

National Educational Stratification Of Dental Schools In Iran

Mohammadi A, MD, MPH¹; Mojtahehdzadeh R, MD, MPH¹;
Hosseini Toodashki H, DDS²

¹ The Secretariat for Education and Student Affairs of Ministry of Health and Medical Education of Iran

² Chairperson, Dental Education and Postgraduate Council, Minister for Education and Student Affairs of Ministry of Health and Medical Education of Iran

Received: December, 2005

Accepted: April, 2005

Abstract

Background and purpose: After two decades of expansion of universities of medical sciences and increasing the number of medical sciences students as one of the most attainable solutions for the problem of substandard status of Iranian community health, recently, quality-based policies in medical education have taken priority over most of the national health plans. The purpose of this study was to determine differences of Iranian dental schools in the field of education by stratifying their educational services.

Methods: To measure the educational performance that could be utilized to rate the schools nationwide, a benchmarking tool, consisting of about 60 indicators, was devised. Each school was asked to introduce a representative who would complete a questionnaire, which was designed to collect schools' information. In the next step, all the divisions were visited by one of the project's members and the school's representative to revise and approve the data. Then, data retrieval was performed and verified at the project's office. Finally, a special computer software was exploited to perform the final analysis.

Results: There were 18 public and private dental schools nationwide, which were stratified based on their individual scores. Furthermore, all schools were also ranked in each indicator.

Conclusion: This study as one of the phases of Strategy Compilation for Educational Missions of the National System of Medical Education, defines the educational strengths and weaknesses of Iranian dental schools that could be used as a measure for authorities to determine the developmental limits and current stance of these schools; and optimize their budget and facilities.

Journal of Medical Education Summer 2005; 7(2);57-61

Introduction

Improving the standards of universities of medical sciences that impacts on education and public health, has been of great concern in many countries especially in the past decades. However, holding academic standards is not a sufficient justification for running for certain educational institutions; and the nation's need graduates must be given priority. Therefore, all

educational service providers in biomedical sciences must first be evaluated and their educational missions and developmental capabilities be certified, and just thereafter go through the systems of accreditation for their programs.

Some countries when encountered the substandard status of the community health and welfare turned to training a higher number of medical staff as one of the most attainable solutions for the problem. But eventually this was not the appropriate solution¹⁻⁴.

In the late 80s, Iranian health community encountered the same problem and employed the same strategy. Unfortunately, this expansion rather involved political concerns and short-term

Corresponding author: Aeen Mohammadi, M.D, M.P.H
 13th floor, Secretariat for Education and Student Affairs,
 Ministry of Health and Medical Education, Simaye Iran
 St., Falamak Jonoobi Ave, Shahrake Ghods, Tehran
 1467664961, Iran

E-mail: a_mohammadi@mohme.gov.ir

goals than a systematic long term planning. So, the growth was disproportionate to the resources and facilities of the time.

Although these movements realized some of the government's goals, such as a higher number of medical sciences graduates, the allocated budget and resources were not sufficient and many educational centers had to provide much more services at a less expense.

Now, after about two decades the previous concerns are alleviated and the former quantity-based policy is giving way to a more quality-seeking attitude.

The most rational approach to this transformation is adjusting the number of post-graduate institutions, shrinking the size of the current institutions in proportion to their potentials, and finally reforming some centers to attain the highest possible quality. So Ministry of Health and Medical Education, as the main accrediting body which deploys a variety of systems for evaluation, accreditation, and rankings of universities of medical sciences; needed to have a full comparative perspective of all schools. The long perceived need for such an approach was eventually solidified in the form of *Strategy Compilation for Educational Missions of the National System of Medical Education* and was put on the agenda of the Secretariat for Education and student Affairs of Ministry of Health and Medical Education. The main objectives of this project were determining the developmental limits and current stance of biomedical educational service providers nationwide, assessing their productivity and finally modifying their functions to meet the nation's needs.

The above mentioned project covered all biomedical programs including medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing, midwifery, health, nutrition, allied health sciences and rehabilitation in all medical universities around the country and *National Stratification of the Dental Schools* was one of its major portions.

Methods

During a period of two years (from February

2002 to January 2004), the stratification of dental schools was performed at the Secretariat for Education and Student Affairs of the Ministry of Health and Medical Education of Iran.

Planning phase

Initially, several sessions were held to define the elements, objectives, methods and implications of the project. The core members of those sessions later formed the Project's Medical Education Expert Panel. The panel also primarily designed data collection questionnaires and criteria and indicators related to each biomedical program.

For the stratification of dental schools, the Committee for Dental Program was formed comprising of the project's executive members, specialists and experts of dentistry, and experts on medical education.

