

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT Received 20/06/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

DENTISTRY

*Subject(s):*

*Periodontology*

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

Dental Hygiene & Therapy

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

BSc Dental Hygiene & Therapy

**Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards**

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

The introduction of the unseen cases in the Developing Clinical Practice 2 assessments is worthy of note as it significantly improves the assessment compared with previous cohorts.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

See above

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

There are no matters that require urgent attention.  
An element requiring careful consideration is the timing of the examination boards with the advent of shared modules – see comment below.

**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?	Y
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
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y
6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	N/A
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	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*

There has been a steady improvement in the programme which has been difficult for the programme team to manage with the introduction of the new programme and phasing out of the 'old' programme. Despite these logistical issues, the academic and administrative team continue to strive to improve the programme which is notable.

## 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>Positive</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>Teaching is research-led and modular content requires critical evaluation of literature.</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> <p>N/A</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 are commensurate with a programme of this nature providing comprehensive training for Dental Hygienists working as part of a dental team.</p>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<p><i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</i></p> <p>The General Dental Council (GDC) are the regulatory body and have inspected during my tenure as External Examiner. The GDC process was rigorous and the outcome positive.</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>Comprehensive</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 academic standards demonstrated by the students were generally of a high standard.</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>See general comments below:</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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

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

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

The academic and professional support staff for the programme should be commended on their efforts as they run a high quality programme for which they should be congratulated. Clearly busy, they are collegial, approachable and hospitable and this makes acting as an External Examiner a pleasure.

The following are some comments / pointers that might be considered to further enhance a quality programme:

The paperwork ahead of the assessment period was received in good time and my comments were clearly considered and acted upon where necessary.

The standard of candidates in examinations was very high and where there were instances of failure, these were clearly evidenced and justified; throughout all elements I observed cross-referencing to the marking criteria/descriptors.

There was clear evidence of independent marking ahead of reaching a consensus on the final agreed grade.

There had been some minor issues with Excel spreadsheets of results and when these were identified then they were swiftly and correctly amended for which I am grateful. This may be due to the significant workload associated with the administration of these assessments.

The process of standard setting is clear and the majority of standard setting results had an anticipated pass mark of approximately 50%. In some instances, the student performance exceeded expectations by a significant margin. In these instances, a post-hoc analysis should be considered to compare the anticipated standard set pass mark against the student results and a process developed to manage such instances.

In face-to-face assessments, examiner teams avoided verbal and non-verbal feedback to the candidates as far as reasonably possible and this is to be commended.

As stated above, the introduction of the unseen cases in the Developing Clinical Practice 2 assessments is worthy of note as it significantly improves the assessment compared with previous cohorts. Thought might be given to further evolve the assessment and develop questions in addition to the clinical elements. There could be an opportunity to blueprint the assessment against other domains such as professionalism, communication skills, management and leadership etc.

Ahead of face-to-face assessments, it is clear that a calibration exercise was undertaken. This was clearly undertaken to a high standard but a process that was undertaken internally and there could be an opportunity to have a calibration event with external examiners present to oversee the QA process. This might be of value to formally evidence the activity for the GDC and the use of student recordings made of the assessments in this academic year may facilitate this process if this is permitted.

Finally, the timing / alignment of examination boards needs careful consideration. The advent of shared modules has resulted in logistical issues relating to the consideration of exam results at the relevant examination boards. This is perhaps the most significant comment of my report that requires attention.

**Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)**

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Dental Hygiene and Dental Therapy

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Graduate Diploma in Dental Hygiene and Dental Therapy  
BSc in Dental Hygiene and Dental Therapy

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

As above

Title and Name of Responder:

Position\*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Faculty of Medicine and Health / 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](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**

We are very pleased that \_\_\_\_\_ has acknowledged good practice in the way that the unseen case examination was conducted and \_\_\_\_\_ identified good calibration between examiners. We will consider suggestions for further development in this area and keep him informed of any planned changes.

We specifically acknowledge his comments regarding the good practice of cross referencing to marking criteria being completed by assessment teams.

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

We are grateful for the comments identifying that the assessors completed the calibration activity / standardising prior to assessment. We agree that this activity could be completed with External Examiners as observers.

**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:

In relation to \_\_\_\_\_ comments regarding the alignment of the exam boards, the timing of the Progression and Awards Board - assessment schedule for the next academic session have been adjusted so that results for shared modules can be received at the same time for both the Dental Hygiene and Therapy programme and the Dental Surgery programme.

**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 receive \_\_\_\_\_ comments acknowledging the challenges of managing the delivery and assessment of both programmes.

**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:*

Positive response – no specific issues were identified.

**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 receive \_\_\_\_\_ comments acknowledging the comprehensive assessment of the learning outcomes and that high academic standards demonstrated by this cohort.

**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:*

All achieved, no actions required.

**Other comments**

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

In relation to standard setting and post-hoc adjustments to the standard set mark, it is not the School's policy to adjust the standard set mark post-hoc. Student performance is reviewed to confirm that there are no errors in the questions and any questions that are incorrect are removed while other questions which may be judged non-discriminatory, for example, are removed from the question bank for rework.

We are grateful for \_\_\_\_\_ suggestions which has identified areas of opportunities which will assist us to further improve the programme.