

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:

School of Dentistry (Faculty of Medicine and Health)

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD Year 2

- DSUR 2200 (Clinical Skills A)
- DSUR 2122 (SSRD)
- DSUR 2220 (IBMS)
- DSUR 2115 (PPD-2)
- DSUR 2240 (Clinical Practice 2)

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

N/A

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.

This was my first involvement with the Leeds programme so I was able to view it from a fresh perspective. A notable feature was early clinical engagement, supported by a very clinically focussed but none the less academically rigorous didactic programme. This gives students the opportunity to contextualise their learning to clinical problems they may subsequently face from early in the curriculum.

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 involvement with the programme

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

No specific issues

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

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

Although I have answered 'No' to Questions 2 and 3 I have had the opportunity to meet and discuss issues with other External Examiners associated with the programme and support was available if needed.

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>See 'Points of innovation and/or good practice'</p> <p>Year 2 has been thoughtfully planned to maximise opportunities for the integration of a rigorous, science based didactic programme with clinical experience. This will help to engage students with key issues relevant to dental practice and encourage learning.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>Because the MChD is a professional programme, the early years are taken up with providing a foundation of core knowledge necessary to underpin clinical practice. The topic areas covered within this overarching framework are informed by research. This is reflected in the assessments and helps to ensure that the material taught is both contemporary and relevant.</p> <p>Specific note needs to be made of the DSUR 2220 (Integrated Basic Medical Science) module. This combines core information which underpins dental practice with a more advanced exploration of scientific principles set at the level of a second-year undergraduate programme. In this respect, the second year programme makes a real effort to integrate contemporary bioscience relevant to dentistry into the second year curriculum.</p> <p>This, and other parts of the Year 2 programme help to provide a foundation of knowledge and scientific ethos which underpins the introduction of project work later on in the programme.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>The MChD programme is not designed as training for a PhD but it is good preparation for clinically focused postgraduate programmes which may follow Dental Foundation training which may include PhD opportunities.</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>I am unable to comment specifically on processes designed to assess the ability of Year 2 MChD students to perform procedures on individual patients on the clinic.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>Year 2 of the MChD programme is consistent with General Dental Council requirements and is informed by those outlined by other bodies such as the Association for Dental Education in Europe (ADEE).</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<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>The Year 2 programme uses a variety of assessment tools, multiple choice questions, written papers, written scenario based papers, essays and poster based presentations. This matches a prevailing view in the Dental Education literature which recommends that assessment should not be reliant exclusively on a single mode of assessment and that, where possible, multiple assessment tools should be used.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<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>The student's performance was comparable to that of other students at a similar level at UK dental schools.</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>No specific comments</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 / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

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

An issue arose subsequent to the Exam Board on the 29th of June which necessitated reconvention of the Board on the 20th of July. I was kept fully informed from the outset and was invited to participate in the board by teleconferencing. It is inevitable that problems occasionally arise and am happy to note that on this occasion they were resolved in a fair and open way.

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 School

Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Dentistry

Level 6, 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 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 acting as external examiner for Year 2 MChD Programme at Leeds. Thank you for your thorough report, with constructive feedback and comprehensive comments. We are delighted to hear that you are happy with our integrated programme with early clinical exposure.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

NA

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:

NA

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:

We are pleased to hear that you are satisfied with the support and arrangements.

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:

It is reassuring that you are satisfied with learning outcomes for Year 2, the overall content, a wide range of different assessment methods and the standard of performance of students across a diverse range of modules. It is encouraging to hear that you found the Year 2 curriculum has successfully integrated contemporary bioscience into clinical training and practice, laying critical foundation for future years. Our colleagues who are responsible for the running and teaching of the Introduction to Biomedical Sciences module will be delighted to hear your positive comments of their module, acknowledging their hard work in delivering research-led bioscience core principles that underpin dental practice.

Evidence-based practice is one of the key strands of SSRD, the skills and techniques learnt, which build on from Year 1, will enable students to put theories into practice across all modules in Year 2 and beyond. Hopefully, it will inspire students to undertake more research in the future and to become a critical evidence-based practitioner.

Thank you for your comment which relates to assessing the ability of Year 2 MChD students to perform procedures on individual patients on clinic. A proposal to include the opportunity for you to discuss this independently with _____, Year 3 External Examiner, who is a dental clinician, has been made which we hope you will find useful.

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:

Your comments regarding the value and importance of using multiple assessments with a variety of assessment methodologies are particularly well received. The Year 2 is currently reviewing the curriculum, teaching and assessments, part of the ongoing MChD Programme development. Your comments are extremely timely and invaluable.

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 are pleased that you are happy with the paperwork, examiners' guidance, support, process and administrative arrangements. Your acknowledgement of the effort from all those who are involved in the setting, marking and administering the assessments is much appreciated. Thank you for your contribution at the Progression and Awards Board and the School Circumstances meeting, and we are pleased that you are satisfied with the process and outcomes.

