las puntuaciones en el enfoque profundo es muy superior a la media del enfoque superficial, lo cual propone que los alumnos muestran una tendencia a la comprensión en su proceso de aprendizaje. Mediante esta investigación conocimos cuáles son los problemas que tienen, en forma individual o grupal, y en consecuencia los docentes podrán corregir la modalidad de trasmitir los conocimientos teóricos y prácticos, los resultados en las evaluaciones parciales e integradoras, la bibliografía a utilizar y toda otra cuestión que surja.

Reality of Learning Approaches in Students of the U.N.L.P School of Dentistry

AUTHORS: SAPORITTI FERNANDO OMAR; MEDINA, MARÍA MERCEDES; COSCARELLI NÉLIDA YOLANDA; RUEDA LETICIA; SEARA SERGIO; TOMAS LEANDRO; PAPEL GUSTAVO; TISSONE SEBASTIAN; BANDER MELINA; CONTE CECILIA; LOZANO SILVINA; SALVATORE ALBERTO; TAPIA GABRIELA EDITH; JOTKO CLAUDIA; PEREZ VALERIA; HERRERA MAXIMILIANO. WORKPLACE. NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LA PLATA. SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY

The research was related to knowing the learning approaches in students of 1st, 3rd and 5th year of the Faculty of Dentistry of the U.N.L.P., during the year 2019, considering it relevant within teaching. This interest in learning about the learning approaches of the students generated a contribution to optimize the teaching-learning processes of the students. Objective: Know the different types of learning approaches of 1st, 3rd and 5th year students of the Faculty of Dentistry of the U.N.L.P. during the 2019 period. Methodology: A type, qualitative and quantitative research was carried out. The research design was descriptive cross-sectional, explanatory, correlational. The Revised Study Process Questionnaire (R-SPQ-2F, The Revised Two-factor Study Process Questionnaire) prepared, validated and authorized for Latin America by Biggs, et al. (2001) and also validated by Leung and Chan (2001) was used. in its latest reduced version and adapted to Spanish. A sample was taken of N = 80 1st year students, N = 80 3rd year students and N = 80 5th year students of the degree during 2019, to know the deep and superficial learning approaches of the same. Results: According to the deep focus classification, 1st year students are: little related = 63 (86.3%), 3rd year students are intermediate = 50 (48.1%) and 5th year students totally related = 42 (66.7%). In the superficial focus classification, the 1st year students are: related = 66 (82.5%), the 3rd year students are intermediate = 53 (66.3.1%) and the 5th year students little related = 48 (60%). Conclusion: The average of the scores in the deep approach is much higher than the average of the superficial approach, which proposes that the students show a tendency towards understanding in their learning process. Through this research we learned what the problems are, individually or in groups, and consequently teachers will be able to correct the way of transmitting theoretical and practical knowledge, the results of partial and integrative evaluations, the bibliography to be used and all other question that arises.

Comparación De Evaluaciones.

AUTORES: PEÑALVA MARÍA ANAHÍ; TOSTI SONIA BEATRIZ; DETTBARN JORGE ALBERTO; CECHO ANALIA CRISTINA; DI TULLIO ALFREDO; DOMINGUEZ GABRIEL ERNESTO. FACULTAD DE ODONTOLOGÍA. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE LA PLATA. ASIGNATURA FISIOLOGÍA

Objetivo: comparar la corrección de una misma evaluación ejecutada por dos docentes distintos. Metodología: a 51 estudiantes de la asignatura Fisiología se les tomó una evaluación, después de la clase, la cual estaba conformada por cuatro preguntas sobre el tema desarrollado. Se fotocopiaron las evaluaciones antes de la corrección y se entregaron 51 evaluaciones a cada docente. La formación de ambos es similar pero el docente "A" tiene mayor antigüedad, por lo tanto, más experiencia y goza de un nivel jerárquico dentro del plantel de la asignatura. El

