

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013-2014 - BDS (Intermediate)

Dear Dr Satterthwaite,

I am writing further to your External Examiner's report for the above programme(s). Your Report has been considered by the School of Dentistry in accordance with our approved procedures. I am, therefore, now in a position to respond on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor to the main points you had raised.

Issues Highlighted

Your Report raised issue(s) which have been referred for consideration by the School. The following response has been provided on behalf of the School.

- “1. [3] the External Examiner's suggested enhancements to the assessment process, including a request for details on the agreed procedure for “agreement/moderation between internals” and for “further guidance to ensure consistency between examining teams”**

The suggested enhancements have been referred to the Director of Assessment and Feedback and will be considered by the School. We will send him copy of the assessment guidelines from the Assessment and Feedback Handbook (staff handbook). The Assessment and Feedback Handbook will be reviewed to ensure that the guidance is clear to ensure consistency between examining teams.

- 2. [3] the External Examiner's observation that “the structure of questions all having 10 marks leads to an unbalanced distribution of marks with inequities in relative weighting within the sub-questions” and related comment**

The Examiners are aware of the issues and this is reviewed through psychometric analysis and standard setting process. Changes to the BDS programme in future including an assessment review, will allow us to further consider the distribution and weighting of marks.

- 3. [3] comments on the “Oral assessment (Part D)” and indication that “Consideration should be given to more structured domains for questioning with a view to ensuring intra- and inter- examiner consistency”**

The marking domains and exemplar statements are reviewed and modified every year. Any variability is discussed following a viva so a consensus reached. In relation to the disparity between cases, it is recognised it may be difficult to standardise all cases, however it is accepted more work is required.

- 4. [3] the indication that the “balance of case submissions and oral assessment should be reviewed to ensure that the assessment load and relative weighting remains appropriate”**

The School thanks Dr Satterthwaite for these comments. Assessment is under review through planned changes which will be further discussed with External Examiners.

5. [5] the External Examiner's indication that a "programme handbook/detailed ILO's for the year in advance would have been helpful"

The BDS Handbook is an online document and access information should have been sent to Dr Satterthwaite. The School apologises this was not received."

Positive Comments

The School and University are pleased to note your positive comments on the School's provision including:

- a. [1, 2 and 3] your positive indications regarding the programme structure, academic standards and assessment process**
- b. [6] your commendation of the early timing of the "case presentations and associated assessments".**

I hope that you will find this response satisfactory and thank you for your service as External Examiner.

In order to meet the expectations of the QAA Quality Code, both the External Examiner Annual Report and this Institutional Response will be published on Registry web pages and will be available publically.

The University's provision of the formal Institutional Response is not intended to constrain direct communication between schools and their External Examiners. Schools are encouraged to discuss with their External Examiners any matters of detail raised in their Reports and, more widely, any issues impacting on the quality and standards of awards, including possible changes to programmes.

We are most grateful for your comments and for your support in this matter.

Dr S L Williamson

for Dr C B Turner
Academic Registrar