



DENTAL ASSISTING COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Monday, December 15, 2014
Department of Consumer Affairs
2005 Evergreen Street, Hearing Room
Sacramento, CA 95815

Members Present

Teresa Lua, RDAEF, Chair
Anne Contreras, RDA, Vice Chair
Pamela Davis-Washington, RDA
Judith Forsythe, RDA
Michele Jawad, RDA
Emma Ramos, RDA
Bruce Witcher, DDS

Members Absent

Staff Present

Karen Fischer, MPA, Executive Officer
Sarah Wallace, Assistant Executive Officer
Jennifer Casey, Educational Program Analyst
Michael Placencia, Legislative and Regulatory Analyst

10:00 A.M. MEETING OF THE DENTAL ASSISTING COUNCIL

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum**
Teresa Lua, Chair, called the Dental Assisting Council meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. Roll was called and a quorum established.
2. **Welcome and Introductions**
Sarah Wallace, Assistant Executive Officer and manager of the Dental Assisting Program, stated that the Board's current priorities include an update and review of Dental Assisting educational component. At the August 25, 2014 Council meeting, members had asked for additional information on the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA). The Council members and public were given the opportunity to introduce themselves.
3. **Presentation by Representatives from the American Dental Association's (ADA) Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) Relating to the Accreditation Standards and Application Process for Dental Assisting Educational Programs**

Dr. Sherin Tooks, Director of the American Dental Association's (ADA) Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA), gave an overview of accreditation in general and CODA as an accrediting organization, recognized by the United States Department of Education. Patrice Renfrow, Manager of CODA's Allied Dental Education, presented on dental assisting accreditation, standards, policies and procedures, and the documents used to assess and continually monitor programs.

4. **Open Discussion Regarding the Presentation by Representatives from CODA Relating to the Accreditation Standards and Application Process for Dental Assisting Educational Programs**

In response to Vice Chair Anne Contreras' question regarding the total cost for a school going through the CODA accreditation process, Dr. Tooks stated that for 2015 the application fee is \$15,000 per program, the annual accreditation fee is \$1,620, and additional incidental fees include a \$35 administrative fee, \$4,000 if a focused site visit is required outside of the 7 year review cycle. These fees cover the manpower needed to oversee the accredited program as well as the cost incurred by the site visits. It was also noted that during the year of the site visit, the annual fee is double.

Dr. Bruce Whitcher asked if CODA reviews the applicable state laws when they do a site visit and review initial applications. Ms. Renfrow answered, yes, the state laws are reviewed. Dr. Whitcher inquired as to whether or not CODA would provide accreditation if a program did not comply with the state's standards. Dr. Tooks stated that if a program does not meet the state's standards, it is identified at the time of the site visit as a recommendation. Outstanding recommendations would place a program on Approval with Reporting Requirements status. Programs have a set amount of time they can be on this status in an effort to come into compliance. In the last 6 months of that time frame the Commission can issue Intent to Withdraw status. The Commission can take action to withdraw.

Dr. Whitcher asked about radiation safety and difference between California and CODA standards with regards to the number of FMX's that need to be taken, for the program to be compliant with that standard would they need to include the number of FMX's that are required in California? Ms. Renfrow answered, no, that standard is a National standard representing the minimum requirement. Schools with California students would need to demonstrate compliance with the state regulations. Dr. Whitcher asked about the accessibility of the information obtained by the site visits and whether or not there would be a problem if California requested the site visit report from the program. Dr. Tooks stated that all of the materials are considered confidential, but the program is able to release the information if they would like. The Board would not receive any information from CODA on any program's accreditation progress. Dr. Whitcher explained that the Board and Board staff would want to see a summary, for further review, that ensures consistency with California's application process and program requirements in order to use CODA's findings to expedite the California approval process. Dr. Tooks clarified that the site visit reports are formatted in such a way

that only shows deficiencies. They do not go standard-by-standard or include information on all that was seen at the site visit.

Emma Ramos asked how CODA acceptance would affect California schools with program directors not having a bachelor's degree. Dr. Tooks responded that those California approved programs that have a program director that does not have a bachelor's degree would be identified in the review process and would be considered deficient. Every program in the U.S. that is accredited by CODA must abide by the same standards. Tamara McNealy asked for clarification on whether or not laboratory, preclinical, and clinical instructors require a bachelor's degree. Ms. Renfrow confirmed that a CDA is required for those hands-on instructors.

Ms. Contreras asked about the approximate turnaround time for schools seeking CODA accreditation. Dr. Tooks re-stated that it is a minimum of 9 months, as it is multilayered process.

Karen Fischer, Executive Officer of the Dental Board, asked if CODA has had issues with programs not meeting the standards between site visits and or programs dropping out, and if statistics can be presented to the Council. Dr. Tooks did not have specific statistics to present, but stated that CODA oversees compliance in a variety of ways, including annual surveys and reports of program changes. If it is found that a change requires review, it will be placed on the Commission's review committee and Commission's agenda and the program is requested to make progress reports with regard to the changes between cycles. These sometimes result in review and require a focused site visit or a review and approval of the change. Complaints may also come in inner-cycle and are also considered in the review process.

