

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTEERISM

Background: At its August 2021 meeting, the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) considered the Report of the Standing Committee on Nominations, noting that the Standing Committee expressed concerns regarding the difficulty in obtaining public member representation on the Commission and its Review Committees. Following consideration of the Report of the Standing Committee on Nominations, the Commission directed formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to further study the topic of volunteerism and stipend for all Commission volunteers, at all levels of the Commission, including its site visitors, review committee members, and Board of Commissioners. The Ad Hoc Committee considered the topic of volunteerism and submitted a report to the Commission in Winter 2022 (**Appendix 1**). The Commission concurred with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee was delayed.

In Spring 2023, the Ad Hoc Committee on Volunteerism continued its work. The Committee met on May 23, 2023 and August 4, 2023. Committee members included: Dr. Barbara Krieg-Menning (chair), Dr. Scott DeRossi, Ms. Martha McCaslin (absent May 23), Dr. Monica Nenad, Dr. Miriam Robbins, Dr. Nancy Rosenthal (absent May 23), and Dr. Marshall Titus (absent May 23 and August 4). Dr. Carol Anne Murdoch-Kinch attended the May 23, 2023 meeting only, and is no longer a member of the Commission. Dr. Sanjay Mallya, chair, Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA), *ex-officio*, attended the August 4, 2023 meeting. Dr. Sherin Took, senior director, and Ms. Jamie Asher Hernandez (absent August 4), Ms. Katie Navickas (absent May 23), Ms. Yesenia Ruiz (absent August 4), Ms. Peggy Soeldner, and Ms. Kelly Stapleton (absent August 4), managers, CODA, were also in attendance.

The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed its charge and prior report to the Commission, including recommendations and actions taken by the Commission in Winter 2022. The Committee discussed the two (2) remaining areas of consideration, as follows.

The Ad Hoc Committee again noted CODA's directive for a financial comparative analysis study, which will occur later this year through the Finance Committee and will include consideration of the Commission's funding model to determine the impact of a stipend and honorarium on the Commission's operational budget. The Ad Hoc Committee noted that the comparative analysis could also include a review of methods by which other agencies compensate volunteers (volunteer compensation strategies) and related funding mechanism. Consideration of the amount of stipend awarded and eligibility for stipend (i.e., currently only awarded for volunteer travel) should be considered, including a consideration of stipends for non-travel CODA volunteerism, and heavy workload to prepare for CODA meetings and activities such as site visits. The Committee believed the Commission should review this topic at a future date in conjunction with the work of the Finance Committee. However, the Standing Committee acknowledged that the amount of stipend awarded to volunteers would not likely equate to an individual's personal income for missed work.

The Ad Hoc Committee also considered the Commission's directive that past and current site visitors and current Review Committee members be surveyed to determine barriers to service, perceptions and attitudes toward volunteering, and links of volunteerism to service, promotion and tenure within their institutions. The Ad Hoc Committee noted, anecdotally, that volunteerism has declined due to lack of time, inability to get approval to volunteer and/or travel, and other personal and professional commitments, as barriers to volunteerism. Prior to consideration of a survey to Commission volunteers, the Ad Hoc Committee conducted an informal survey of other accrediting agencies, noting that some agencies are also struggling with volunteerism while others appear to have sufficient volunteers. Challenges of volunteerism affecting some accrediting agencies are like those of the Commission. Some agencies provide stipends greater than the Commission, while other agencies acknowledge difficulty in providing a stipend commensurate with an individual's daily salary. The Ad Hoc Committee again noted that volunteering within the Commission requires many hours of preparation in addition to the time spent conducting Commission activities.

The Ad Hoc Committee did not believe that a survey of past and current site visitors and current Review Committee members was warranted at this time, to determine barriers to service, perceptions and attitudes toward volunteering, and links of volunteerism to service, promotion and tenure within their institutions. The Committee noted that a future survey may be appropriate following the Finance Committee's budget analysis. Additionally, the Committee was informed that in some disciplines volunteerism is returning since the COVID-19 pandemic.

Following consideration, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that other gestures of appreciation may be appropriate and should be further investigated by the Commission, through its staff, including the following:

- Approaching Dental Deans to express the importance of faculty development and volunteerism with CODA. Additionally, encouraging volunteerism among all dental disciplines within CODA's purview.
- Exploring a partnership with the American Dental Association to offer Continuing Education (CE) for the Commission's training programs and activities, as available.
- Communicating CODA's appreciation for volunteerism through certificates of appreciation and letters to CODA Site Visitors, Review Committee Members, and Commissioners, with copy to the individual's leadership. This could include a mailed certificate and an electronic thank you card for an individual's generosity of time and service to CODA, without which CODA would not be able to conduct its accreditation program.

The Ad Hoc Committee concluded its work, with recommendations noted above, and an understanding that the issue of volunteerism would be further considered through the Standing Committee on Finance, as described above.

Ad Hoc Committee on Volunteerism Recommendations: It is recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct continued review of volunteerism through the

Standing Committee on Finance, in conjunction with the financial comparative analysis study.

