

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
Subject(s):	
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MChD/BChD, BSc – Year 4
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	

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.

*** Draft edition of exam questions and answers received in very good time by external examiner. Any comments or suggested changes were graciously received and questions altered as appropriate for examination by staff in Leeds.**

*** Identity of students unknown to examiners marking their papers**

*** Three pairs of examiners in paediatric dentistry who set and corrected answers to the question they set. This gave a very good breadth to that part of the examination process**

*** Double marking of answers**

*** Openness, transparency and fairness of examination process**

*** Very well organised and delivered OSCEs with clear marking criteria**

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

First year as external examiner

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 matters for urgent attention

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiners Handbook?	YES
----	--	-----

2.	Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?	NO - not required
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	NO - not required

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

Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Yes
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Yes
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Yes
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?	Yes

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

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

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 faculty who provide undergraduate education and set and mark these undergraduate exams are actively involved in research so that what is taught and examined is evidence based and current

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	No
-----	--	----

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

Undergraduate programme for dental students

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

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:
Appropriately examined by OSCE*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i>		
Meets all standards - in an exemplary fashion - for Dental Council, the regulatory body for dentistry in UK		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes
<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>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Yes
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Yes
<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>		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</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?	Yes
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Yes
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Yes
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Yes
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Yes
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Yes
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Yes
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Yes
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?	Yes
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Yes
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Yes
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

Other comments

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

--

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:

Dean of School	
<i>Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Dentistry</i>	
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 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

Thank you for your comments noting the clarity, openness and fairness of the examination system and adherence to our marking regulations.

We really value the input of our external examiners in the exam setting process and duly note that this was appreciated and acted upon accordingly.

Maintaining student anonymity is taken very seriously for the written examinations and our process of double marking we feel is rigorously adhered to and I am pleased this was noted.

The OSCEs play a crucial role in year 4 to enable us to support students falling behind clinically. We agree with you that the staff organising the OSCE, giving briefings to students and staff carry out a superb job.

It is gratifying to see that the Paediatric department were able to cover a good breadth of material in the exam, this is something in the past that students have been critical of and we are gratified to see that we seem to be managing this well.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

As this was your first year you were not able to comment, we look forward to your opinions on innovations made in the coming years.

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:

No matters raised.

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:

I hope you found the external examiners handbook to be of use and we are more than happy to provide any further information you require.

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 confirming the Programme meets the Professional Statutory Regulating Bodies requirements. We noticed that a response to the national subject benchmark and accreditation of the programme had not been given, which may be an oversight and attach a copy of the GDC guidance for Preparing for Practice and we can confirm the Programme is accredited by 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 recognising that we have aligned the programme and assessment to the intended learning outcomes, this has taken a lot of work by many staff to achieve.

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:

Thank you for your review of the progression and awards process. We appreciate your work, particularly with regard to the volume of papers and results to review. We are pleased that all aspects were found to be satisfactory.

Other comments

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

Welcome to the School and for taking part in our examinations process. We recognise how much effort and energy it takes to become familiar with the assessment process at another school and thank you very much for playing such an important and valued role in the process.

Thank you for noting that you were very impressed with the extremely well organised examination and student evaluation processes that were based on sound educational foundations.

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:	Medicine/Dentistry
Subject(s):	Dentistry
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Year 4: Clinical Practice 4 (DSUR505OM), Clinical Medical Sciences (DSUR3301), Child Centred Dentistry (DSUR3330), Complex Adult Dentistry (DUR3310), Personal and Professional Development (DSUR5046M), International Dentistry (DSUR3340)
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

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box. The Reflective components included in the assessment are beneficial. It allows students to integrate into their learning and continuous professional development.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box. Although, this is my first year as an External examiner, I am aware that there have been a number of enhancements made to the programme. For example:

- Improvements in the Orthodontic component.
- Marking of scripts i.e. introduction of 'checked marking' (double marking).

I certainly did not encounter any concerns with the above.

