



EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT FORM

The completion of this Report is supported by *Annual Report Form – Guidance to External Examiners*. The Guidance and this Form are available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/regis/ifs/exex/rep/index.html>. Fee information and claim forms are available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/regis/ifs/exex/fees/index.html>.

	For completion by External Examiner:		
Name of External Examiner:	Professor Daryll Jagger		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Glasgow Dental School		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	Final BDS		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2013-2014	Date of Report:	16 th June 2014

For completion by External Examiner in the spaces provided. Please extend spaces where necessary. **Please note this Form will be published online.**

1. Programme Structure

I have no concerns regarding the structure of the BDS programme in Cardiff Dental School. It is in line with similar programmes in other UK Dental Schools in which I have examined. It covers the learning outcomes as specified by the General Dental Council in the First Five Years, now replaced by Preparing for Practice. The programme sufficiently prepares the undergraduate dental students to graduate as a safe beginner and move forward onto independent clinical dental practice.

2. Academic Standards

The standards are comparable with other UK Dental Schools. The students performed at a range of levels as expected, some performing at a substandard, satisfactory and high level. This was clearly reflected in the range of marks awarded to the students at examination.

3. The Assessment Process

This is my third year as External Examiner for the Final BDS Examination. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the school for the great level of hospitality shown.

As in previous years I had an opportunity to comment on the examination questions and suggestions made for modification were taken into account. The questions were set at the appropriate level and covered a broad range of learning outcomes as

recommended by the General Dental Council.

This year I also received an on line examiner training package in an attempt to ensure a higher degree of inter examiner consistency for the case presentation and unseen case oral examinations. Although this package is in its early stages of development it was still helpful. I understand that the school is going to further develop the training package for future diets.

The administrative support and organisation was excellent as in previous years. This year the school had the General Dental Inspection team present for the examinations. They should be congratulated on how they coped with the additional pressure of the visit.

I was asked to attend an examiner briefing presentation ahead of the oral examinations. This was a useful reminder as to how the different components of the examination contribute to the overall mark awarded.

For the case presentations, I was provided with these ahead of the examination which provided me with ample opportunity to review their content. The candidates presented a range of clinical work. The range was at a similar level to that seen in other UK Dental Institutions. Last year a recommendation was made that the candidates should clearly identify the items of treatment undertaken. This had been taken on board and could be seen on a number of case presentations. The marking sheet still needs some modification. There is a category for additional marks which is set at 10%. This category is very difficult to mark and can reduce the inter examiner consistency. This category should either be removed or renamed with clear marking criteria attached. A structured question sheet would also be helpful to ensure that the candidates are asked similar questions. The time allowed for the examination is perhaps in excess of that required and could be reduced by 5 minutes. This would still allow sufficient time to examine the weaker candidate and allow those who perform at a higher level to shine.

For the unseen case a number of cases of differing complexity were used. This can make it rather difficult to standardise this examination. It is appreciated, however, that much work has gone into the development of these cases since the school moved away from the live patient. I understand that the school is still working on and developing this part of the examination. The category marked history and examination, for which the students are awarded marks, requires some further thought. There is certainly an improvement from last year and comments have been taken on board, such that the amount of marks awarded for this section have been reduced. However the candidates are still being marked on reading out information which they have been provided. Perhaps this category could be removed and the candidates asked to summarise the salient points that they have been given in the history/examination and move straight to providing a diagnosis. Alternatively have the diagnosis as the starting point and simply explore aspects of the history that have led them to the diagnosis. As with the case presentation there is scope to reduce the length of this oral examination by 5 minutes.

The development and use of a structured question sheet would again be helpful to improve the inter examiner consistency.

The role of the External Examiner is currently under review. There is the possibility of

a move to the External acting in a Quality Assurance role rather than being actively involved in the oral examination. This approach seems to be preferred by the General a Dental Council as it allows the External to have a more overall view of the examination process, more closely monitor consistency between examiners and allow flexibility to see an increased number of teams to ensure consistency between teams. The school will need to review the role of the External ahead of the next diet.

Overall the candidates performed well and at a similar level to those in schools which I have previously examined e.g. Birmingham, London and Dundee.

The Final Board examination was clear and concise.

In summary I can confirm that the examination process is fair, transparent and robust. I have no concerns.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

The examination has evolved and improved over the three years that I have examined. The administration staff are absolutely excellent and should be congratulated for their hard work.

5. Preparation / Induction Activity (for new External Examiners only)

Not applicable

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

The school is proactive in an attempt to produce a robust examination which adequately prepares the students as a safe beginner. The school have taken on board feedback from External Examiners, acted on that feedback and continue to develop the examination.

7. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)

Not applicable.

8. Annual Report Checklist

Please include appropriate comments within Sections 1-7 above for any answer of 'No'.

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
Programme/Course Information				
8.1	Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?	Y		
8.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?	Y		
Draft Examination Question Papers				
8.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?	Y		
8.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	Y		
8.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Y		
Marking Examination Scripts				
8.6	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Y		
8.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Y		
8.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Y		
8.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	Y		
8.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?	Y		
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
8.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	Y		
8.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?	Y		
8.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	Y		
8.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	Y		
Clinical Examinations (if applicable)				
8.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?	Y		
Sampling of Work				
8.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	Y		
Examining Board Meeting				

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
8.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	Y		
8.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	Y		
8.19	Cardiff University recognises the productive contribution of External Examiners to the assessment process and, in particular, to the work of the Examining Board. Have you had adequate opportunities to discuss the Programme and any outstanding concerns with the Examining Board or its officers?	Y		
Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)				
8.20	Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?			N/A
8.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			N/A
8.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			N/A

Please return this Report, preferably in a Microsoft Word format, by email to:

ExternalExaminers@cf.ac.uk

Your fee and expenses claim form and receipts, should be sent electronically to the above email address or in hard copy to:

Clive Brown, Registry Officer, Registry & Academic Services, Cardiff University,
McKenzie House, 30-36 Newport Road, Cardiff, CF24 0DE