

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT received 24/10/19

**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

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

MClinDent

**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.*

N/A – first year examining MCLinDent, however already examiner for MSc Restorative Top Up

**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
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	N/A
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	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 Intended Learning outcomes were appropriate for the programme and standards appropriate for the award of MClindent. The programme is comparable to other institutions programmes and to national standards.</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>Reflective log and case studies are supported with evidence from the literature as well as the poster presentation.</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?	Y
<p>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here: Submission of case reports and reflective log; unseen clinical cases</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 / N
<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> <p>A variety of assessment methods were used including written papers (SBA and SSAQ), case studies, reflective log, poster presentation and unseen cases</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 / 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><i>As a variety of assessment methods were used, this allowed the student to demonstrate their knowledge and performance in different areas and using various skill sets.</i></p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>The SBA questions were to a high standard and SSAQs covered a broad subject area and were appropriate to the level of MclinDent. I was satisfied with the marking of the various assessment, double marked and in the main consistent with each other and the marking scheme.</p> <p>I was sent the “managing the worn dentition’ written paper for deliberation in July 2019. I note that my recommendation to provide a more detailed mark allocation scheme had not been considered. I feel that it is imperative to know the breakdown of each section of a question to know exactly how each mark is allocated. This will ensure consistency between examiners and is a fairer process for the students. It also makes the examination more robust and defensible. For example, one question only had 9 bullet points so I did not know how the marks were achieved. I did provide examples in the question paper of how you could indicate the allocated marks and it was also helpful to include in the students question paper so they know the level of detail required for each part of the question. I hope you will re-consider this for next years’ papers.</p> <p>There were some differences in SSAQ marks between the 2 examiners on a couple of questions and detailed mark allocation as suggested can help prevent this. Where there was a difference however, the 2 examiners had met and modified the result accordingly which is good practice.</p> <p>Also I made some suggestions of other possible answers that were not added to the marking scheme either.</p> <p>With the unseen cases, a clearly defined restorative dentistry marking rubric is recommended again to enhance consistency, validity and robustness of the examination in the future. It is not clear how marks are allocated in the present scheme.</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?	N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	N
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?	Y
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	N
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:*

There was a slight administrative error regarding sending the necessary documentation to be prior to the Progressions and Awards Board, however, as a 2<sup>nd</sup> Board was required due to an issue of Academic Integrity, this was not an issue.

In addition, see comments above regarding mark allocation on the written papers

As there was only one candidate sitting the examination, I could not compare the performance with another candidate, it will be interesting to see the spread in results when more candidates are enrolled on the course. There were issues with candidates written and reflective skills which I have recommended to be forwarded to the student for advice and support.

Overall, I was impressed with the quality of the assessment material used, scope of the subject area and the dedicated input from all staff concerned.

#### 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):

Clinical Dentistry, PGT

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MClinDent

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

MClinDent in Advanced Dental Practice

*Title and Name of Responder:*

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Medicine and Health

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](mailto: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**

No comments were made.

**Response to Enhancements made from the previous year**

Not relevant, as this is the first year that the programme ran.

**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 were 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:*

No comment is 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 comments.

Please note that under question 16, the MClinDent is not 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 your comments.

In relation to the breakdown of available marks within questions: for some years now and in relation to the report from a previous External Examiner (on a different clinical programme), marking schemes and guidance to candidates / markers have become holistic. Each guideline answer is framed in relation to the expectation of a minimally competent candidate overall, *at that level* of examination. It is felt that this is particularly relevant at the postgraduate level. A global judgement of worth of the whole response from the student is considered and marked against the written criteria, as candidates should be able to articulate their thoughts in a considered and sophisticated way, as opposed to knowing that "three marks are available for three important facts"... and so on. As you are aware, all draft papers are scrutinised at an internal Assessment Panel before they are sent to you.

It is important to note, however, that your comments about robustness and defensibility are very well taken and that we will ensure that the process is reviewed.

We apologise that other comments were not acknowledged.

**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 comments.

The School apologises for any confusion caused regarding the timing of documentation. It was thought that the information had actually been sent in time. Fortunately, the need for a second Board allowed the issue to be clarified and we are very grateful for your patience.

The School is most grateful for your ongoing support and constructive criticism, as this new programme is rolled out. We look forward to working with you again in the session which has now commenced.

**Other comments**

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