

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

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2017-18

QAT Received 04/04/2019

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

*Title and Name of Examiner:*

*Faculty / School of:*

Dentistry

*Subject(s):*

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

BChD / MChD

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

Finals

**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.*

I was consulted at all stages during the development of the written assessments for this assessment both for the initial paper and subsequently for the resit paper. I was content with the standard of the questions and any comments that I made were taken into account by the team in Leeds. It is of note that some of these papers were submitted to the external examiners at very short notice. I was able to respond but this was to an extent fortuitous. I would urge colleagues in Leeds to consider setting both the initial and resit papers at the same time. I appreciate that this may appear as additional work but it is usually required and it would assist the external and internal examiners in ensuring that the standards set between these papers are the same.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

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

Greater balance and clarity around the dissertation process  
Greater use of "standard for the just passing candidate" statements

**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*

There were word-processed responses from some candidates (presumably due to special circumstances) but they are intrinsically neater and easier to read / assess, and have the potential to allow the candidate to write more one candidate for example had a full page of typed A4 script for each answer another with very large (and legible!) handwriting often ran out of space within the context of the paper forms this is inherently inequitable in terms of the amount students can write in relation to each question and may affect the outcomes to the detriment of those students who hand write their answers?

I was asked to validate the outcomes for poster presentations in Paediatric dentistry. The forms show why the candidates were scored the way they were but there is no narrative to say why. It is difficult to validate on the basis of the poster alone as often the posters appeared OK with the difficulty revolving

around the oral component of the presentation. The notes from the examiners were very useful but sometimes limited in their extent.

I was asked to validate the outcome for the MChD dissertations. There were a small number of dissertations with very high TurnItIn scores, this seems to relate to the submission being formatted as for a paper and then submitted as a pdf which means that all the text in the presentation is ignored by TurnItIn and the only elements remaining are the title and a report at the end which had been seen previously.

All manuscripts should be submitted as word files and then put through TurnItIn to affirm plagiarism compliance. There is no evidence that plagiarism had occurred it simply couldn't be checked in manuscripts that have been submitted as pdf files

#### **For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

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**

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?	Y
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*

I have enjoyed my time as external in Leeds and have watched with interest the transition from a BChD to an MChD. This program has evolved progressively over the years I have been involved and I am confident that the program is robust and leads to dental graduates that are comparable with others elsewhere in the country. My comments above about the balance of awards does not detract from the program being able to discriminate the "safe beginner" as a dentist.

I would like to thank the team in Leeds for giving me this opportunity and looking after me so well over these times.

#### **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
<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>		
14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	N
<i>Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:</i>		
15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y
<i>Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here: The standards of clinical care that I saw from the students were comparable with those of dental graduates elsewhere I have examined</i>		
16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y
<i>Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here: <b>The program is able to identify dental students who are "safe beginners" and suitable for progression into dental foundation training</b></i>		

#### Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y
<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>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
I note that split of distinction / merit / pass is 49:21:18 I remain of the view that this high proportion of distinctions is out of line with similar awards in other Universities. I appreciate the MChD is different to BDS programs elsewhere but most degrees have some form of recognition of performance usually identified as honours. Such honours awards are normally at a rather lower proportion of the outcome compared with the performance we have seen here and over the recent years of this M level qualification.		
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<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>  See above		
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i>		

**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>		

**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 Surgery*

Programme(s) / Module(s):

MChD/BChD – Final Year

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 / 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) 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 [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**

Thank you for your response.

We are pleased that you felt that you were consulted at all stages during the development of the written papers and that your comments were taken on board. It is reassuring to know that you were content with the standard of assessment for the programme.

We note your comment with regard to short assessment turnaround expectations with our external examiners and are endeavouring to undertake the preparation of assessments earlier in the cycle. We also note your recommendation of best practice in preparation of both the first and second sitting papers in parallel. We recognise that this reduces workload and helps ensure continuity of the assessment. We have moved to implement this throughout the School's programmes.

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

We are glad that you were able to see the further development of the Final Year Project process and the use of the standard for the 'just passing candidate'.

**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:

Thank you for your comments which we will address under the areas of word processed candidates' responses, the paediatric case examination and Final Year Project Turnitin protocols:

**Word processed candidate responses**

We note your comments and can confirm that students who currently word process their responses have been assessed externally to the School and these arrangements have been recommended to ensure appropriate support and as such these students are not disadvantaged in the assessment process. The time allocation is identical for each student and a concise answer may provide the relevant and required information to the question asked. We are accepting that the typed response may have the potential to have a higher word count than the

hand written response in the space provided but this may not always provide the opportunity for greater achievement in the time allowed.

#### Paediatric case examination

Your observations regarding a lack of clear narrative on some of the mark sheets for the paediatric examination cases were flagged to the examiners within Paediatric Dentistry at the time. It is anticipated that examiner instructions would be made clearer going forward to ensure this was not an issue in future years.

#### Final Year Project Turnitin protocols

Instructions for the submission of the Final Year Project document in the Module Handbook now includes that this should be in Word format and all PDF versions were converted to Word and reviewed for any academic malpractice.

#### **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 very pleased that you have been able to see improvements in the programme during your time as an External Examiner and would like to thank you for your contribution to the changes and developments in both process and programme. The transition of the award from Bachelor to Integrated Degrees of Masters and Bachelor was challenging and we are proud of what the programme has become. We are very grateful to everyone who has been involved in that transition, not least our External Examiners.

### **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 reassured that you were able to confirm that the standards of clinical care that you saw from our students were comparable with those of dental graduates you have examined elsewhere and that you feel our Dental Surgery programme is able to identify dental students who are "safe beginners" and suitable for progression into Dental Foundation Training.

### **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 note your comments regarding the split of pass, merit and distinction for the MChD programme. Each module has assessments which are reviewed every year by External Examiners to ensure the appropriate level. The final award is then derived from students' attainment across the modules and is therefore a reflection of the results across multiple modules over multiple years. A 0-100 marking scheme has been introduced 2018/19 which is based on the level of the module and provides greater scope for discrimination of short answer questions throughout the programme. The impact of this will take time to see in the final classification.

### **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 see that your responses indicated your satisfaction with the progression and awards process and thank you sincerely for your commitment, effort and expertise.

### **Other comments**

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

N/A