

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

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

Faculty / School of:	Leeds Dental Institute
Subject(s):	<i>Periodontology</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	<i>Dental Hygiene and Therapy</i>
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	Graduate Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Therapy

Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.

All assessments that I observed were fair and transparent.
 There was a high level of consistency between examiners and there was clear evidence of check-double marking.
 I took the opportunity to review all 'Fail' written scripts for the following modules and agreed with the outcome DSURG1140, DSURG1141, DSURG1142, DSURG1143, DSURG1144, DSURG1145, DSURG2025, DSURG2026, DSURG2027 and DSURG2028, DSURG2029, DSURG2030, DSURG3022, DSURG3023 and DSURG3028.
 High academic and clinical standards observed throughout.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.

N/A – this is my first year of appointment

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

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? <i>I do not recall this but this may be an oversight on my part</i>	N

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

7.	Have you acted as a External Examiner Mentor?	N/A
----	---	-----

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

N/A

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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

This is a well-run programme which allows registration on graduation with the regulator (General Dental Council; GDC).
The GDC were in attendance (June 2017), inspecting the programme and observing 'clinical finals' for this cohort. A full mapping document was available ensuring that all GDC ILOs were met alongside those of the academic programme.
The curriculum is in transition in that a Degree programme is due to embark but this has not undermined or detracted from standards in the current programme.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)

The inherent nature of evolving and evidence-based clinical practice ensures that the curriculum must respond to the latest developments and these are seen in the modular content and assessments.
Module DSUR2029 is specifically a research project whereby students can select a topic of interest across the field of dentistry. This provides a diverse range of projects but there is a structure that is common to each such that the students should go through the same process albeit with different findings related to the project undertaken. The assessment of this module was fair and transparent and I reviewed multiple scripts across the grade range.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

Entirely appropriate – SALUD system used for clinical grade collation.

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

See above – Curriculum mapping documents that I was provided with demonstrated that all the GDC Preparing for Practice outcomes were covered.

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: 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.</i></p> <p>Contemporary assessment strategies were utilised and planned/structured coherently.</p>		
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
<p><i>Please comment on 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:</i></p> <p><i>The academic standards demonstrated are entirely commensurate with those of other Dental Schools in the UK where I have worked and acted as external examiner.</i></p> <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>The assessment team are well organised, hardworking and all of the information that I needed in order to undertake my role was proactively provided. Where additional information and clarity was sought, this was addressed in a timely manner and without issue.</p>		

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?	N/A
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><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>Entirely appropriate discussions and outcomes.</p>		

Other comments

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

This is a high quality programme and the team should be proud of their hard work.

The qualities of the assessments, including all of the preparations (standard setting etc.) were transparent and contemporary and robust.

The following comments are made in the context of a very good programme and are made to stimulate discussion to further enhance the programme:

The use of a Rubric for grade combinations is a mechanism utilised across many Dental Schools however, grade combinations are not always consistent across the modules such that a grade combination BD provides an outcome of Grade C for written papers but the same BD grade combination provides a Grade D in other specific modules. This has the potential for confusion amongst the student body. The documentation surrounding the processes of rubrics and grade combination are clear and there are no 'process' issues that result, the difficulty would be student confusion/perception.

The clinical vivas / seen case assessments (where student present cases that they have treated) is a standard assessment strategy across most UK Dental Schools. Once the student has been assessed, the two internal examiners discuss the various attributes of the candidate's performance under the assessment headings. Whilst I did not observe any issues for those assessments where I was present, there is the potential for one examiner to 'lead' the discussion which could bias the outcome. In my view it would be optimal if the two examiners independently graded the students before the discussion and final grade agreement.

Finally, I would like to thank the team for their hospitality and welcome, especially given that they were required to attend to the requirements of the GDC as well addressing elements where I needed clarification/discussion.

Part C: School Response to External Examiner Report**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Head of the School of Dentistry

Medicine & Health / School of Dentistry

University of Leeds, Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds LS2 9LU.

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 gat@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

We are grateful to receive a positive report recognising the effective contribution of the assessment team and the consistency between examiners when marking written papers.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

N/A

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:

N/A

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:

Q3. The opportunity to shadow previous examiners in the 2016 diet was proposed, however the External Examiner was engaged elsewhere on the specific dates, this would have allowed direct contact with previous examiners. Copies of the previous examiner reports were made available.

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:

The programme has recognised the External Examiner positive comments to Q13 in relation to the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching; and similarly in relation to the Curriculum Mapping (Q16).

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:

We are pleased to have confirmation that the External Examiner feels that the academic standards are commensurate to other UK schools.

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:

We acknowledge that the External Examiner confirmed that he received all guidance and relevant documents as required and that the discussions and outcomes were entirely appropriate to School Special Circumstances and Progression and Awards Board.

Other comments

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

The External Examiner made a recommendation that examiners independently grade the students prior to discussion and awarding final grade during the clinical oral examination, which has been discussed and actioned within the school as part of our internal review processes.

In addition further to the interpretation of the rubric with regards to compensation and clarity to students – the students are advised by the module leads at the start of the clinical practice modules that compensation between exam components within these modules cannot take place and this is reinforced prior to completion of the assessments. The removal of compensation between components within the clinical practice modules was a requirement following our last General Dental Council programme inspection (29 June-01 July 2009).

The team appreciate the time and effort provided by the External Examiner prior to and during the assessment process and the constructive feedback received. We look forward to continuing working together in the future.