

DH Restorative
Mock Board Results Summary
 DH 245 Mock 1

Appendix 1a

| PCC Student # | MOCK WREB CANDIDATE # | Student NAME | Amalgam | | | | | Composite | | | | | Students' Final Score | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|---------|----------|----------|------|----------------|------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------------|----------|------|------|------|
| | | | SURFACE SCORES | | | ERRORS | | SURFACE SCORES | | | ERRORS | | | | | | |
| | | | Occlusal | Margins | Proximal | Occlusal | | | | Occlusal | Margins | Proximal | | Occlusal | | | |
| | | | | | | O2.1 | O2.2 | O2.3 | O2.4 | | | | | | O2.5 | O2.1 | O2.2 |
| 1 | 214 | | 2 | 4 | 4 | X | X | X | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | 3.55 | |
| 2 | 201 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | 3.85 | |
| 3 | 210 | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | 3.85 | |
| 4 | 202 | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | 2 | 4 | 4 | X | X | 3.55 | |
| 6 | 204 | | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 3 | | | 3.50 | |
| 7 | 209 | | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3.18 | |
| 8 | 208 | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 5 | 4 | | | 3.88 | |
| 9 | 217 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | 4 | 3 | 4 | | | 3.33 | |
| 23 | 205 | | 4 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | 3.40 | |
| 11 | 211 | | 4 | 5 | 4 | | | | | | 4 | 5 | 3 | | | 4.18 | |
| 12 | 215 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | X | X | | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | | | 3.38 | |
| 13 | 213 | | 4 | 5 | 4 | | | | | | 2 | 4 | 4 | X | | 3.88 | |
| 14 | 203 | | 2 | 4 | 3 | X | X | | X | | 4 | 5 | 3 | | | 3.53 | |
| 15 | 216 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | 3.05 | |
| 16 | 206 | | 2 | 4 | 4 | | X | X | X | X | 3 | 2 | 3 | | | 3.20 | |
| 17 | 219 | | 4 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | 3.50 | |
| 18 | 220 | | 4 | 5 | 3 | | | | | | 4 | 5 | 4 | | | 4.18 | |
| 19 | 212 | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 20 | 207 | | 3 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3.18 | |
| 41 | 218 | | 2 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 3.35 | |
| DATA STATISTICS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Scores | | | 2.95 | 4.00 | 3.53 | | | | | | | 3.21 | 3.89 | 3.53 | | | 3.55 |
| TOTAL ERRORS PER CATEGORY | | | | | | O2.1 | O2.2 | O2.3 | O2.4 | O2.5 | | | | | O2.1 | O2.2 | |
| | | | | | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 2 | 1 | |
| % of Errors Made | | | | | | 17% | 25% | 8% | 17% | 8% | | | | | 17% | 8% | |

Passed **ABOVE MINIMUM** expectations >75%
 Passed **AT MINIMUM** passing Score of 75% (WREB Standard)
BELOW MINIMUM <75% - Failed Attempt- Must be Repeated, Remediation needed

Analysis of the Data:

- 100% Passing rate for this report vs. 7/19 students from previous report
- 68% fewer errors were made by students on their exam
- Students were still stronger in placing amalgam restorations
- Nearly 60% of all errors made (7/12 = 58.3%) were in only
- 2 categories:
 - Amalgam O2.1 – *Anatomy inadequately carved and/or over/under carved*
 - Composite O2.1 – *Anatomy inadequately carved and/or over/under carved*
- All errors were made within only 5 categories vs. 8 categories in previous report
- Of the students who had errors:
 - The average point deduction was 1.13
 - 7 students had only -1 point
 - 1 students had -2 points

- **Discussion:**
 - New grading system by the WREB examination board resulted in changing the way grading happened.
 - Surfaces were graded for more accurate difficulty
 - Teaching curriculum changed to match the emphasis on certain surfaces
 - Information from previous report also supported changes in the curriculum to improve student outcomes. This report confirms that the actions taken have resulted in global improvements to student learning and outcomes.