



Faculty of Dentistry

Department of Conservative Dentistry
Head of Department: Vág János, D.M.D., Ph.D.

Action plan based on the student feedback received in the II. semester of the 2020/2021 academic year

Department: Department of Conservative Dentistry

Faculty: Faculty of Dentistry

Our feedback on general comments by the students:

We generally received nice ratings for our Clinical Dentistry subject, it is much better than the average of the Dental Faculty. On the other hand, we got the worst evaluation for Propedeutics among our subjects. The interest of the students to clinical oriented practices is of average in IV. year; however, in V. year the students take part in practices to a greater extent and with more satisfaction, probably due to their greater theoretical background knowledge. Student presence in Conservative Dentistry is higher than in Propedeutics. The presence of students on lectures is about 79,8%, but they value their context to be less useful. The lectures of our clinic are always updated and verified. To improve Propedeutics, this year we will have new leading teacher and a new prepared teaching staff will be organised. The thematic structure of the lectures will reflect the topics of the practices. We would like to help learning a topic by making hand-outs to cover what will be done and said in practice. These hand-outs will be uploaded into the Moodle system. Tests will be written on topics announced ahead. The practical work required of the students will be first demonstrated by the teachers. Videos of these preparations will also be made to help students study. It is very important to highlight that participating in lectures is not obligatory, but the content of the lectures explain and serve information on the tasks that need to be done in practices in Propedeutics and during treating patients. So without knowing what was said in the lectures a student is not fully prepared to take part in practices. Students very often do not know what their text book is, not even in V. year. According to the students the clinical practices (Conservative Dentistry II., Conservative Dentistry IV.) are average to well organized and do not fully help them learn what is required in the exams. The treatments performed in clinical practices cannot be planned, nor can the practices be thematically divided and ordered 100%. The treatments done are chosen according to the needs of the patients and following professional guidelines. Due to the pandemic situation it is even more difficult to always provide the number of patients required for a practice. The negative opinions of Propedeutic II. must be mentioned. The organisation of the classes averages to 3,5; however, Propedeutics has the worst, 2,62pts. This subject needs further development. The tests will be on previously announced topics, which will be uniformly corrected. According to students in the clinical subjects the educational discipline is very good. Exam conditions are straight forward and they are able to achieve what is required of them; however, in Propedeutics there is a need to determine more straightforward criteria for the practical exam and for developing a clearer evaluating system.



Our feedback on specific comments on mandatory subjects:

According to the students it is difficult to meet requirements set in Propedeutics II., because they are not accurately standardized. From this new semester; however, our department nominated a new leading teacher to the course and she will lead a new set of teachers to guide the students. The thematic structure of the practical course will be harmonized with the lectures, so what the students hear in the lectures will be learnt parallel in practice.

Preventive Dentistry for the students is not very attractive, but with active participation they were able to master the subject and its requirements.

Students find practices too short for patient treatment in Conservative Dentistry II., Conservative Dentistry IV. They do not approve of the teachers overtaking a part of the patient treatment. It is important, though for the clinic that the treatment of the patients follow professional guidelines along with a humanic approach and this might require the intervention of the teacher. The judgement of this is up to the teacher. They would like more chance to practice on phantom. In higher years the students have a unique chance to learn basic dental professional skills on real patients compared to other countries and this should be valued. Critical opinions were mentioned on the behavior of some teachers, one with name and some without names. They say that practice is further hindered by the unprofessional and rude attitude of the assistants. In these matters it would be important for the management of the clinic to know in which practice room do these assistant problems arise and which teachers do not show polite and helpful behavior. The teachers who were mentioned by name will be interviewed. The students resent that in some practice the Hungarians work alone where they must work in pairs. From this semester, both Hungarian and not Hungarian students will work in pairs in Conservative Dentistry practices.

Clinical Dentistry I. is usually a popular practice. They, however do not value that during consultation some teachers discuss with them how to present a case report. In our opinion this presentation is very useful. It teaches the student how to refer about a patient and teaches them where to start a patient treatment and how to build up a treatment plan, how to think logically. At the end of each semester in V. year, students must take case reports to the exams as a proof of their knowledge and work done during the semester.

Our feedback on specific comments on elective subjects:

The students find the Aesthetic Direct Restoration course very useful with great teachers and well planned practices. We would like to maintain the quality of this elective practice at minimum this level.

Budapest, 04. 03. 2021.

The action plan was compiled by: Vasziné Dr. Szabó Enikő, Dr. Lohinai Zsolt