

College of Dentistry
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
December 15, 2014

Present: Cunningham-Ford, (Chair), Burke, Case, Clancy, Eckert, Garcia, Hindman, Holmes, Justman, Kwon, Lindquist, Nelson, Orgill, Schneider, Solow, Straub-Morarend, Timmons, Vargas, Weistroffer

Absent Caplan, Cowen, Hernandez, Hoffmann, Marshall

Guest: Johnsen

1.0 Approval of September 26, 2014 Minutes

The motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the September 26, 2014 meeting as written.

2.0 Clerkship Focus Group Recommendations

C. Solow distributed the summary of the comments and recommendations offered during the Clerkship Focus Group (see attachment). She wished to discuss the recommendation to *Explore establishing a model in which D1 students observe and D2 students assist D3 and D4 students*. Because it involves all four years of the curriculum, she brought it to the Committee to consider whether such a proposal would be pedagogically advantageous and logistically possible.

Comments:

The D2 course is at the end of the D2 year. D1s and D2s would have no training in endodontics and observing/assisting might slow down D3/D4 students down, possibly detrimentally.

Students would need instruction in how to assist prior to participating in such a project. The D1s and D2s would probably learn more from just observing.

Endodontics invites students to visit the clinic during the summer to observe and/or assist. Only a few respond.

Having D1s or D2s assisting would take away credit from D3 students.

A student commented that D2s did not benefit from observing the D4; they were there to observe communication skills only.

The Committee did not express a great deal of enthusiasm for initiating such a project.

3.0 Prosthodontic New Course Request

The revised Prosthodontics curriculum adds a one-credit hour clinic readiness course of eight hours' duration at the end of the D2 year. (PROS: 8250).

Comments:

The course has no didactic content, yet it is assigned a credit hour.

The description indicates that it is a capstone exam, rather than a course.

The format of the course has yet to be determined.

Remediation has yet to be determined.

It is not intended as a "hurdle," but as a refresher for entering the clerkships.

Interpretation of pass/fail: not as intrusive or ominous.

The rationale for being stand-alone course is that it covers whole 2 year Prosthodontics sequence.

How much weight will this carry? If a student fails, what are the consequences?

Drs. Clancy and Lindquist were unable to clarify details.

It was noted that students are given a Prosthodontics pretest at end of D2 year. How will the D2 Prosthodontic pretest mesh PROS:8250?

The course will not interfere with IPE because the IPE program will move to January.

When will students have time to review for the course with the heavy schedule at end of D2 year?

How quickly will the results be posted? Students leave right after the end of year and some may not know that they would need to remain to remediate.

The Committee postponed a vote until more information is forthcoming from Dr. Holloway.

4.0 Pharmacology Focus Group report

Dr. Koland approached Dr. Garcia about ways to improve the D2 Pharmacology course. Twelve students participated in a focus group to discuss the course. Students offered many compliments and some concerns. Students appreciated how well the course was organized. Several lectures on the relevance of the course content to Dentistry would have been helpful.

Dr. Garcia reviewed the comments with Dr. Koland. He noted that the College of Medicine no longer offers a stand-alone Pharmacology course to its students. Dr. Koland will explore additional resources to enhance the course content and to be on responsive to students' concerns.

5.0 GRISTO Instructional Issues

The first-year Dental Histology course (half of the combined Gross Anatomy – Histology course called GRISTO), includes a segment on oral histology that addresses the histology of dental tissues as well as oral mucosa and tooth development. In prior years, Dr. Finkelstein taught this section of the course, made histology relevant to dentistry and prepared the D1s for the D2 oral pathology course. With Dr. Finkelstein's passing, Drs. Hoffmann and Swailes are working to reestablish this segment of the course. Dr. Garcia stated that the College does not anticipate College of Dentistry faculty replacements for that part of curriculum, at this time.

6.0 Roundtable Comments

Endodontics: one-fourth to one-third of the students have completed requirements. Those students are assisting.

Prosthodontics: Grades are not posted until the end of the academic year and this is a source of great anxiety for students. The faculty contacts students who are having difficulty. Students should, therefore, be aware of their status well before the end of the year. Students noted that this policy may delay applying opportunities for applying to specialty programs.

The Pros clerkship changed competencies to 2 diagnostic impressions and 2 diagnostic casts and mountings. Overall the feedback has been beneficial. Students are looking more critically at their own work and receiving useful feedback from faculty.

