

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19 QAT Received 24/07/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

School of Dentistry

Subject(s):

Programme(s) / Module(s):

**Year 4 MChD/BChD, BSc in Dental Surgery
Year 4 International MChD/BChD, BSc in Dental Surgery**

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

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.

- ***Draft exam questions and answers for external examiner's review and comments received by e-mail in a timely manner with documents being password protected***
- ***Exam questions covered an appropriate breadth of clinical knowledge and procedures and were set at the correct standard***
- ***Administration of examination and assessment process were excellent including engagement with and support for external examiners***
- ***A committed and enthusiastic faculty support for the examination and assessment process was noted***
- ***Standard setting for exam questions and clear marking criteria***
- ***Double marking of all borderline and failing answers; check marking of 20% sample of passing answers***
- ***Well conducted and supported Progression and Awards Board meeting in June 2019 that was open and transparent in relation to examination results. There was correct and appropriate confidentiality in relation details concerning a student fitness to practice case as this procedure was in process***
- ***The OSCEs were observed and continue to be very meaningful in relation to assessment of history taking, clinical problem solving, treatment planning and procedural skills of students***

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

- ***There continues to be a very high standard of examination and assessment procedures in Year 4 thus insuring the competency of students to progress to Year 5***

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 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

Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.

- An exemplary programme in relation to structure, design, aims, intended learning outcomes and assessments**

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y
-----	---	---

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)

- Evidence-based clinical treatment, based on research, is assessed in the answers to the examination questions**

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
-----	--	---

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

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

There are intended learning outcomes for the students who undertake clinical practice on patients under supervision. The assessment process is rigorous, thorough and fair so that only students who have demonstrated attainment across the full range of learning outcomes can progress to Year 5.

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
-----	--	---

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

- **General Dental Council**
- **I do not practise dentistry in the UK. However, as an external examiner for Year 4, I am of the strong opinion that this programme at Leeds complies fully with the GDC standards and requirements for providers of education and training programmes in dentistry**

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment methods and their appropriateness to ILOs are extremely good • Any question with a lower than average pass rate may be reviewed in relation to the ILOs and the design and structure of the assessment method for that question 		
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>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic standards of the students as a cohort in this year 4 examination were very good and similar to that of students on a comparable course 		
<p>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</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.	<p>Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments annotated on separate sheet as institutional advice is not to write on examination scripts 	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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplary 	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>		

Other comments

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

- **An exemplary programme with an appropriate range and standard of questions and assessments. The programme is provided to appreciative students in a very fine environment empowered by the enthusiasm and academic and clinical expertise of the faculty members.**

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Examiner:

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD/BChD, BSc

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

MChD/BChD, BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School 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 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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for the positive comments and appraisal of the examination and assessment processes. We are pleased that the External Examiner found our processes to remain robust and transparent in relation to examination results while maintaining appropriate confidentiality in fitness to practice processes. We will continue to employ the same processes for the next year.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that the External Examiner found that we have continued to maintain very high standards of examination and assessment procedures in Year 4.

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:

No matters for urgent attention have been identified.

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:

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 would like to thank the External Examiner for positive comments. We are pleased to know that the External Examiner found our programme an exemplary in relation to structure, design, aims, intended learning outcomes and assessments. We are delighted that the External Examiner found that our teaching is evidence based and that our assessment process is rigorous, thorough and fair. We aim to continue to maintain the high standards ensuring coherent programme structure and robust teaching and assessment processes.

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 would like to thank the External Examiner for the positive comments regarding the assessment and feedback processes. We have taken the comments in relation to lower than average pass rate questions on board for the next year. We are also pleased to know that our student cohort have shown very good standards similar to that of students on a comparable course.

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 to know that the External Examiner was well informed with the progression and award process. We would also like to thank the External Examiner for appraising our administrative arrangements and the operation of the Progression and Awards Board.

Other comments

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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for positive comments regarding the programme and the standard of questions and assessments. We are pleased to know that the External Examiner found that our programme provided a satisfactory environment for our students who are supported by experienced and enthusiastic members of staff.

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2018-19 QAT Received 30/08/2019

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

Faculty / School of:

Medicine/Dentistry

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

Year 4: Clinical Practice 4 (DSUR5050M), Clinical Medical Sciences (DSUR3301), Child Centred Dentistry (DSUR3330), Complex Adult Dentistry (DUR3310), Personal and Professional Development (DSUR5046M), International Dentistry (DSUR3340)

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

MChD, BChD

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.
 In Clinical Practice 4 module, the Undergraduates (UG) have to write and present a Periodontology case. It is good practice in that at an UG level it serves as a starting point as novice investigators, prepares and encourages UGs to seek more contextual writing experiences for future research investigation.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

Marking guidance has improved. Model answers outlined include answers expected of a borderline passing candidate, helpful for calibration.

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

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

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?	Y
-----	---	---

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?	N
-----	--	---

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

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
-----	--	---

Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:

Very much so throughout all modules including the Clinical Practice 4.

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
-----	--	---

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

Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
-----	---	---

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.

The design and the structure of assessment methods are tailored appropriately to the ILOs and are entirely commensurate for the level examined.

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>A total of 7 candidates failed the Clinical Practice 4 and Clinical Medical Sciences modules. The 5 candidates that failed the CP4 module passed the re-sit diet in August. Unfortunately of the 2 that failed in the CMS module, 1 student failed in the written component with 39% despite passing the clinical diary component with 65%. As the written component is non-compensable, the candidate has to re-sit the year.</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 / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / 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?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N
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
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p>		

Although I had not received the programme and module documentation, assessment questions, marking criteria and draft examination papers in advance due to personal reasons, all these were made available to me on the day of the examination review. I had ample time to review all the paperwork and was satisfied with the quality of the assessments, robustness of the marking, and the entire process.

I also had the opportunity to attend the Special Circumstances meeting which was conducted in a fair and confidential manner.

Unfortunately as I had not realised the change in timing of the progression and awards board and had assumed it was going to be in the morning as in my first year, I had to convey my apologies in advance. The School kindly sent me all examination scripts, marking criteria, students' scripts and breakdown of marks to review in advance. I was satisfied with the examination material and the marking. Many Thanks.

Other comments

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

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)*Title and Name of Examiner:*

Subject(s):

Dentistry

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD/BChD, BSc – Year 4

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

MChD/BChD, BSc

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Head of School

Faculty / School 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 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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for the positive comments and appraisal of the examination and assessment processes. We will continue to employ the same processes for the next year.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We thank the External Examiner for the positive comments and for acknowledging the improvements made from the previous year in relation to the marking guidance and the setup of the model answers.

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:

No matters for urgent attention have been identified.

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:

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 would like to thank the External Examiner for positive responses. We aim to continue to maintain the high standards ensuring coherent programme structure and robust teaching and assessment processes.

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 would like to thank the External Examiner for the positive comments regarding the assessment and feedback processes. We are pleased that the External Examiner found that the design and the structure of assessment processes are tailored appropriately for the level examined.

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 to know that the External Examiner was well informed and was provided with the information required for the examination review process. We would like to thank the External Examiner for positive comments appraising the quality of the assessments and the robustness of the marking. We are also pleased that the External Examiner had the opportunity to attend the Special Circumstances meeting.

Other comments

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

No further comments from the External Examiner.