DMD CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL
(Submit completed form to the Office of Education, gcchilds@dental.ufl.edu)

Date: August 1, 2017
Course Title: DEN8710L: Community Dentistry 3
Department: Community Dentistry and Behavioral Sciences
Course Director: Dr. Gibbs

Revision requested: Add one day (AM and PM) pilot clinical rotation at Santa Fe College
Four 4DN students will be assigned on Tuesday and Thursdays in Spring (semester 11).
Dr. Tom Zellmer will provide faculty supervision.

Rationale: (If you are requesting additional class time please include why this time cannot come from re-prioritizing the current content, shifting to independent study in areas of direct instruction and/or cannot be incorporated in another existing course.)

This rotation will provide students with a valuable opportunity to provide preventive and restorative dental care to patients attending the Santa Fe clinic and working with trained dental assistants and dental hygienists. Students will have the opportunity to apply legal and regulatory concepts related to the provision and/or support of oral health care services (Competency 5); Communicate and collaborate with other members of the health care team to facilitate the provision of health care (Competency 10); Apply the basic principles and philosophies of practice management, models of oral health care delivery and how to function successfully as the leader of the oral health care team (Competency 11); Provide oral health care within the scope of general dentistry to include Patient assessment, diagnosis, comprehensive treatment planning, prognosis and informed consent (Competency 12); and Provide oral health care within the scope of general dentistry to include restoration of teeth (Competency 17).

Dr. Dilbone will calibrate Dr. Zellmer. Student procedures and rvu’s will be tracked as in other community rotations. However RDS will include all activities at Santa Fe in their UFCD clinical expectations.

Patients with dental needs beyond preventive and restorative needs will be referred.

Student hours requested by event and science type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours by Type</th>
<th>Biomedical Hrs.</th>
<th>Behavioral Hrs.</th>
<th>Clinical Hrs.</th>
<th>Total Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOURS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Chair Approval: ___X___ YES_____NO

Responsible Dean/Chair/Faculty: Dr. Gibbs, Dr. Dilbone, Ms. Treloar, Dr. Zellmer, Dr. Miglioriti, Dr. Sposetti

Proposed implementation date/semester: Spring 2018

Curriculum Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved in Concept</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present: G. Childs, R. Pileggi, A. Sharma, M. Ghorbani, O. Saniukovich, C. Sayoc, C. Adams

Course Evaluation: Respondents: 57, Mean course evaluation questions scores ranged from 2.97-4, and rated the course overall 3.09.

Purpose of debriefing: New course director

Syllabus
- Students reported that a percentage grade conversion table in the ECO syllabus was removed during the course. Dr. Pileggi explained the table in the course’s syllabus and lab manual was incorrect. To convert consistently, 0.5 was added to the first or second psychomotor for each student. Dr. Pileggi offered to meet with each student to review their lab scores.

Learning Environment:
- Students were confused about what their expectations were in the early lab sessions. It was suggested providing models for each pod or demonstrating on the monitors prior to the lab assignment.

Course Content:
- Students were sympathetic to Dr. Pileggi’s family loss at the beginning of the semester yet felt they not prepared for class and lab due to a lack of communication. It was suggested adding an introduction/orientation lecture to the course. Students learned by asking fellow students or other instructors.

Laboratory
- Faculty calibration varied from the lab in this course compared to the clinical entry exam grading. Additionally, faculty were not available for all of the students who needed assistance.
- Students liked the residents’ assistance in the lab.
- Reduce time waiting in line for radiographs.

Teaching Methods:
- Students felt there could have been more examples of endodontic errors in prep for the clinic entry exam.

Text/Course Materials:
- Students had mixed comments regarding the Endodontic lab manual. Some felt it needed more images.
- Students appreciated the step-by-step printed instructions provided by Dr. Pileggi.

Evaluation:
- Students liked the quizzes and felt it help reinforce the information.
- Students had mixed reviews about the electronic exams. Some felt psychomotors could take the place of the written exams.