Dr. Justman reported that at the December 12th Clerkship Committee meeting a working group was appointed to review radiology issues in the curriculum. Dr. Guzman-Armstrong will chair the group.

Dr. Kwon reported that the Curriculum Management working group is addressing educational initiatives.

Dr. Garcia issued a memo to the DEOs informing them that evaluations will not be reopened once closed. The UI is considering an online course evaluation system.

Family Dentistry is in a situation with greatly reduced access to chairs. The department has developed special protocols and policies to cope with the issue. Students have been very cooperative in adjusting to changes.

Family Dentistry students will need to meet a lot of requirements in last 10 weeks of the year. The faculty requested that extra patients from the clerkships be directed to Family Dentistry.

7.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on **January 30, 2015**, 12:00-12:50 p.m. in the Deans Conference Room.

Response to D3 Clerkship Focus Groups

September 2014

BACKGROUND

In the spring of 2014, two focus groups were held in response to faculty request to better understand the D3 experience. Both D3 and D4 students were randomly selected to participate in the groups facilitated by a PhD student from the College of Education. There were positive and challenging experiences highlighted as well as a set of recommendations proposed from the groups. The Clerkship Directors' Committee charged a subcommittee to review and suggest a response to the recommendations. The subcommittee membership consisted of:

Ms. Ursula Diehl, D4 and Class President

Dr. Nidhi Handoo, Oral Pathology and Radiology

Dr. Bruce Justman, Endodontics

Dr. Tad Mabry, Pediatric Dentistry

Ms. Joni Yoder, Clinic Administration

Ms. Cathy Solow, Associate Dean for Students

RESPONSE

- 1. Do not group Endodontics and Prosthodontics requirements. Lengthen the Prosthodontics clerkship. Move some of the clerkship blocks to the fourth year.**

There are historical, logistical and pedagogical reasons for grouping Endodontics and Prosthodontics together. This arrangement originated 7-8 years ago as students were having difficulty finishing cases in clerkships where multiple appointments were necessary. Increasing the number of weeks was possible by bundling together three of the clerkships—Endo, Pros and Perio. Ideally, students should be able to see patients across all three clerkships. At the time, other clerkships were asked about their interest in joining the group of three but declined. Lengthening the Pros clerkship is not logistically possible given the number of weeks currently in the academic year. Progression to the D4 year is predicated on the technical skills and level of independence demonstrated by each student. Shifting a clerkship to the fourth year would suggest that a student has not achieved a minimum level of competency in at least one area.

There have been some requirements finished in the D4 year by selected students who faculty deem independent enough to do so and with good technical skills.

Prosthodontics has recently decreased the number of competencies students have to pass due to a changing patient population.

- 2. There should be a coordinated effort by the College to recruit potential patients.**

Clinic administration program managers and clinic clerks work diligently to equitably distribute patients but cancellations and no shows create havoc with the system in place. There are some clerkships that track patient assignment from the beginning of the clerkship and others that will start that approach this year. The College has also recently hired a marketing coordinator and launched a number of ad campaigns targeted towards getting the word out about the College and, specifically, recruiting new patients. With the implementation of the Dental Wellness Plan, the College should also see an increase in patients.

3. Release patients before faculty feedback is shared with students. Provide full time dental assistants.

Some clerkships already have processes in place to provide feedback after patients are released. It is suggested that the Clerkship Directors' Committee sponsor a "best practices" discussion either at an upcoming meeting or in a separate venue so that others can benefit from consideration of options that streamline the process for patients and, in the case of negative feedback, provide some confidentiality for feedback sessions with students. It is also recommended that clerkships integrate more regular feedback sessions so that students have a better sense of where they stand in the clerkship.

Providing full-time dental assistants for all students in all clerkships is cost-prohibitive although the College provides experiences with dental assistants in Pediatric Dentistry as well as in the DAU in the D4 year. The committee suggests exploring a model in which first and second year students are provided the opportunity to assist 3rd and 4th year students in the clinic as part of their educational requirements. D1 students would observe and D2 students would do the assisting. Although logistically challenging, it would be advantageous for patients to remain with students on the "team" as the move forward in the curriculum.

