

APPROVED MINUTES
BOARD OF DENTISTRY
EXAMINATION COMMITTEE
December 16, 2016

TIME AND PLACE: The Examination Committee convened on December 16, 2016, at 10:08 a.m., at the Department of Health Professions, Perimeter Center, 2nd Floor Conference Center, 9960 Mayland Drive, Henrico, VA 23233.

PRESIDING: James D. Watkins, D.D.S.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nathaniel C. Bryant, D.D.S.
Patricia B. Bonwell, RDH, PhD
Carol R. Russek, JD

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Al Rizkalla, D.D.S.
John M. Alexander, D.D.S.
Augustus Petticolas Jr., D.D.S.
Tammy C. Ridout, RDH
Bruce S. Wyman, D.M.D

STAFF PRESENT: Sandra K. Reen, Executive Director
Kelley W. Palmatier, Deputy Executive Director
Christine M. Houchens, Licensing Manager

ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM: All members of the committee were present.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Dr. Watkins explained the parameters for public comment and opened the public comment period. No public comment was received.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dr. Watkins asked if the Committee members had reviewed the February 13, 2015 minutes and asked if there were any corrections needed. Dr. Bonwell moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed.

PATHWAYS TO LICENSURE- DR. RIZKALLA: Dr. Rizkalla gave a brief slide presentation on Licensure Pathways, noting that mobility of licensees can be an issue because not all states accept all of the regional clinical examinations. He explained the relationship of the Commission on Dental Competency Assessments (CDCA) and ADEX. He then reviewed the Curriculum Integrated Format (CIF) now being used by testing agencies. He said the CIF allows students to be examined in sections during the fourth year of dental school instead of taking all parts of a clinical examination at the very end of the dental program.

He added that some states accept completion of a Post-Graduate Year Residency (PGY1) in lieu of a clinical examination and the ADA is developing an OSCE for use in determining competency for initial dental licensure in the United States. He concluded by noting the following issues to think about when considering clinical examination requirements: portability, ethical considerations when using patients for licensing examinations and if CIF is an acceptable compromise.

Discussion followed about accepting a Post-Graduate Year Residency in lieu of a clinical examination which has the advantages of the student having more patient experiences. Concerns were raised about the differences between GPR programs which are hospital based and AEGD programs that they can be affiliated with a hospital but can be stand alone. Quality control was also questioned. In response to questions from Board members, VCU School of Dentistry faculty members in the audience said a PGY1 graduate is more competent than a dental school graduate who completes a clinical exam and will be a better dentist with better training. Dr. Watkins asked for a motion if the Committee would like more information on accepting PGY1 programs in lieu of a clinical exam for the next meeting. A motion by Dr. Bonwell to get more information was made and passed.

**REPORT ON THE ADA 2016
OSCE DEVELOPMENT
FORUM:**

Dr. Rizkalla and Dr. Wyman expressed concern that the ADA is proceeding with its investigation of the feasibility of developing a non-patient based OSCE for licensure purposes despite the lack of support by the participants in the forum.

**PROPOSE A POSITION
STATEMENT ON CLINICAL
EXAMS FOR LICENSURES
OF DENTISTS AND
DENTAL HYGIENISTS:**

Ms. Reen said this topic is on the agenda for discussion so representatives of the Board have a clear message on where the Board stands when they are participating in the national and regional discussions of clinical examinations. Ms. Reen said that in the past the Board explored establishing a portfolio examination with VCU but concluded this exam model was not workable with only one dental school in the state Virginia. The Board has not discussed its position on clinical examinations since that effort. It was noted that the Board has always supported having patient based exams and has never been interested in any other exam models. Ms. Reen suggested that the Board could reaffirm its position of requiring live patient exams for all licensees. Ms. Russek made a motion to recommend reaffirming this position which was seconded and passed.

Discussion followed about examining and being members of the regional testing agencies whose exams are accepted by the Board. Dr. Watkins questioned if membership is needed since all the examination are essentially the same. The sense of the committee was that such membership and examining was desirable. Ms. Reen advised that Board Counsel should be included in this discussion because the testing agencies are in competition for

business. Dr. Watkins decided to table this discussion so Board Counsel can participate.

**IMPLEMENTING A LAW
EXAM FOR LICENSURE
APPLICANTS:**

Ms. Reen asked the Committee for guidance on structuring the law exam for licensure applicants and asked:

1. How many questions?
2. How to determine passage- all answers correct or a percentage correct?
3. Open book or not?
4. Are there other considerations to be addressed?

She explained that this information is needed so the IT Division can evaluate the system's capacity to meet the expectations.

The Committee agreed by consensus with Dr. Watkin's suggestion that the exam be open book. It was noted that the previous exam was 25 questions with an 80% or higher score to pass. Mrs. Palmatier said when the previous exam was ordered in discipline cases, the exam was open book and the licensee was limited to 1 hour to complete it. She stated that having a time limit means that they had to review the regulations prior to the exam and only needed to find the information again during the exam. The committee agreed by consensus to having a time limit of one hour.

Following further discussion, the committee also agreed by consensus to the following test parameters:

- Require completion of the exam in one attempt without the ability to pause and come back later;
- Each test would consist of 25 questions;
- Applicants for dental and dental hygiene licenses and for registration as a dental assistant II are required to take the exam;
- There should be 4 response options for each question; and
- a score of 80% or higher is required to pass.

Mrs. Palmatier explained the need for a bank of questions to draw from so that questions and sequencing can vary to limit the opportunities for cheating. She then reviewed a report on the most cited violations in the disciplinary cases that were closed this year to assist in formulating questions. She also noted that for each question there must be one clear answer.

Ms. Reen recommended that Ms. Palmatier develop a pool of questions and answers for review by the Committee. Dr. Watkins said he wants the Committee members to develop the questions then have Ms. Palmatier review them. He added that the Committee should meet as often as the Board meets in order to monitor the effectiveness of the exams and change the questions when needed. A VCU School of Dentistry faculty member said he believes the School would BETA test the examination with some of its students then

Virginia Board of Dentistry
Examination Committee
December 16, 2016


provide the Committee with an analysis.

Dr. Bryant moved to have the Committee members develop the exam questions. The motion was seconded and passed.


Dr. Watkins said the Committee should meet again before the next Board meeting, so that they can present the pool of questions each member has created, review and decide which questions to use and to also receive feedback from IT on what they are able to do. It was tentatively agreed that the Committee would meet on the reserved date of February 10, 2017.

ADJOURNMENT:

With all business concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 12:24pm.



James D. Watkins, D.D.S, Chair
2-10-17
Date



Sandra K. Reen, Executive Director
February 10, 2017
Date