

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

QAT received 24/10/19

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Dentistry

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Clinical Dentistry – Restorative Top Up

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

MSc

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.

N/A

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Change to weighing

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 only

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment only

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 an 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>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The programme structure is appropriate to the level of MSc and allows the programmes aims and intended learning outcomes to be met. In addition, they meet the expectations the national subject benchmark and the programmes is comparable to other institutes with similar programmes.</p>		
13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
<p>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)</p> <p>There is a research module for the MSc and each student undertook a literature review or systematic review of a Clinical aspect of Restorative Dentistry. The dissertation forms part of the assessment process in which the students submit a thesis and also undertake an oral presentation and 15 minutes of questioning</p>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<p>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</p>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	N
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> <p>General Dental Council</p>		

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<p>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.</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>The students were able to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes through submission of their thesis and the viva which consisted of the 20 minutes presentation and 15 minute of questions as well as over written assessments in the programme.</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>		

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y

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

The research theses were received by email in a timely fashion allowing plenty of time for me to read them. Three candidates submitted their theses, delivered a presentation and under went 15 minutes of questioning. All three performed to a high standard and had undertaken considerable work for their distance learning MSc. I was very

impressed with the quality of the research undertaken and I hope publications will result from all three projects. I observed all three candidates during their presentation and questioning and all performed extremely well with a thorough knowledge of their subject area. There was double marking of the viva with close agreement between the scores of the examiners.

There was an issue with the marking of one the candidate's dissertation. Following the literature review, it was apparent that the candidate had changed emphasis on the projects aims and objectives and had not reviewed these areas in the aims and objectives. A minor alteration to the title and aims and objectives would have corrected this. Overall the project was well researched, discussed and defended. The work was awarded 30% (Outright fail: serious deficiencies) which was extremely harsh considering the overall quality of the work and after discussion with the staff involved in delivery of the MCs and internal examiners, all were in mutual agreement to raise the mark to 47% (Bare fail) with corrections as appropriate. This does highlight a flaw in the University Marking Scheme as there is no mark that can be awarded in between these percentages. A Fail at 40% would seem a logical addition to the marking scheme however I appreciated that cannot be changed at School level and is an issue to be raised at Faculty/University level.

It is important to remember the level on commitment required with a distance learning research programme and that the candidates are in employment as well and level required is at a Masters not Doctoral level.

I was made very welcome during my visit to Leeds, the administrative team were excellent and all staff and supervisors involved in the programme had obviously put a tremendous amount of work into its delivery.

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

MSc in Clinical Dentistry (Restorative Dentistry) Distance-learning programme in collaboration with the Faculty of General Dental Practitioners (UK), London for holders of their Diploma in Restorative Dentistry.

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

MSc in Clinical Dentistry (Restorative)

*Title and Name of Responder:**Position*:*

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Dentistry

*Address for communication:**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) must be sent 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

N/A

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

Thank you for your work in suggesting this change.

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:

No responses recorded at present.

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 and assessments of the MSc.

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 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 positive responses.

In particular, we would like to thank you for your very supportive report upon the process and standards of the course. Your kind and generous words on the quality of the research and the performance of the candidates are greatly appreciated.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for your wise counsel on the work of the candidate who had a conflict between the extensive research had undertaken and the title, research question, and objectives written into dissertation. We are very grateful for your insight, experience and diligence which resulted in a sensible decision.

We aim to put in place processes to avoid similar problems occurring in the future. These include new guidance to supervisors and examiners and a requirement for the candidate to submit the dissertation to their supervisor in a timely manner and receive an acknowledgement from the supervisor that the dissertation is ready for submission.

We appreciate the hard work that is required for your role as our External Examiner and would like to thank you for performing the tasks required diligently and to such a high standard.

Other comments

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

N/A