Summary of Recommendations-prioritized by students:
1. Include an introduction/orientation to the course.
2. Align the psychomotor grading of this course with the clinical entry exam and calibrate faculty.
3. Redistribute faculty lab time so all students receive assistance if needed. Dr. Pileggi announced next year’s plan will be 5 faculty and 5 residents for a lab session; with the class will be divided into 2 sessions.
4. Have model with demonstrated access for each pod and/or show the video demonstrations prior to the lab assignment.
5. Add a review session prior to the clinic entry exam.
6. Add examples of common endodontic errors to the manual or lecture portion of the course.

Course Evaluation: Respondents: 69, Mean course evaluation questions scores ranged from 2.94-4.67, and rated the course overall 4.38.

Purpose of debriefing: New course director

Overall
Students consistently rated this course very highly through the course evaluation feedback noted above. The following statements briefly reflect the discussion and these students’ suggestions in the designated areas below.

Learning Environment:
- Students felt Dr. Ribeiro created a good learning environment with her calming and compassionate demeanor and her dedication (e.g. prepping 100 teeth for students with early caries (using glue and chili) prior to lab).
- Students appreciated that Dr. Ribeiro knew all of their names. She listened to students and helped them manage failure as a means of improvement. Students commented that they felt the faculty were there to help them succeed.
- Students felt the course’s group exercise helped see how other students evaluate clinical decision-making and helped them develop critical thinking skills.

Syllabus
- Have the presentations available in the ECO document section prior to class.

Course Content and Laboratory Practice:
- Students reported they appreciated the theory and evidence portion of the “Cariology” course with the procedural practice in Operative I.
- Biomaterials material was “dense” and overwhelming and students were confused on what was important to study.
- A student expressed including ergonomics helped reinforce the correct way to do things.
- Students appreciated the 4-handed dentistry emphasis but felt it could be better placed in the beginning of Operative 2 when they begin their DEN6015 rotations in the TEAM clinics.
- Students felt the time was adequate for both the preparation and restoration in the same session.
- Students appreciated rotating faculty in lab. It gave students several different methods of approaching the lab experience.
- Students felt the TA’s needed calibration. Dr. Ribeiro reported she is currently conducting a “Train the tutors” program for all TA’s in RDS.
- Dr. Ribeiro asked how the students would feel about a pre-session training with the tutors demonstrating how to set up a hand piece and reviewing instruments before going to lab. Students had mixed feelings, some sighted this should be optional and others said they would like the additional practice. Dr. Ribeiro noted burs will be separated into two operative blocks for future courses.
- When asked by Dr. Ribeiro about adding a class 2 lesion for next year, students felt strongly that this course should maintain class 5, 1 and 3.
Teaching Methods:
- Students felt failure was an option because they knew they only could improve.
- Dr. Ribeiro said she incorporated cariology in a clinical setting so it directly could be applied to operative topics.
- Dr. Shen’s handouts students felt were very helpful. However, some felt his lecture style of questioning and never answering the question was confusing.
- Students appreciated faculty not using their phones during lab and being cognitively present.

Text:
- One student felt the text reinforced the lecture material.

Evaluation:
- Biomaterials material presented was not equivalent to the number of questions on the exam. Students reported when they found there were very few biomaterials questions on the exams they did not put any study emphasis in this area.
- Students noted exams questions are confusing due to the questions being written by non-native English instructors.
- The lectures’ emphasis did not always reflect the exam questions asked about the subject. Dr. Ribeiro questioned if there should be 2 exams in the future, however students strongly supported maintaining the three current exams.
- Students mentioned faculty hovering over students during psychomotors is very stressful.

Summary of Recommendations-prioritized by students:
1. Re-evaluate biomaterials lectures with relation to clinical practice for students.
2. Create course materials and/or videos on common early mistakes and how to correct them.
3. Consider moving 4-handed dentistry to Operative 2 in semester 3.