Designing the criteria and indicators

A decision tree is an appropriate tool for the statistical ranking. It also helps us to point out the weakness of our data and to generate further questions. Drawing the decision tree requires accurate information on the desirability of each 'branch'. Also a new variable, the 'probability score', is assigned to each branch that states how desirable it will be if the outcome occurs. In the current project, the desirability of each branch of the tree diagram was determined by the schools' information and displayed as the 'school's score' in that particular branch. The probability score of each branch, which indicated its relative importance among the similar branches, was presented by the 'weight' of the branch.

The Dental Expert Panel devised a set of criteria and indicators as a decision tree template for evaluation of the educational service provision by dental schools. For this reason, medical education standards of various accreditation systems such as: the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME)⁵, World Federation for Medical Education (WFME)⁶, Asociacion Mexicana de Facultades Y Escuelas de Medicina (AMFEM)⁷, the Australian Medical Council (AMC)⁸ and General Medical Council (GMC)⁹ were thoroughly investigated to devise the criteria and indicators to the current system of

education in Iran. Some of the college rankings like U.S. News and World Report Rankings¹⁰, MacLean's Rankings¹¹, Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (DAAD)¹², SWISSUP Rankings¹³, Top American Research Universities¹⁴, The 2000 National Doctoral Program Survey¹⁵ and Baldrige National Quality Program¹⁶ were also considered to cover all possible criteria that could be mentioned in the project. Furthermore, the set of criteria and indicators used in *Comprehensive National Rankings of the Medical Schools of Iran*¹⁷ were considered in this study.

The list of the criteria was then further refined through brainstorming. Eventually, the listed items were sorted hierarchically. Each and every criterion and indicator was operationally defined and its scoring guideline was designed to ensure reasonable validity and reliability of the scoring across different schools.

Table 1 presents the tree diagram of the set of evaluated criteria and indicators of this project with their individual weights that covers nearly all aspects of education in a typical dental school. The chart is mainly divided into input, process, and output sections.

After scoring every criterion and indicator pertaining to each school, the final analysis started. Due to the complexity of the calculations for each main branch score, the computer programming team of the project made a special software under the Windows based C++ programming language.

Results

There are 16 public and 2 private accredited dental schools in Iran. The oldest modern dental school, Tehran Dental School, was established in 1934 and the latest ones were built in 1990. All dental schools were ranked regarding not only their overall, input, process and output scores but also every criteria and indicator found practical for schools' planning. The highest dental school, Shahid Beheshti Dental School, obtained 70.12 from 100.

Results were published as a book named '*Dental Schools of Iran, Rankings and*

Database'.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to devise a set of criteria and indicators as a benchmarking tool to investigate the quality of education in dental schools and stratify them based on their potentials.

As it is shown in table 1, we tried to design a complete set of criteria and indicators that covers every aspects of education in these schools. To design such a complete tree diagram we considered all criteria and indicators used in similar projects except the ones which were not compatible with Iranian educational system, e.g. freshman retention rate and alumni giving⁵⁻¹⁶. Furthermore, Ministry of Health and Medical Education is the only organization to allocate financial resources to universities in Iran and this procedure is mainly based on the size of universities and their total enrollments. Therefore, it was not necessary to consider the university financial resources and expenditure as a major indicator in our project.

It is worth mentioning that since Ministry of Health and Medical Education manages universities centrally, schools cooperated for gathering the detailed information. That was a point of strength which made this study feasible and reproducible.

Eventually our tree diagram was a good benchmarking tool to identify the points of strengths and weaknesses of schools compared to peer ones. As discussed previously all dental schools in Iran are being accredited annually to reach the minimum standards for training dental students. This project provided practical guidelines for further improvement in dental education considering the national potential, i.e. the results helped the schools have an overview for internal evaluations and planning.

As mentioned previously even the nation's best dental school could not get a total score of 100 and was far away from the optimal status, so it can follow the example of other schools, even those with a lower total score, to overcome its educational weaknesses in specific indicators.