Other comments

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

Thank you very much for your help at the ad hoc exam board meeting on 29th June 2017 and we are pleased to hear that you are happy with how the matters were handled and resolved.

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:

School of Dentistry (Faculty of Medicine and Health)

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD Year 2

- DSUR 2200 (Clinical Skills A)
- DSUR 2122 (SSRD)
- DSUR 2220 (IBMS)
- DSUR 2115 (PPD-2)
- DSUR 2240 (Clinical Practice 2)

Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):

N/A

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.

This was my first involvement with the Leeds programme so I was able to view it from a fresh perspective. A notable feature was early clinical engagement, supported by a very clinically focussed but none the less academically rigorous didactic programme. This gives students the opportunity to contextualise their learning to clinical problems they may subsequently face from early in the curriculum.

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 involvement with the programme

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

No specific issues

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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

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

Although I have answered 'No' to Questions 2 and 3 I have had the opportunity to meet and discuss issues with other External Examiners associated with the programme and support was available if needed.

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>See 'Points of innovation and/or good practice'</p> <p>Year 2 has been thoughtfully planned to maximise opportunities for the integration of a rigorous, science based didactic programme with clinical experience. This will help to engage students with key issues relevant to dental practice and encourage learning.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>Because the MChD is a professional programme, the early years are taken up with providing a foundation of core knowledge necessary to underpin clinical practice. The topic areas covered within this overarching framework are informed by research. This is reflected in the assessments and helps to ensure that the material taught is both contemporary and relevant.</p> <p>Specific note needs to be made of the DSUR 2220 (Integrated Basic Medical Science) module. This combines core information which underpins dental practice with a more advanced exploration of scientific principles set at the level of a second-year undergraduate programme. In this respect, the second year programme makes a real effort to integrate contemporary bioscience relevant to dentistry into the second year curriculum.</p> <p>This, and other parts of the Year 2 programme help to provide a foundation of knowledge and scientific ethos which underpins the introduction of project work later on in the programme.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p> <p>The MChD programme is not designed as training for a PhD but it is good preparation for clinically focused postgraduate programmes which may follow Dental Foundation training which may include PhD opportunities.</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>I am unable to comment specifically on processes designed to assess the ability of Year 2 MChD students to perform procedures on individual patients on the clinic.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>Year 2 of the MChD programme is consistent with General Dental Council requirements and is informed by those outlined by other bodies such as the Association for Dental Education in Europe (ADEE).</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<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>The Year 2 programme uses a variety of assessment tools, multiple choice questions, written papers, written scenario based papers, essays and poster based presentations. This matches a prevailing view in the Dental Education literature which recommends that assessment should not be reliant exclusively on a single mode of assessment and that, where possible, multiple assessment tools should be used.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<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>The student's performance was comparable to that of other students at a similar level at UK dental schools.</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>No specific comments</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 / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Other comments

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

An issue arose subsequent to the Exam Board on the 29th of June which necessitated reconvention of the Board on the 20th of July. I was kept fully informed from the outset and was invited to participate in the board by teleconferencing. It is inevitable that problems occasionally arise and am happy to note that on this occasion they were resolved in a fair and open way.

Supplementary Report (following Resit Panel 1st September 2017)

I was present at this resit exam board and was asked to review papers for both Year 1 and Year 2 modules. The Year 1 modules reviewed included....

DSUR1127

DSUR1130

DSUR1128 (scripts from spotter)

DSUR1129

Because of the nature of the modules I was not able to review DSUR1201 and DSUR 11240.

Year 2 modules are listed in Section A.

Overall, the assessment process was rigorous with evidence of double marking. Marking was fair, robust and to pre-agreed marking schemes. Pass/Fail decisions were fair although I note that there were examples of students failing an assessment but passing the module because of the compensation permitted between different parts of an exam.

I note that the School went to considerable lengths to ensure that I was kept informed at all stages of the resit process and that every effort was made to make information available to me during my visits to the school.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Interim Dean

Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Dentistry

Level 6, 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 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 your comment about the benefits of early clinical exposure and particularly for noting that academic rigour was maintained.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We acknowledge there was nothing for you to compare with, thank you.

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:

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:

Thank you for the comment under box 7, because we can certainly provide previous external examiner reports, if that would be helpful?

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:

Your comments are very helpful indeed and we are grateful for them. DSUR2220 has benefitted from the excellent work of leaders in basic science.

Thank you for noting, in box 16, that Year 2 of the programme is consistent with the requirement of the GDC.

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 commenting on the range of assessments used and the comparability of achievement

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:

No specific comment is required, thank you.

Other comments

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

Thank you for your comments.

In relation to the first sitting and Progressions and Awards Board, we regret an anomaly occurred on 29 June 2017 but are grateful for your confirmation that the matter was dealt with appropriately and you were able to participate in a reconvened Board in July 2017.

We will look forward to your next visit to Leeds.