

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

QAT Received 06/08/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

Title and Name of Examiner:

--

Faculty / School of:

School of Dentistry , Leeds University

Subject(s):

Year 1

Programme(s) / Module(s):

DSUR1250/1127/1128/1230/1130/1241/1146

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

MChD

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. During the past years, the assessment burden seemed really high, for students as well as the school. The restructured program shows a good balance between quality and quantity of assessments

Enhancements made from the previous year

Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box. The professional competences are organised more transparent and as far as I can judge with a good cohesion

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, though I think that assessing the Dental hygiene and therapy program at the same level as the Dental Surgery program while the students of those programs have a different entrance level should be monitored clos to find out whether the outcome fits the aims.

For Examiners in the first year of appointment

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

For Examiners completing their term of appointment

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 a 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.

Program is well structured and balanced, after year 1 students have a good insight of what they can expect from the program and whether the program fits.

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)

Students in Year 1 work together on a systematical approach of a given problem, finding answers using knowledge and reporting on this

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:

The Module introduction to clinical skills and clinical practice shows a well thought out approach to the development of clinical competence giving broad insight to students professional development. Interesting that this module is progressional and formative. I wonder whether some summative assessment within this module would provide the school and the student with an option for selection and preventing students to move on while being clinically too weak. Monitoring of the students further progression may show whether there is a need for a more summative approach

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

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.

18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N

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:

Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:

The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiners 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?	NA
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	NA
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:
 During the process all additional information and evidence I asked for was provided fast and complete. The School special Circumstances meeting and related decisions were professional and transparent, the discussion on the cases was well prepared and the decisions thoughtfully taken.

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 Responder:	
Position*:	Head of School
Faculty / School of:	Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Dentistry
Address for communication:	Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds, LS2 9LU
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) should be attached to an e-mail and sent to the Pro-Dean for Student Education in the relevant Faculty. Following approval by the Pro-Dean for Student Education, the School must send the response (including the full original report) 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

The School is very happy to note that the report acknowledges the restructuring of the programme which has resulted both a reduction on the assessment burden but also delivered a good balance between the quality and quantity of assessment within year 1.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

The revisions made to year 1 have included the bringing together of many mandatory training and clinical activities delivered previously across multiple modules into the clinical practice module titled "Introduction to Clinical Skills and Practice". The aim of this was to make this aspect of the course both more cohesive and transparent to students, staff and outside stakeholders, the School is very pleased that the report acknowledges this enhancement to the course.

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:

The School would like to acknowledge the fact that the report has not highlighted any matters for urgent attention.

We would like to add that we are taking the suggestion about monitoring the performance of both cohorts of students very seriously. The School would like to outline the following points:

- All students across both programmes have achieved the academic requirements to study at this level and the learning outcomes for the year 1 modules are aligned to the General Dental Council learning outcomes for both professional groups.
- Despite the lower entry requirements for the dental hygiene and dental therapy students, review of student performance across this year has revealed that in some assessments the cohort for hygiene and therapy students performed to an equal standard, or at times to a higher level than the dental surgery cohort, in relation to pass rate.
- We will continue to monitor assessments to confirm that all are set at an appropriate level for the students' level of study and General Dental Council requirements.
- Within modules and across the year we will continue to monitor student performance, in relation to curriculum content, so we can provide appropriate support for student learning.

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:

Not applicable, as this was neither the first nor the last term of appointment for the external examiner.

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:

In relation to question 15 we are very pleased to note that the report acknowledges the Introduction to Clinical Practice module shows a well thought out approach to both clinical practice and professional development. The report questions the fact that the module is a progression module and whether some summative assessment should be introduced in order to prevent students who are “clinically too weak” to progress into year 2. The module is progression in that it will only allow students who have engaged with the teaching activities within the module and completed requirements to a satisfactory standard to pass the module. The students are required to complete all mandatory activities to a satisfactory standard within the module enter the second year of the course. Any student that was not able to demonstrate a satisfactory standard within the year would not be able to pass the module and therefore progress, a “summative assessment” is not required to prevent students progressing.

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:

The School is pleased to note that no concerns regarding Assessment and Feedback have been raised within the report.

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:

The School is pleased to note that in relation to the Progression and Awards process no concerns have been raised within the report, and in relation to decisions about mitigation the report outlines that decisions were thoughtfully taken in a professional and transparent manner.

Other comments

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