Matters for Urgent Attention

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? * Not provided with a named mentor formally. *However, 3 tutors and all the administrative staff were present at all times to assist and had explained the processes and procedures. Therefore, I felt fully equipped and supported.	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

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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i> The Aims and Intended learning outcomes of the course were met and appropriate to the level of award for the year.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<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> Although in dentistry the ability of research to influence the curriculum is limited, Leeds Dental Institute as much as other UK Dental schools appear to connect teaching and research. For example: The Periodontics posters demonstrated the students' ability to apply evidence based dentistry to their clinical practice.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i> The clinical practice components were covered broadly using formative, progressional and summative assessments, which in turn demonstrated inclusive learning styles. Clinical skills were assessed in the OSCE. The OSCE stations included Dental procedures and Communication skills. The stations tested a broad range of clinical skills.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p>		

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>The range of assessments used in this programme is vast. All assessment tools were aligned appropriately to the ILOs. I found all methods of assessments used valuable.</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

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:

Yes very much so. The wide range of assessment methods used by the school provides the students every opportunity to demonstrate learning.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The Academic staff and Administrative staff of the School have worked hard to deliver quality assessments to support students learning and teaching. I was impressed with the commitment of all staff. I noticed that the staff also self-reflect on the examination performance and identify areas for improvements which is admirable. At the examination board, I made a comment on the 'Spotter' component in one of the modules. My comment was that all students achieved very high marks and approximately 30% achieving full marks in this component. My suggestion was to consider increasing the standard set marks in the future diet. The board echoed the same suggestion and accepted and agreed promptly.

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?	N/A
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N/A
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:

All documents including examination questions and scripts were made available for quality assurance. The marks were presented clearly on spread-sheets which made review straight forwards. The administrative staff demonstrated experience and well aware of the contents of the programme and subjects covered in each module, which was remarkable.

Other comments

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

I would like to Thank all staff for paving the way forwards during my first visit.

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:	
Position*:	Dean of School
Faculty / School of:	<i>Faculty of Medicine and Health / School 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 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

Thank you for your feedback. We agree with you wholeheartedly that learning should be a reflective process and we have worked hard to integrate this into our assessment process.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Thank you for your comments, we introduced the process of check marking a little while ago which is now embedded in our assessment process. I am happy to see that the improvements in Orthodontics had been recognised.

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:

None noted.

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 your comments about the support you received from tutors and administrative staff and we are glad you found this to be helpful. When we are aware a prior External Examiners role has been fulfilled we would not normally suggest a mentor, however, this can still be arranged if you feel it necessary?

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 your positive comments, particularly noting the inclusivity of using a range of assessments which has been a very important part of our assessment planning. We aim where possible to provide research led education and assessment and duly note that you feel we are in line with other UK schools which is satisfying.

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 positive comments. The spotter exam has been highlighted as needing some attention regarding the pass mark, which will be acted upon. Although the Module Lead was gratified to see so many students doing well, the exam clearly does not differentiate at the higher levels. We are planning some changes to the assessment which we will include you in the draft forms of these prior to the examinations next year. We would very much welcome your inclusion in this process.

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:

Thank you and particularly for identifying the hard work and diligence of the exams team who are invaluable throughout the process.

Other comments

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

Welcome to the School and for taking part in our examinations process. We recognise how much effort and energy it takes to become familiar with the assessment process at another school and thank you very much for playing such an important and valued role in the process.

Many thanks for your prompt report. It is gratifying to read your comments of how the students were supported and that the examinations, and your first year as an external examiner with us ran smoothly.

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:	Medicine/Dentistry
Subject(s):	Dentistry
Programme(s) / Module(s):	Re-sit exam diet for Year 1 Modules: DSUR1128,1129,1130,1127,1240 Year 2 Modules: DSUR2122, 2220 Year 3 Modules: DSUR3015,3019,3240 Year 4 Modules: DSUR3330,5050M,3301
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**

Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.
 As mentioned in my first report, the reflective components included in the assessment are beneficial. The school offers feedback to those who have underperformed and counselling prior to re-sit diet.

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.