4. More flexibility with remediation plans is encouraged.

Before a student is asked to remediate all or part of a clerkship, multiple faculty have contributed to the assessment of the student's progress and have provided suggestions as to how the student should remediate. The clerkship director for the specific clerkship will make the final decision about what is necessary for the student to show a minimum level of competency. The timing of when the student is completing the clerkship will sometimes dictate how the student will remediate. In the past, students have repeated the entire clerkship; extended time in the clerkship; remediated within the clerkship; remediated during the summer between their 3rd and 4th year; or selected students have completed requirements in Family Dentistry. Each student in need of remediation is looked at individually and, after consideration of the best educational experience and student needs, the College tries to minimize the additional time spent in the program. Two years ago, the College initiated and received approval from the University for a third graduation date (March) so that students who need extended time do not have to wait until June to graduate. Dr. McQuistan has also worked with extramural sites to take students at "off" times so they can make progress towards degree requirements. It is also recommended that there be feedback between preclinical course directors and clerkship directors, similar to that between D3 and D4 faculty, about student progress and those who may have additional needs when entering the D3 year.

5. Evaluation of faculty-student relationships should be evaluated each semester with feedback addressed at the collegiate level. Office hours should be posted. Additional advocacy should be available to address ongoing student/faculty conflicts or issues.

The Executive Associate Dean, Associate Dean for Education, Associate Dean for Students, Department Head and Clerkship Directors generally receive evaluation feedback for a course or clerkship and this is shared with individual faculty. Generally, the feedback is positive and constructive, however, in egregious situations and/or when there is a pattern of behavior with a specific faculty member, there is immediate follow up by collegiate administration or the department head. This year, a D3 student liaison committee has been formed to provide "just in time" feedback to clerkship directors as well as to receive feedback for the class. More and regular feedback between faculty and students while the clerkship is in progress will hopefully prove beneficial. There are also two student representatives on the Clerkship Directors'

Committee who are charged with representing student interests. While discussion of an individual faculty member at the committee would be inappropriate, it would be useful to hear concerns about climate, environment, and trends in communication with faculty.

Some faculty already post office hours and it is recommended that departments initiate a discussion about departmental policy and whether posting of office hours could work in their environment.

Advocacy is available from any of the collegiate deans for ongoing issues. The Associate Deans for Education, Patient Care and Student Affairs may be the most appropriate to handle issues in the learning environment. There are University and collegiate policies highlighted in the Student Handbook that address learning environment, sexual harassment, retaliation, etc. Outside the College, the University Ombudsperson is also available to assist students. The Student Liaison Committee could also be a communication channel for broader issues impacting students and can advocate on behalf of their class.

6. Procedure demonstrations and questions should be encouraged.

More information about the request for demonstrations would be helpful. When and where? In advance of seeing the patient may be best although it might be helpful to have the demo after seeing the patient if the appointment did not go well. Consideration should be given to the possibility of more timely demos during treatment planning than during a clinical procedure. If the student is still requesting demos late in the clerkship for procedures with which they should be familiar, then a lack of independence may be perceived.

It is recommended that the Clerkship Directors' Committee underscore that this is a "culture of inquiry" and that questions are absolutely allowed. At the same time, students should be aware that questions are better received when they are presented within the context of some knowledge base.

7. A clear and consistent grading system with a feedback mechanism should be utilized to help students improve.

The Clerkship Directors' Committee has charged a task force to work on a proposal for a consistent daily grading system and the group has representatives from across the clerkships. There has been an initial report to the committee and the final recommendations will be available January 2015.

SUMMARY

Feedback from D3 and D4 student focus groups has been helpful in better understanding some of the issues found in the D3 clerkships. We appreciate the positive comments from the groups about interactions with faculty and patients as well as the opportunity to improve. This subcommittee makes the following recommendations after review of the report:

- Facilitate a discussion about best practices in the Clerkship Directors' Committee about how and when to provide feedback.
- Integrate more formal feedback sessions.
- Explore establishing a model in which D1 students observe and D2 students assist D3 and D4 students.
- Consider a formal feedback session between pre-clinical and clerkship directors about student progress and identify students entering the D3 year who may have specific needs.
- Utilize representation on the Clerkship Directors' Committee, the student liaison committees, administrative personnel and processes to provide feedback and to advocate for change.
- Departments should initiate a discussion about the feasibility and utility of posting office hours.
- Gather more information about students' interest in additional "demonstrations" and when they are most useful.
- Clerkships should encourage questions from students.
- Communicate recommendations from the subcommittee working on a consistent grading system in the D3 year.