It is further recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct Commission staff to communicate the importance of volunteerism to the communities of interest, and to explore additional methods through which the Commission may express appreciation to its volunteers, including offering continuing education, issuing certificates of appreciation, or other methods, as available.

Commission Action:

WINTER 2022 REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTEERISM

Background: At its August 2021 meeting, the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) considered the Report of the Standing Committee on Nominations, noting that the Standing Committee expressed concerns regarding the difficulty in obtaining public member representation on the Commission and its Review Committees. The Committee noted that volunteerism has diminished; further, reaching the public audience to obtain nominations for public members has become increasingly difficult. The Committee observed that most volunteers, whether public or within the dental profession, expect to be compensated for the extensive time and effort they must dedicate to the work of the organization for which they are volunteering. The Committee also noted the heavy workload for the Commission's site visitors, Review Committee members, and Commissioners when conducting the work of the Commission.

Following consideration of the Report of the Standing Committee on Nominations, the Commission directed formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to further study the topic of volunteerism and stipend for all Commission volunteers, at all levels of the Commission, including its site visitors, review committee members, and Board of Commissioners. The Ad Hoc Committee could consider topics including:

- 1) Investigating whether a stipend can be offered, or increased for volunteerism. The Standing Committee noted that a \$75 daily stipend is issued to volunteers; however, this stipend is only available if the volunteer travels for the Commission's business. Virtual meetings are not eligible for the disbursement of a stipend for volunteer's efforts.
- 2) Potential extension of term limits or permitted additional terms. The Standing Committee noted that public volunteers may complete two (2), consecutive four-year terms. Discipline-specific volunteers may complete two (2), four-year terms with a one-year period between terms.
- 3) Potential assignment of public members to multiple Review Committees. The Standing Committee noted that some Review Committees' workloads may be such that a single public member could participate as a member of more than one Review Committee during their tenure as a Review Committee Public Member. The Committee noted that they may be positive and negative benefits to this arrangement, which the Commission may wish to further consider.

The Commission Chair appointed the following individuals to the Ad Hoc Committee on Volunteerism: Dr. Barbara Krieg-Menning (chair), Dr. Scott DeRossi, Dr. Susan Kass, Ms. Martha McCaslin, Dr. Carol Anne Murdoch-Kinch, Dr. Miriam Robbins, Dr. Nancy Rosenthal, and Dr. Marshall Titus. The Ad Hoc Committee conducted a virtual meeting on January 5, 2022 and all members were present. Dr. Sherin Tooks, director, CODA, Ms. Jamie Asher Hernandez, Ms. Kirsten Nadler, Ms. Jennifer Snow, and Ms. Peggy Soeldner, managers, CODA, and Ms. Cathryn Albrecht, senior associate general counsel, ADA/CODA, were in attendance.

Below is the Ad Hoc Committee's report and recommendations to the Commission following its January 5, 2022 meeting.

Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee:

Stipend and Honorarium: The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed its charge and the information that was collected to support the work of the Committee. The Committee began its discussion noting that currently the Commission on Dental Accreditation applies the American Dental Association's volunteer travel and reimbursement policies and procedures to the volunteer work of the Commission. Under the current volunteer travel and reimbursement policy, CODA volunteers are reimbursed for travel expenses and provided a minimal stipend to offset miscellaneous expenses while traveling. The stipend is provided only when a volunteer travels; therefore, when work is completed virtually there is no reimbursement and no stipend for the efforts of the volunteer. The Committee discussed whether the Commission should adopt an honorarium process by which all CODA volunteers receive an honorarium for their time and work effort, regardless of travel. The honorarium would serve as an acknowledgement and appreciation of the volunteer's tremendous effort to support the CODA's mission and accreditation program.

The Ad Hoc Committee noted that since 2015, the Commission has demonstrated fiscal responsibility, covering both direct and indirect expenses. Nonetheless, the Ad Hoc Committee recognized that the shift from a stipend to honorarium, or a combination of both, could have a financial impact on the Commission that must be carefully analyzed prior to a final decision on this matter. The Committee noted that a review of the stipend and honorarium is warranted and, perhaps, the Commission could consider providing the stipend and honorarium when travel is involved, and an honorarium when travel is not involved. The Ad Hoc Committee noted the modification to volunteer reimbursement protocols would require development of an honorarium and policy for its application, which the Committee believed could be \$100 per day.

The Ad Hoc Committee believed that further information should be gathered related to the following: 1) the budget impact of adding an honorarium along with the stipend, and policy for the use of each; 2) further study of the reasons for the lack of volunteers (e.g. workload, time, effort, reimbursement, recognition, etc.), cultural changes in volunteerism, and potential long-term impact to CODA accreditation activities; and 3) review of other volunteer models used to sustain volunteerism, such as reimbursement models and use of volunteers (e.g. volunteers versus salaried reviewers).

The Ad Hoc Committee noted that the CODA Standing Committee on Finance could be charged with reviewing the CODA funding model to determine the impact of a stipend and honorarium on CODA's operational budget. Further, to obtain the necessary information to study the impact of volunteerism on CODA's work, the Ad Hoc Committee believed that surveys of past and current site visitors and current CODA Review Committee members should be conducted to determine barriers to service, perceptions and attitudes toward volunteering, and links of volunteerism to service, promotion and tenure within their institutions.