Table 1. The set of criteria and indicators as a decision tree

Division	Division Weight	Category	Category Weight	Criterion	Criterion Weight	Indicator	Indicator Weight
Input	41%	NUEE ¹ score	5%	N/A ²	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Faculty	38.4%	Raw numbers	35%	Full Professors	38%
						Associate Professors	31%
		Facilities and equipment	56.6%	Ratios	65%	Assistant Professors	24%
						Instructors	7%
				Library	11.7%	Student/ faculty ratio	64%
				Computer resources	11.7%	Senior faculty ratio	36%
				Educational spaces of the faculty	16.6%	Facilities ³	33%
				Clinical dental training	60%	Books and Periodicals ⁴	67%
Process	81%	Administration	81%	Students' affairs	28%	Databases	16%
				Faculty affairs	32%	Internet	48%
				Administrative systems	40%	Equipment ⁵	36%
		Support and counseling systems	19%	Students	71%	Classrooms, auditoriums	35%
				Faculty	29%	Laboratories ⁶	65%
						Teaching dental chairs ⁷	53.3%
						Teaching dental sections ⁸	46.7%
						Credits and courses ⁹	40%
Output	20%	Students	73%			Clinical instruction ¹⁰	60%
						Faculty development ¹¹	36%
						Evaluation of faculty's teaching skills ¹²	64%
		Faculty publications	27%			Compliance with regulations ¹³	57%
						Examination assessment	19%
						Syllabus design	24%
						Faculty advisors	67%
						New student orientation	9%
						Student guidebook	13%
						Educational noticeboard	11%
<p>1- National University Entrance Examination score (Konkour). 2- Not applicable. 3- Includes indexing, reading rooms, seating capacity, seats per student, photocopying and printing. 4- Includes number of books, journal titles, number of reference books, and reference books per student. 5- In total number and per student. 6- Includes basic sciences and dental laboratories. 7- In total number and per student. 8- Includes number of separate sections and equipment. 9- Includes curricular credits, computer, English language and research methodology courses. 10- Includes demonstration sessions and allocation of appropriate time to credits. 11- Includes development in medical education, research methodology and computer skills. 12- Consists systematic evaluation of theoretical and clinical teaching. 13- Includes prerequisites, conditional status, dismissal and automated system of registration. 14- National Comprehensive Examination on Basic Sciences.</p>							

On the other hand, this project provided a documented base to optimize schools' budget and facilities, allocate national grants and foster constructive competition among them.

Finally, the analysis of the results of this project can assist the authorities in Ministry of Health and Medical Education to determine the schools' missions considering their national potentials and workforce assessments; e.g. when we have excess dental workforce in country this project suggests strategies for modifying the schools total enrolments, altering their missions and preventing the establishment of new dental schools.

Acknowledgement

Authors wish to thank members of dental expert panel, Dr. Hossein Afshar, Dr. Saeed Asgari and Dr. Ahmad Jafari Ghavam Abadi; and also Dr. Shahram Yazdani.

References

1. Richard A. Cooper. Perspectives on the physician workforce to the year 2020. *JAMA*. 1995; 274 : 1534-1543.
2. Yasuki Kobayashi & Haruyoshi Takaki. Geographic distribution of physicians in Japan. *Lancet*. 1992; 340 : 1391-93
3. Steven A. Schroeder. Western European responses to physician oversupply. *JAMA*. 1984; 252 : 373-84.
4. Medical college of the pacific established in 1872 and national efforts to reform medical education. Available from URL: <http://elane.stanford.edu/wilson/text/22a.html>
5. Liaison Committee on Medical Education. Functions and structure of a medical school. Washington DC: LCME; 2004.
6. World Federation for Medical Education. Basic Medical Education WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement. University of Copenhagen: WFME; 2003.
7. Huacuja HR, Stoneware DC, Lopez OC, Dwells JC, Villalobos JC, Montiel ID, et al. Quality standards of the Mexican medical education. Asociacion Mexicana de Facultades Y Escuelas de Medicina. *Retrieved on 14/12/04*
8. Australian Medical Council. Assessment and Accreditation of Medical Schools: Standards and Procedures. AMC; 2002.
9. General Medical Council of the United Kingdom. Tomorrow's doctors: recommendations on undergraduate medical education. London: GMC; 2003.
10. U.S.News and World Report. America's Best Colleges 2005. *Retrieved on 14/12/04*. Available from: URL:http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/about/index_brief.php
11. Johnston AD, Dwyer M. Methodology: Ranking Canadian universities. *Retrieved on 12/12/04*. Available from: URL: http://www.macleans.ca/universities/article.jsp?content=20031106_111836_3700. 2003
12. Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst. What's special about the CHE and stern university ranking? *Retrieved on 15/12/04*. Available from: URL: <http://www.daad.de/deutschland/en/2.2.9.1.html>. 2003
13. Swissup 2003 Ranking. FAQs and Methodology. *Retrieved on 12/12/04*. Available from: URL: http://www.swissup.com/r2k3_main.cfm?upid=EN. 2003
14. The Center. Top American Research Universities. *Retrieved on 12/12/04*. Available from: URL: <http://thecenter.ufl.edu/research2003.html>. 2003
15. The 2000 National Doctoral Program Survey. *Retrieved on 12/12/04*. Available from: URL: <http://survey.nagps.org/chooseType.php>. 2001
16. Baldrige National Quality Program. Education Criteria for performance excellence. *Retrieved on 14/12/04*. Available from: http://www.quality.nist.gov/PDF_files/2004_Education_Criteria.pdf. 2004
17. Mohammadi A, Mojtabahedzadeh R. Comprehensive National Rankings of the Medical Schools of Iran. Tehran: Ministry of Health and Medical Education; 2001.