

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

QAT Received 21/06/2017

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Medicine & Health
Subject(s):	Dentistry
Programme(s) / Module(s):	CP5
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MChD/ BChD

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

Points of innovation and/or good practice

It is difficult to be innovative in a course which has to conscribe to a standard set by a regulator (the General Dental Council) however the development of the Masters undergraduate programme is a good example of innovation in a dental programme. In terms of good practice, it was clear that students felt very much at ease in the vast majority of interactions with the internal examiners that I observed. I believe that this reflected the supporting educational environment that is cultivated within this school.

Enhancements made from the previous year

The completion of the transfer from the BChD curriculum to the MChD curriculum has been completed and I believe that this has enhanced the programme

Matters for Urgent Attention

No URGENT matters were identified

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	Y
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	Y
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	N
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y
7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	Y

Under point 5 above – I have encouraged the staff to be more standardised in the preparation of model answers and I believe that this is still “work in progress” across the various dental disciplines.

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y
Appropriate Intended Learning Outcomes are contained in the programme and appropriate standards applied . The programme compares favourably with other institutions in the country – however this particular course is also unique in my experience as the degree awarded is at Masters Level for the undergraduate programme in dentistry.		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
I got the impression that Research developments undermine the teaching of dentistry on this course. There were a number of occasions when students were able to include evidence based research references within their submitted course work as well as within their research projects.		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
The clinical practical components were assessed through knowledge assessments and through the presentation of clinical cases to the internal examiners in the presence of the extern. Internal examiners prepared appropriate questions in advance of the assessment.		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<i>I feel that the programme meets the standards recommended by the General Dental Council</i>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
Assessment methods were appropriate for the students on this course. I feel that the marks in the written papers could be slightly higher for students who covered all the points identified in the model answer.		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y
Students were given good opportunities to demonstrate their participation and achievements. The students demonstrated good communication skills and many showed an excellent grasp of holistic care for patients who had challenging social and medical issues. I believe that the performance of the students is comparable to other institutions where I have examined		
<i>I was impressed by the clear commitment of the staff to the teaching of the students and there was also a clear understanding of the role of feedback to all students but particularly those who may have underperformed at some time within the course.</i>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
-----	--	---

21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
<p>The external examiners had access to all the assessed material. I would prefer to see the scripts presented without the annotations of the first examiners before it goes to the second marker. I was disappointed to see that there was an example where calibration of the examiners in one subject area took place after the start of the marking process. This generated a problem that was managed by the application of Tippex – students benefitted by the changes (which were appropriate) but this is not “good practice” and steps should be taken to avoid this happening in the future.</p> <p>I was able to attend the committee that considered mitigating circumstances and all cases were treated with compassion.</p>		

Other comments

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

As this is my last report, I would like to thank the University for permitting me to contribute to this essential element of University life for the past 5 years. I should also commend the staff of the Dental School – both administrative and academic teachers – for their organisation and for their hospitality during the tenure of my appointment.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Head of School
Faculty / School of:	<i>Faculty of Medicine and Health, School of Dentistry</i>
Address for communication:	Level 6, Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds, LS2 9LU
Email:	
Telephone:	

*If the individual responding to the report is not the Head of School please state their position within the School.

Completing the School response

The completed School response (including the full original report) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) directly to the External Examiner. A copy must also be emailed to the Quality Assurance Team at qat@leeds.ac.uk. External Examiners should receive a formal response no later than six weeks after receipt of the original report.

Response to Points of innovation and/or good practice

Thank you for recognising the innovative nature of our programme and the supportive educational environment that we endeavour to achieve within the School.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

As recognised the MChD curriculum is fully in place. We feel this has enhanced opportunities for our students to develop their abilities further – for example, by undertaking a research project.

Response to Matters for Urgent Attention

If any areas have been identified for urgent attention before the programme is offered again please provide a specific response to them here:

We are pleased that you did not feel there were any matters for urgent attention.

Response to questions 1-7 (and related comments)

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

The need to standardise the use and application of model answers has been recognised as needing further attention. The School will work to ensure that Assessment Panels particularly scrutinise model answers to ensure these are clear. Examiner training will be put in place also.

Standards**Response to questions 8 to 16 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Thank you for affirming the sufficiency of the curriculum. In particular, we are pleased that the unique nature of the integrated Masters level qualification has been recognised.

Assessment and Feedback**Response to questions 17 to 19 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

Thank you for your comments specifically in relation to assessment. The School will, in particular, focus on the better application of model answers. Staff training and briefing will highlight the need to reward students who meet the expectations of model answers. We use a range of assessment types and we are pleased that you have recognised that students are able to demonstrate a spectrum of clinical abilities. Thank you in particular for recognising the commitment of staff in the support of our students to achieve their best.

The Progression and Awards Process**Response to questions 20-35 (and related comments)**

Schools may provide a general response; however, where Examiners raise specific points these must be addressed individually:

The School's policy is that examiners should not mark on examination scripts and we acknowledge that these requirements should be made clear to examiners. Staff training and briefing will particularly focus on these points.

Other comments

Response to items included in the 'Other Comments' section of the report

Thank you sincerely for your work over the last 5 years, in particular with the volume of assessment work that we have asked you to review. Your comments will help us to develop our processes and practices further and we hope you have also felt that this has been valuable.