Committee Member Term Limits: In further discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the Commission's term limits within the various CODA policies and procedures for Commissioners, Review Committee members, and Site Visitors. The Committee specifically noted that in Review Committees, the public member may complete two (2), consecutive four-year terms. Discipline-specific volunteers may complete two (2), four-year terms with a one-year period between terms. Following discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that policies and term limitations should be retained; however, the Commission should explore strategies to generate additional public members utilizing external networks.

Public Members on Multiple Review Committees: In its final meeting discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee continued to focus on the difficulty in finding public members to serve on the Commission, noting that CODA's Board of Commissioners includes four (4) public members and a public member also serves on each CODA's 17 Review Committees. The Committee discussed the concept of a public member serving on multiple review committees, particularly for the smaller review committees where the workload may not be extensive. Following discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee determined that some Review Committees' workloads may be such that a single public member could participate as a member of more than one (1) Review Committee during their tenure as a Review Committee Public Member. The Ad Hoc Committee believed that assignment of public members to multiple Review Committees should be permitted. The proposed revision to the policy on Review Committees and Review Committee Meetings is provided in **Appendix 1**.

Ad Hoc Committee on Volunteerism Recommendations: It is recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct the Standing Committee on Finance to review the Commission's funding model to determine the impact of a stipend and honorarium on the Commission's operational budget, with a report to the Commission in Summer 2022.

It is further recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct a survey of past and current site visitors and current Review Committee members to determine barriers to service, perceptions and attitudes toward volunteering, and links of volunteerism to service, promotion and tenure within their institutions, with further consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee on Volunteerism and Commission in Summer 2022.

It is further recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct that term limits for all Commission volunteers be retained, as dictated by current Commission policy.

It is further recommended that the Commission on Dental Accreditation direct that a single public member may serve as a member of more than one (1) Review Committee during their tenure as a Review Committee Public Member, effective immediately, with

revision to the Commission's Evaluation and Operational Policies and Procedures as noted in **Appendix 1**.

Commission Action:

II. REVIEW COMMITTEES AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

A. REVIEW COMMITTEES AND REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETINGS

1. **Structure:** The chair of each Review Committee will be the appointed Commissioner from the relevant discipline.
 - i. The Commission will appoint all Review Committee members.
 - a. Review Committee positions not designated as discipline-specific will be appointed from the Commission where feasible, e.g. a public representative on the Commission could be appointed to serve as the public member on the Dental Laboratory Technology Review Committee; an ADA appointee to the Commission could be appointed to the Dental Assisting Review Committee as the general dentist practitioner.
 - b. Discipline-specific positions on Review Committees will be filled by appointment by the Commission of an individual from a small group of qualified nominees (at least two) submitted by the relevant national organization, discipline-specific sponsoring organization or certifying board. Nominating organizations may elect to rank their nominees, if they so choose. If fewer than two (2) qualified nominees are submitted, the appointment process will be delayed until such time as the minimum number of required qualified nominations is received.
 - ii. Consensus is the method used for decision making; however if consensus cannot be reached and a vote is required, then the Chair may only vote in the case of a tie (American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures).
 - iii. Member terms will be staggered, four year appointments; multiple terms may be served on the same or a different committee, with a one-year waiting period between terms. A maximum of two (2) terms may be served in total. The one-year waiting period between terms does not apply to public members.
 - iv. One public member will be appointed to each committee. Following consideration of workload, public members may concurrently serve on more than one (1) Review Committee.
 - v. The size of each Review Committee will be determined by the committee's workload.
 - vi. As a committee's workload increases, additional members will be appointed while maintaining the balance between the number of content experts and non-content experts. Committees may formally request an additional member through New Business at Review Committee/Commission meetings. If an additional member is approved, this member must be a joint nomination from the professional organization and certifying board, as applicable.
 - vii. Conflict of interest policies and procedures are applicable to all Review Committee members.
 - viii. Review Committee members who have not been on a site visit within the last two (2) years prior to their appointment on a Review Committee should observe at least one site visit within their first year of service on the Review Committee.
 - ix. In the event that fewer than 50% of discipline-specific experts are present for any one discipline, the decision by a quorum of the Review Committee shall be acceptable. In the case of less than 50% of discipline-specific experts, including the Chair, available for a review committee meeting, for specified agenda items or for the entire meeting, the Review Committee Chair may temporarily appoint an additional discipline-specific expert(s) with the approval of the CODA Director. The substitute should be a previous Review Committee member or an individual approved by both the Review Committee Chair and the CODA Director. The substitute would have the privileges of speaking, making motions and voting.
 - x. Consent agendas may be used by Review Committees, when appropriate, and may be approved

by a quorum of the Review Committee present at the meeting.

Revised: 2/22; 8/20; 1/20; 8/18; 8/17; 2/15; 1/14, 2/13, 8/10, 7/09; 7/08; 7/07; Adopted:
1/06