

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2011– 2012

Part A: General Information**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	Dental School
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	BChD 4 th year

Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk.

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Academic Quality and Standards**
Academic Quality and Standards Team
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**Matters for Urgent Attention**

If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box

Only applicable in first year of appointment

Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School

The School are to be congratulated on the successful transition to a module-based curriculum. This has involved a huge amount of time and effort. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Programme Managers along with the 4th Year Lead who have co-ordinated this for the 4th year programme. This new curriculum sees the School very well placed in meeting the requirements of the newly published learning outcomes of the General Dental Council, 'Preparing for practice – dental teams learning outcomes for registration'. A whole new assessment rubric is in place to ensure that students are rigorously assessed. The School is at the forefront of innovation in dental learning, teaching and assessment. I had the opportunity on my recent visit to trial the MOOG dental simulator, which is an added resource that will be available to students to enhance their clinical skills.

1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

The ILOs, structure, content and standards of the programme are appropriate to 4th year BChD.

2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The General Dental Council has recently published new learning outcomes for dental education, 'Preparing for practice – dental teams learning outcomes for registration'. This replaces its previous guidance – 'The First Five Years – Third Edition (Interim 2008)'. It is the intention of the GDC that the new learning outcomes be incorporated into dental curricula for the first time in the academic year 2012-13. The learning outcomes cover four domains – clinical, communication, professionalism and management and leadership. The learning outcomes of the revised curriculum for 4th year BChD cover these domains effectively. The programme compares very favourably with those in other schools in the British Isles.

3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The students undergo very rigorous assessment with a number of formative, summative and progressional assessments throughout the 4th year and a variety of assessment methods are used, as is good practice.

In the clinical medical sciences module, 40% of the marks were allocated to the clinical diary which involves the writing up of one clinical case with a significant medical history – I feel this proportion is a little high and the school may wish to consider reducing this to, perhaps, 30%.

Assessment of the CCD2 module comprises a paediatric and orthodontic paper, both of which have to be passed. Three students failed the paediatric paper and so have to sit a supplemental paper in this component. One of these students was also clearly weak in orthodontics, barely passing the orthodontic paper. I suggest that students who fail one of these components and get <55% in the other, should sit a supplemental paper in both components.

Finally, the assessment that most students failed was the periodontal case which accounts for 10% of the clinical practice 4 module. There is no compensation within this module and so students who failed this assessment failed the module. Some of these students had performed extremely well in the other assessments in the year. This assessment is the first time they have a summative chair-side assessment of a clinical case under their care. In view of this I feel consideration should be given to introducing a degree of compensation with the OSCE examination in the same module.

Student performance indicated that the quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods was high.

4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

There was a wide range in student performance, with most of the students performing well. Their performance was similar to that of students at the same level in my home institution.

As indicated above, the most challenging module was the clinical practice 4 module, in particular the OSCE and periodontal case presentation. In the CCD 2 module, both questions on caries were answered poorly, with approximately 50% of the class failing the question on management of caries in a deciduous molar.

5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

Leeds Dental Institute has excellent clinical facilities and highly motivated clinical supervisors. There are very well equipped and staffed clinical skills laboratories.

The students have OSCEs in both dentistry – procedures and communication - and in clinical medical sciences. The OSCEs are standard set and students have to pass at least 50% of the stations in each domain. There is also a newly introduced clinical 'spotter' test in the CAD 2 module and it was interesting to note that students who performed badly in the OSCE, also generally performed poorly in this spotter.

The scenario based paper in the clinical practice module has been a feature of the assessment for several years and reflects the integrated approach that is required to patient management in 'real life'.

A clinical case presentation has been introduced to the fourth year assessment rubric for the first time this year. Having a clinical case component in the examination is a welcome development and very useful preparation for the clinical

examinations in final year.

6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.

The programme has undergone huge changes in the last year with the development of modules. There are five modules, which comprise clinical medical sciences, complex adult dentistry, child centred dentistry, personal and professional development and clinical practice 4.

I was very impressed by the reflective assignment in the personal and professional development module on team working. Students drew on their own experiences of good and bad team working and were given excellent and informed feedback.

I welcome the fact that marking criteria for SAQs will be introduced to the 4th year programme next year. This will facilitate grading based on evidence of the students' understanding of the subject matter.

7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.

The curriculum and assessment meet the recommendations of the Association of Dental Education in Europe as outlined in the recent publication by Manogue et al. (Manogue M. et al. Curriculum structure, content, learning and assessment in European undergraduate dental education – update 2010, European Journal of Dental Education 2011 Vol 15; 133-141).

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

8. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

n/a

9. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

- Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.

Yes

10. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

- The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.

Yes

11. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes – I was provided with all draft examination papers. The level of questioning was generally appropriate. All my comments were addressed and, in the one instance where I felt a question was not challenging enough, the question was modified to test the students more.

12. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes – all examined work was made available to me. Scripts were clearly annotated.

13. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

n/a

14. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

Yes to all of above

15. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

Yes.

Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

I learned at my recent visit that there will be two external examiners for 4th year in future years – one with dental expertise and the other with clinical medical sciences expertise - and I welcome this. I would like to thank the School for inviting me to be their 4th year BChD external examiner for the last four years. I have enjoyed and learned from the experience and thank all the staff for their helpfulness and hospitality over the years.

Leeds Dental Institute

University of Leeds
Clarendon Way
Leeds LS2 9LU



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

11 February 2013

Dear

Thank you for your report on our 2011-12 4th year examinations. Your input into the examinations process was greatly appreciated and is invaluable in helping us to further improve our standards of examining.

We are pleased to see that you found our examinations and the performance of our students reflected high quality teaching, learning and assessment and that assessments introduced into the modular assessment system such as the CAD spotter and Periodontology clinical case have been positive developments. Your comments with regards to the Periodontology Case and possible compensation with the OSCE will be carefully considered. We will also review the weighting of the CMS clinical diary and resit requirements for the Paediatric and Orthodontic elements of CCD2 in light of your suggestions.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and for your valuable contribution to the Year 4 assessment process over the last 4 Years. The move to modular assessment was a challenge but your contribution helped to make it an overall success. We appreciate that the workload involved was significant and that the move to modular assessment has perhaps increased this workload whilst making it in some areas, more subject specific. With this in mind we felt it would be more appropriate for two External Examiners from different specialties to be involved in Year 4 and as you have indicated in your report, this has been organised for the new academic year.

Yours sincerely,