Ms. Fischer asked if it is CODA's policy to communicate with state boards when a complaint is filed. Dr. Tooks responded that state boards receive the CODA Accreditation Action Report which would include any complaints brought to the Commission's attention. Notifications are not addressed to the state board, but they are disseminated to boards of dentistry and are available to the public via CODA's website.

Dr. Whitcher commented that in the presentation, there were approximately 9,000 students in CODA accredited dental assisting programs, while California approved programs hold approximately 35,000 students. Dr. Tooks responded that it is her belief that this is due to licensure requirements in other states.

LaDonna Drury-Klein, a representative from the California Association of Dental Assisting Teachers (CADAT), asked the CODA representatives if they are currently issuing reports to the state dental boards of all of the findings of accredited programs and the actions of the Commission for dental hygiene programs and dental programs in the state of California. Dr. Tooks answered yes, the Accreditation Action Report lists all of the actions, identifying the name of the institution, the status that the program came into the Commission with and the

status it left with. This information is public and on their website as well as mass emailed to the state dental boards. The listing does not give detail on the specific deficiencies of the programs.

Ms. Drury-Klein asked if the Commission requests that a representative from the state board be present during the site visit to address the differential between the state's regulations and CODA standards. Dr. Toombs responded that CODA welcomes the state board's presence in the accreditation process. The representative must be a current sitting member of the board and is required to sign a confidentiality agreement and agree to abide by it. Spencer Walker, legal counsel for the Dental Board, explained that a board member is a representative of the Board; if a board member participates in an inspection of a school or in the accreditation process, they must have the ability to report back to the Board. A board member in California should never sign the confidentiality agreement.

5. **Discussion and Possible Action Regarding the Following Items Requested by the California Association of Dental Assisting Teachers (CADAT):**

A. Discussion and Possible Action to Formally Enact the Provisions of California Code of Regulations Section 1070.2 Effective January 1, 2015

Ms. Drury-Klein, representing CADAT, requested that the Council recommend that the Board consider accepting the findings of CODA to assist in the Board's application process for Registered Dental Assisting (RDA) programs. Ms. Drury-Klein requested that an abbreviated application be created and approved by the Board for RDA programs that are CODA accredited. Ms. Fischer asked how this will change things. Ms. Drury-Klein believes the current application process is preventing students from taking the exams after graduation from a CODA-approved school that is not approved by California. The application process for California approval would be a simplified process if the Board were to accept the findings on the CODA accreditation report. Ms. Forsythe requested that the Council look at a side-by-side comparison of CODA standards and the Board's requirements for program approval, to make an educated recommendation to the Board. A subcommittee of Ms. McNealy and Ms. Ramos was established, to analyze the side-by-side comparison prior to the Board's review. Board Staff was then directed to compile a side-by-side comparison with the new CODA standards and to research the issue further.

B. Discussion and Possible Action to Establish an Ad-Hoc Panel of CADAT Representatives, the Dental Assisting Council Chair and Board Staff to Establish, in a Specified Time Period, a New Abbreviated Application for Approval of a Registered Dental Assisting Program for Institutions who are Applying for or have Obtained CODA- Accredited Status

Ms. Drury-Klein requested that the Council appoint an ad-hoc panel to develop an abbreviated application and process for those programs that have obtained CODA accreditation. Staff was directed to work with CADAT on creating an abbreviated application and process.

C. Discussion and Possible Action to Formally Recognize All New CODA-Accredited RDA Programs as Being Approved by the Dental Board and Whose Graduates Shall be Deemed Qualified to Sit for the California Examinations

Ms. Drury-Klein asked for the Council to consider recognizing all CODA-accredited programs so that the students of non-Board approved programs may sit for an upcoming examination.

D. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve, as Eligible Candidates, Examination Applications from Graduates of a CODA-Accredited Dental Assisting Program Outside of California who Shall Present, as Part of the Examination Application, Evidence of Graduation from a CODA-Accredited Program and the California Specific Certifications, Without Necessity to Obtain Additional Work Experience to Qualify

Ms. Wallace requested that Board Staff work with a subcommittee to research Business and Professions Code Section 1752.1 (c) relating to *Licensing as registered dental assistant; Educational and examination requirements; Obtaining permit as orthodontic assistant or dental sedation assistant*. Council directed staff to research this item.

E. Discussion and Possible Action to Seek Legislative Clarity in the Dental Board Sunset Review Legislation, Language Allowing for Graduates of Both Board-Approved and CODA Programs to be Eligible for Application to Take the State Board Examination for the RDA

Ms. Fischer explained that Ms. Drury-Klein previously requested that the Board seek clarification of this in the Sunset Review process.

6. Public Comment of Items Not on the Agenda

There was no public comment.

7. Future Agenda Items

There were no future agenda item requests.

8. Council Member Comments for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no Council member requests.

9. Adjournment

Ms. Lua, Chair, adjourned the Council meeting at 3:07 p.m.