

The University of Leeds

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 09/10/2018

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):

MChD/BChD, BSc – Year 4

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.

- **Timely receipt of draft exam questions and answers for extern examiner review and comments with subsequent alteration of exam questions as appropriate**
- **Outline answers with standard setting for all exam questions**
- **Excellent faculty and administrative support for examinations and assessment processes including review of written scripts and observation of OSCEs**
- **Progression and Awards Board meeting in June 2018 and a further meeting in August 2018 for resit examinations were well conducted with superb administrative and collegiate support. These meetings were well attended and allowed for good open and transparent discussions in relation to examination results.**
- **Organisation and undertaking of OSCEs continues to be very impressive**

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

This was my first time attending a Special Circumstances Committee meeting in relation to Repeat Examinations and I was very impressed. Those who attended this meeting were sensitive and aware of the various concerns of individual students who had made submissions and were also aware of the responsibilities of students, now and in their anticipated future careers, in relation to patient care.

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

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 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.

Programme structure, assessment and learning outcomes are aligned

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 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)

Teaching and assessment is evidence-based reflecting up-to-date research findings

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 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:

Both OSCEs and end of year examinations are aligned to programme structures and assess student progress including dental practice

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 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:

The programme is accredited by the regulatory body for dentistry in UK, the General Dental Council (GDC)

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> | | |
| 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><i>Well educated students with high standards</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>Very well organised and developed examination and student assessment processes that are fit for purpose and are undertaken by an obviously superb and committed staff at School of Dentistry</p> | | |

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? | 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? | 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 |
| <i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i> | | |

Other comments

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

Examination Scripts and Annotations

I understand that the current recommended practice in universities in the UK, including the University of Leeds, is not to write comments on a student exam script but rather to write comments on a separate page. A very reasonable argument for such practice is that annotations on scripts may bias a second marker. However if a key role of a second marker were to be viewed as an insurer of quality and transparency, then writing comments clearly on a student exam script might be viewed as good practice? This is my current practice as an internal examiner

I wonder if it would be of any value to have an internal discussion concerning advantages/disadvantages of the current practice in Leeds of writing comments concerning a student exam script on a separate page compared to the current practice in of annotating student exam scripts?

Name of School and Head of School (or nominee)

Title and Name of Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Head of School

Faculty of Medicine and Health / School of Dentistry

School of Dentistry, Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds, LS2 9LU

*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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for positive comments and appraisal of the examination process for Year 4. We will continue to make sure that the examination and assessment processes remain robust and well organised.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

We are pleased that the External Examiner was able to be involved in the Special Circumstances Committee meeting this year. We are delighted to hear that it was found to be very impressive. We shall continue our robust process and ensure that the meeting is attended by the relevant staff who are well aware of the students' concerns and personal circumstances.

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 are delighted to know that the External Examiner's comments were all positive in relation to the programme and that we have met the programme aims and learning outcomes, meeting the expectations of the national subject benchmark. Additionally we are pleased that the External Examiner found that our teaching and assessment is up to date and based on high quality evidence. We shall continue to maintain the high standards ensuring coherent programme structure, 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, and for recognising the efforts of our staff in organising and developing a robust examination and assessment processes. We are also delighted to know that our student cohort have shown standards of a high level.

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 delighted to know that the External Examiner was well informed with the Progression and Award Board process.

Other comments

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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for comments regarding the examination scripts and annotations. We understand the External Examiner's point of view and the argument in relation to the role of the second marker. We will certainly encourage a discussion amongst our staff at examination and assessment meetings.

The University of Leeds
EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18 QAT Received 05/11/2018

Part A: General Information

Subject area and awards being examined

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Title and Name of Examiner:</i> | |
| <i>Faculty / School of:</i> | Medicine/Dentistry |
| <i>Subject(s):</i> | Dentistry |
| <i>Programme(s) / Module(s):</i> | Year 4: Clinical Practice 4 (DSUR505OM), Clinical Medical Sciences (DSUR3301), Child Centred Dentistry (DSUR3330), Complex Adult Dentistry (DUR3310), Personal and Professional Development (DSUR5046M), International Dentistry (DSUR3340) |
| <i>Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):</i> | 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.

Reflective components embedded in the programme encourages student learning.

Enhancements made from the previous year

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

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

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 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 |
| <p>Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.</p> <p>The programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes were commensurate with the level of award and comparable with the national subject benchmark.</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>To a limited extent in Dental Undergraduate studies.</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:</p> <p>The clinical practice components are covered using formative and summative assessments.</p> <p>Clinical practice components are included in all assessment tools used including OSCE.</p> | | |
| 16. | Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)? | N |
| <p>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:</p> | | |

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.

All assessment tools are appropriate and are valuable to student learning and teaching.

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 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 |

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:

Yes very much so.

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 / N |
| 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 / N |
| 29. | Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated? | Y / N |
| 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 / N |
| 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 / N |

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| 35. | Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board? | Y / N |
| <p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i></p> <p>I received all draft examination question papers/assessments for the first sitting and the re-sit diet for my scrutiny. Overall, the examination material was well written. All questions were appropriate. Only minor alterations were required. The latter was fed-back to the School administrator for submission to the Module lead. I am satisfied that all my comments were acknowledged and taken on board.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was unable to attend the progression and awards board meeting. I conveyed my sincere apologies in advance. This year I was invited and attended the OSCE diet but as a result of travel disruptions incurred by the local examiners due to bad weather the examination was cancelled on the day. I understand the reason for cancellation and look forwards to attending the OSCE <i>live</i> as planned in March 2019.</p> | | |

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 Responder:

Position*:

Faculty / School of:

Address for communication:

Email:

Telephone:

Interim Dean of School

Faculty of Medicine & Health / School of Dentistry

Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, Leeds, LS2 9LU

*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

We would like to thank the External Examiner for comments acknowledging the embedded programme components which encourage our students' learning experiences.

Response to Enhancements made from the previous year

NA

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:

NA

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 are delighted to know that the External Examiner comments were all positive in relation to the programme structure, design and aims and that we have met the programme learning outcomes to the expectations of the national subject benchmark. We shall continue to maintain the high standards ensuring a coherent programme structure, 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 delighted to that the External Examiner found that all assessment tools are appropriate and are valuable to student learning and teaching. We are also delighted to know that our student cohort have shown their high level standards.

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 delighted to know that the External Examiner was well informed with the progression and award process. We look forward to having the External Examiner at the OSCE in 2019.

Other comments

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