

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19

QAT received 10/10/19

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Clinical Dentistry

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD Year 2
– 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):

N/A

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

Points of innovation and/or good practice

Comments made in previous years remain current, and the Year 2 programme remains academically rigorous and highly contextualised to clinical situations found in Clinical Dentistry.

Enhancements made from the previous year

Matters for Urgent Attention

No specific items noted

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?	<u>Y</u> / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	<u>Y</u> / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	<u>Y</u> / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	<u>Y</u> / N

The Year 2 programme is equivalent in scope and standard to equivalent programmes run at other UK universities.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	<u>Y</u> / N
-----	---	--------------

Multiple modules incorporate contemporary research findings into the teaching. Research Informed teaching continues to form a backbone of the programme.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / <u>N</u>
-----	--	-------------------------

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

Not applicable

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	<u>Y</u> / N
-----	--	-------------------------

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)?	<u>Y</u> / N
-----	--	-------------------------

Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:

A feature of the Leeds MChD programme is early clinical involvement which takes place in well-equipped clinics on site. It has not been possible to observe clinical sessions in progress, but the scope of the written assessments that relate to these indicate a breadth of teaching appropriate to Year 2 of a contemporary dental programme.

The Leeds MChD programme meets the standards required by the General Dental Council and the Year 2 modules are an integral part of this.

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	<u>Y</u> / N
<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 Year 2 programme continues to employ a range of assessment tools including best out of 5 MCQ's, short answer questions, longer written responses and practical exercises. This is consistent with contemporary best practice. Papers are Standard Set and where appropriate there is double marking. Psychometric analysis is used to help ensure the validity and reliability of assessments.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	<u>Y</u> / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	<u>Y</u> / 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>Overall, students performed strongly. Where students failed to meet the required standard, their performance was discussed and I was assured that structures were in place to offer support and remediation.</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>No specific comments</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?	<u>Y</u> / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	<u>Y</u> / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	<u>Y</u> / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	<u>Y</u> / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	<u>Y</u> / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	<u>Y</u> / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	<u>Y</u> / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	<u>Y</u> / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate? Not Applicable	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations? Not Applicable	Y / N
32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N

33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	<u>Y</u> / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	<u>Y</u> / N
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>No specific comments</p>		

Other comments

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

In addition to the June Board, I was able to attend the Resit Progress and Award Board held on the 30th of August; As the only External; Examiner present it is important to note that the rigor applied to consideration of the Year 2 progression decisions was similarly applied to Years 1, 3 and 4.

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):

MChD/BChD, BSc – Year 2

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

MChD/BChD, BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School of:

Medicine & Health / 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 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 continued endorsement. It is encouraging for the team to hear that the Year 2 programme remains academically rigorous and highly contextualised to clinical situations found in Clinical Dentistry.

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:

We are pleased that you are happy with the structure, aims and learning outcomes of the programme. Thank you for confirming that the Year 2, as part of the Leeds MChD programme, meets the GDC standards and is comparable in scope and standard to equivalent programmes run at other UK universities. The team would appreciate very much that the effort putting in to translate research findings into teaching has been recognised.

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 acknowledging that you are happy with the students' performance and that the Year 2 programme continues to employ a range of assessment methods that are appropriate and considered to be best practice. Your recognition of the efforts made to ensure the validity and reliability of assessments and the support given to students are particularly well received.

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. Thank you for your contribution at the Progression and Awards Board and the School Circumstances meeting, 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

Thank you for attending, and for your contribution at, the Resit Progress and Award Board meeting. We are pleased to hear your comments on the rigor applied to consideration of the Year 2 progression decisions.

Your report has been discussed with the Year 2 team and your comments and feedback are very much appreciated.