabricate removable full prostheses (RFP) and did not include services related to partial dentures.

Following this, the Complaints Director initiated a complaint investigation on April 3, 2024. The investigation revealed the following:

The investigator determined:

1. The dental technician had unknowingly provided services beyond their authorized scope (RFP), and the dental clinic was unaware that these services were outside the technician’s authorized scope.
2. The dental technician cooperated fully with the investigator and took responsibility for their actions, including halting all activities beyond their authorized scope.
3. There was no evidence of harm to the public.
4. The dental technician admitted to the conduct in question.

In reaching a decision on this case, the Complaints Director considered several factors:

1. The dental technician fully cooperated with the Complaints Director and the investigator.
2. They admitted to the unprofessional conduct and immediately stopped activities outside their scope of authority until such time as they receive the necessary training and authorization.
3. There were no prior complaints on record, and there was no evidence of public harm.
4. The dental technician took responsibility and agreed to an informal resolution of the matter.

Based on these factors, the Complaints Director and the dental technician reached an agreement. This agreement allowed the technician to better understand restricted activities and the steps needed for additional authorizations. It also included sharing the costs of the investigation and stipulating that any future breaches could be used in a hearing to determine sanctions.

While operating outside one's scope of authority is considered unprofessional conduct under the HPA, the decision between a formal hearing and an informal process depends on various factors. In this case, the mitigating factors outweighed the aggravating ones, and since the Complaints Director was the complainant, the issue was resolved through education and cost sharing.

For more information on what activities are restricted and how to obtain further authorizations, review the Standards of Practice available on the [website](#).

For more information on the difference between the scope of practice for dental technologists and dental technicians, review the advice to the profession available on our [website](#).