

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

QAT Received 08/08/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

School of Dentistry

*Subject(s):*

BDS

*Programme(s) / Module(s):*

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):*

Year 2 BDS

**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 year I was aware of a greater emphasis on shared teaching between the Dental programme and the parallel programme in Dental Therapy. This was indicative of a progressive approach to dental education and a willingness to engage with contemporary issues such as inter-professional education.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

No specific issues

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

**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

## 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)?	Yes
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)		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	No
Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Yes
Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Yes
Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:		
The programme leading to a qualifying dental degree (MChD) is approved by the General Dental Council and the Year 2 programme is an integral part of this.		

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Yes
<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 written summative assessment process is the same as that used in 2016-2017, and involve a range of assessment tools including short answer/essay questions and single best answer multiple choice style questions .</p> <p>The General Dental Council has, in their evaluation of the programme, commented on the robustness of the assessment processes. My own observations further endorse this view.</p>		
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
<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>As a whole the cohort performed strongly. As with any cohort there are weaker students and there are structures in place to ensure that these students are offered appropriate support. Students who perform strongly may be offered to brake their professional studies for a year in order to complete an intercalated degree in a related scientific discipline</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 programme recognises the needs and aspirations of students performing strongly in the biomedical sciences and offers the opportunity for selected students to complete an intercalated degree. In recent years students have undertaken intercalated studies both in Leeds and at other institutions elsewhere in the UK. This is to be encouraged.</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?	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?	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?	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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>I was very happy with the 'Progression and Awards' process which was robust and fair.</p>		

## Other comments

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

None

**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	
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](mailto: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**

One of the special features of our programme in Leeds is the inter-professional education and training across disciplines among the dental team. Thank you for acknowledging this and for your encouraging comments.

**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:

N/A

**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 very much for confirming that the overall programme structure is coherent and appropriate for the level of study, allowing the aims and intended learning outcomes to be achieved. We are delighted that you are happy with the learning outcomes of year 2 and consider them meeting the expectations of the national standards. Thank you for acknowledging the important contribution of Year 2 to the MChD programme as a whole.

**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 hear that are happy with the alignment of intended learning outcomes with assessment and a range of assessment strategies employed in Year 2, all of which are considered appropriate to the level of award. Thank you for highlighting the robustness of the assessment processes that we aspire 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:*

We are pleased that you are happy with the paperwork, examiners' guidance, support, process and administrative arrangements. Your comment about the progression and awards process being robust and fair is particularly well received by the team. Thank you for your contribution at the Progression and Awards Board and the School's Mitigating Circumstances Committee 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**

Your report has been discussed with the Year 2 team who find it very encouraging and reassuring.