docente "B" conlleva menor experiencia y es un auxiliar docente. El criterio de corrección fue aprobar solamente a aquellos estudiantes que tuviesen tres respuestas correctas y completas como mínimo. Es decir, no se consideraron respuestas incompletas, regulares o preguntas no respondidas. Análisis de los resultados de las evaluaciones: en 48 evaluaciones se coincidió en el número de aprobados (21) y de desaprobados (28) .En tres evaluaciones hubo divergencias. Análisis de cada una de las cuatro preguntas: Respuestas a la pregunta 1: Docente "A" no responden 3, Incompletas: 9, incorrectas 9, correctas, 30, docente "B:" 3 no responden,12 incorrectas, 27 correctas, incompletas: 9. Respuestas a la pregunta 2: Docente "A" no responden 6, 12 incompletas, 18 incorrectas,15 correctas; docente "B": no respondidas 6, 15 incompletas, 15 correctas y 15 incorrectas. Con respecto a la pregunta 3, el docente "A" señaló   3 preguntas sin responder, marcó 13 incompletas, 29 correctas y 6 incorrectas, mientras que el docente "B" señaló 3 preguntas sin respuestas, 33 correctas y 15 incorrectas. En cuanto a la pregunta 4: El docente "A" señaló 6 preguntas sin contestar y consideró: 13 incompletas, 25 correctas y 7 incorrectas. A la vez, el docente "B" señaló: 6 no responden a la pregunta,27 correctas, 5 incorrectas y 13 incompletas.

Comparison of Evaluations

AUTORES: PEÑALVA MARÍA ANAHÍ; TOSTI SONIA BEATRIZ; DETTBARN JORGE ALBERTO; CECHOANALIA CRISTINA; DI TULLIO ALFREDO; DOMINGUEZ GABRIEL ERNESTO. FACULTAD DE ODONTOLOGÍA. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE LA PLATA. ASIGNATURA FISIOLOGÍA

Objective: to compare the correction of the same evaluation carried out by two different teachers. Methodology: 51 students of the Physiology subject underwent an evaluation, after the class, which consisted of four questions on the developed topic. The training of both is similar but the teacher "A" he is older, therefore, more experienced and enjoys a hierarchical level within the subject's campus. Teacher "B" has less experience and is a teaching assistant. The correction criterion was to approve only those students who had at least three correct and complete answers. In other words, incomplete, regular answers or unanswered questions were not considered. Analysis of the results of the evaluations: in 48 evaluations, the number of passes (21) and disapproved (28) coincided. In three evaluations there were divergences. Analysis of each of the four questions: Answers to question 1: Teacher "A" did not answer 3, Incomplete: 9, Answers to question 2: Teacher "A" does not answer 6, 12 incomplete, 18 incorrect, 15 correct; teacher "B": 6 unanswered, Regarding question 3, teacher "A" indicated 3 unanswered questions, marked 13 incomplete, 29 correct and 6 incorrect, while teacher "B" pointed to 3 questions without answers, 33 correct and 15 incorrect. Regarding question 4: Teacher "A" pointed out 6 unanswered questions and considered: 13 incompletes, 25 correct and 7 incorrect. At the same time, teacher "B" pointed out: 6 did not answer the question, 27 correct, 5 incorrect and 13 incompletes

Quiste Apical Inflamatorio: Su Registro En El Laboratorio De Anatomía Patológica.

AUTORES: MERINO GRACIELA; MAYOCCHI KARINA; DORATI PABLO; MAYOCCHI MARTIN; ECHEVERRIA NAOMI; SIRIMARCO KARINA; BLASETTI NAHUEL; de VITA LUCAS; ARCURI AGUSTINA. LABORATORIO DE BIOLOGÍA MOLECULAR Y BIOTECNOLOGÍA FOLP- UNLP.

Introducción: las lesiones inflamatorias de la región apical subsecuentes a la infección y necrosis del órgano dentinopulpar, son de alta frecuencia. Dentro de la clasificación de los quistes de los maxilares (OMS 1992, OMS 2017) los quistes odontogénicos inflamatorios, en especial el apical es el más comunicado en todas las series. Objetivos: comunicar una serie de lesiones quísticas de los maxilares diagnosticadas en nuestro laboratorio y caracterizar al quiste apical