Matters for Urgent Attention

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? * Not provided with a named mentor formally. *However, 3 tutors and all the administrative staff were present at all times to assist and had explained the processes and procedures. Therefore, I felt fully equipped and supported.	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

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
<p><i>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</i></p> <p>The Aims and Intended learning outcomes of the course were met and appropriate to the level of award for the year. The programmes i.e. Years 1-4 are comparable to other institutions I have examined in.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<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>Although in dentistry the ability of research to influence the curriculum is limited, Leeds Dental Institute as much as other UK Dental schools appear to connect teaching and research. For example: The Periodontics posters demonstrated the students' ability to apply evidence based dentistry to their clinical practice.</p> <p>In year 4 re-sit diet, one student re-sat the Periodontics poster and passed.</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i></p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</i></p> <p>The clinical practice components were covered broadly using formative, progressional and summative assessments, which in turn demonstrated inclusive learning styles.</p> <p>Clinical skills were assessed in the OSCE and practical skills (e.g. crown preparation in year 3). The OSCE stations included Dental procedures and Communication skills. The stations tested a broad range of clinical skills and covered components of the curriculum. The year 3 student who re-sat the crown preparation passed.</p> <p>All three year 4s students who re-sat the OSCE stations achieved an overall pass in this component. I informed the examination board my observation on the student's performance on the OSCEs. For example in station 3 (cranial nerve examination- all three students who re-sat failed to achieve the standard set pass mark; likewise stations 4 (extra-oral examination) and 5 (alcohol and tobacco) two out of three students failed to achieve the standard set pass mark. All 3 stations included in the OSCE component were fair and taught skills that needs practise. I was reassured that the students will be provided with feedback on their overall performance as well as receive remedial training in areas of poor performance within each component.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	N
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

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.

The range of assessments used in this programme is vast. All assessment tools are aligned appropriately to the ILOs. I found all methods of assessments used valuable.

In Year 1, Module DSUR1127, I commented that one question i.e. Question 13 was difficult i.e. Gene coding. The school board agreed to review this question. The difficulty of the question did not affect the performance. .

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

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:

The wide range of assessment methods used by the school provides the students every opportunity to demonstrate learning.

Out of Years 1, 2, 3 and 4: the majority who failed to pass at the re-sit diet were from Year 1.

This year, in year 1: 3 students have to repeat the year, 1 is allowed under mitigation circumstance and 1 was absent under the pre-2016/2017 year rules. 1 student has to repeat one module i.e. DSUR1128.

All year 2s who re-sat passed well.

In year 3 all students who re-sat passed except for 1 student who was absent from the OSCE component due to a personal circumstance.

In year 4, 1 student failed in the EMQ and SBA paper of the DSUR3301 module. This student will have to re-sit the year before progressing to year 5. The student passed the clinical diary (one aspect of this module) in the first sitting. The student will have to focus on improving clinical knowledge.

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

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?	N/A
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?	N/A
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A

33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N/A
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	N/A
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>All documents including the re-sit examination questions and scripts were made available. This included the re-sit practical skill station e.g. crown preparation in year 3.</p> <p>The marks allocated in all years were fair and double marked in some instances for example in the year 4 resit module DSUR3301, 1 student failed, marks allocated was fair.</p> <p>Marks allocated to those who failed in years 1, and 3 were also fair if not generous.</p> <p>As this was the re-sit diet there was no award of prizes.</p>		

Other comments

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

Although I had Years 1-4 re-sit examination scripts and marks to quality assure, all paperwork were presented systematically and in an organised fashion. The individual and collated marks for each year were presented clearly on separate spread-sheets for each year. The latter made review straight forwards. I would like to Thank the administrative staff in addition to all examiners.

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 comments about reflexive practice. We have worked hard on this element and hope to continue strengthening it in the future. We have benefitted greatly from the appointment of an Associate Director of Student Education (Student Support) who leads a team of dedicated staff who support study skills and pastoral support.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We recognise that this was the first time you had acted in this capacity at resit, so that this box was not relevant.

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:

If it would be of value, we will of course provide formal mentorship. Our inference from your comment, however, is that this will not be necessary. The level of support offered should not be diminished in the future.

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 welcome to read that you felt the aims and ILOs were appropriate, especially as you had the opportunity to see more than one year of the programme.

Thank you for commenting on the programme being research-informed, in line with other dental schools.

Your comments about OSCEs are very helpful and detailed. We are confident in our application of this system of assessment.

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 noting that one question in Y1 was difficult (gene coding) and we are glad to hear that the School Board reviewed the question. We acknowledge that the array of assessment methods is great, but it is pleasing to see that you felt that they were all aligned to ILOs.

Thank you for your detailed comments in box 19.

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:

Thank you. There are no specific comments required here.

Other comments

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

Thank you for your comments about the administrative arrangements and our valued colleagues in the Student Education Service.