

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR: 2015– 2016

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

Faculty / School of:	Leeds University Dental School
Subject(s):	Dental Technology
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Dental Technology Programme
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Diploma in Higher Education

Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner**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 Quality Assurance**
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

none

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?

I was given copies of previous report but not of any response that may have been made by the School

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

Standards

- 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 programme aims and intended learning outcomes are appropriate for the level of the award. Learning outcomes of the programme ensure that the learning outcomes set by the regulating body (GDC) as published in the 'Preparing for Practice' document are met

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.*

I can only compare this program with the one upon which I teach at <<>>. The aims and ILOs are similar and I believe them to meet the QAA benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications ensuring that intended graduate outcomes are met.

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 range of assessment methods were varied and designed to measure the standard which the students had achieved. The marking criteria used is appropriate; arrangements were also in place for second independent marking. There was a wide range of practical and written work on view covering high, mid and lower ranges. The work awarded the mid to the higher range of marks was of a good standard which reflects the quality of teaching and support from the course team.

However I am concerned over the appearance of subjectivity of some of the marking criteria in the theory examination questions

1. Short answer questions - occasionally there are more possible answers than marks available to award for a question
2. With long questions – although a list of points are provided which should be in the answer, it is not clear how the marks are awarded especially when there are more points than marks available.

I'm sure that the students papers are marked in the same manner and that there has been consultation in how the marks are awarded, as there is consistency between 1st and 2nd marker. My concern is that this isn't immediately clear, and the awarding of marks could be subjective rather than objective.

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 is a clear difference in the standard of work as there was a cross-section of students work on view from different year groups both written and practical of varying quality as would be expected.

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

n/a

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.

n/a

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 project undertaken by students in their final year is researched based and this influences the work undertaken by the students. It enables the students to see first-hand how research can affect technical aspects of their work. The work is undertaken to a high standard and the research supported the both the written and technical aspects of the project.

8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD

n/a

For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

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

The Examination/Assessment Process

10. 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.

The guidance I received from the university and mentor with regard to my role was sufficient.

11. 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.

I received the appropriate documentation in good time with regard to the programme structure.

12. 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?

Draft examination papers were provided for each module.

All exam papers were appropriate and set at the correct level. I was consulted on a regular basis regarding any comments/suggestions I might have with regard to examination questions.

13. 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?

I have had the opportunity to visit the university twice during which time I have been able to view a cross section of student's work. The work was of varying quality. Those students who scored at the mid to higher end of the scale produced work of a very good standard and this was marked appropriately.

Samples of exam papers were made available with the solution answers were made available for all of the modules and assessment types encountered by the students. All scripts were clearly marked and annotated with written feedback given to students where appropriate.

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

Yes all projects were of suitable subject areas. The standard of assessment was appropriate.

15. 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?

I attended the Exam Board Meeting for the programme. The board was conducted formally and fairly. The meeting was constructive in nature and I was satisfied with the recommendations made by the board.

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

Yes, a meeting was held to discuss those students with extenuating circumstances prior to the Exam Board. Individual student issues were dealt with both sensitively and in an appropriate manner.

Other comments

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

I would like to say how welcoming everyone has been. The organisation has been well thought out and the days I have been up to look at the students work have run smoothly.

Any queries I've had have been dealt with quickly and professionally.

School of Dentistry

University of Leeds
Clarendon Way
Leeds LS2 9LU

T +44 (0) 113
F +44 (0) 113



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

19 December 2016

Dear

Thank you for submitting your External Examiner's report for the Diploma in Dental Technology, at the School of Dentistry.

The report has been considered by the Undergraduate Programme Management Committee and the School Taught Student Education Committee.

Your feedback and comments on the course aims and intended learning outcomes, being similar to MMU is appreciated. The positive comments you have made regarding the high and good standard of work produced by the students have been passed onto both the staff and the students involved within the programme.

Your concerns over the appearance of subjectivity of some of the marking criteria in the theory examination with both the short and the long questions, is due to their being more possible answers as the questions only ask for 1 or possibly 2 answers and to aid the marker we give all possible answers in the model answer.

Thank you for your comments about the consistency in 1st and 2nd markers. We work hard to ensure consistency with our marks for both practical and theory.

I would like to take the opportunity of thanking you for your contribution and support during your first year as our External Examiner.

Yours sincerely,

Dean of the School of Dentistry