



## EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Guidance notes are available to support the completion of this Report and are available at <http://learning.cf.ac.uk/quality/review/external-examiners/reports/>.

	For completion by External Examiner:		
Name of External Examiner:	Mark Woolford		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	King's College London		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	BDS		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015/16	Date of Report:	June 2016

For completion by External Examiner in the spaces provided. Please extend spaces where necessary. **Please note this Form will be published online and should not make any reference to any individual students or members of staff.**

### 1. Programme Structure

The programme structure is perfectly in line with all other programmes in the UK. The programme delivers a good education in dentistry and creates a 'safe beginner' as required by the GDC UK.

### 2. Academic Standards

The academic standards are satisfactory overall. I still have concerns that the university requires a 40% pass mark. This is 10% lower than any other school in the UK. I have seen no evidence that this is taken into account in the marking scheme of any part of the examination.

### 3. The Assessment Process

The assessment process is reasonable. Constant review takes place of the process and this is as it should be. The written examination requires a rethink. Three similar papers does not stretch the students and seem to test the same thing and do not discriminate. The seen case discussion is variable depending on the case treated by the student. It is conducted fairly but highly subjective to the case. The unseen case is now more reliable and fair.

It is not possible to determine how marks are awarded by different examiners in the written papers, nor how consensus of mark is arrived at.

Due to another commitment and a late meeting, I was not able to attend the Exam Board. However my comments were left with a visiting examiner who could attend and so we were well and appropriately represented.

#### **4. Year-on-Year Comments**

Comments are always reviewed and commented upon by the exam team. The assessment is constantly evolving, as it should.

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

No concerns.

#### **6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement**

The development of using psychometrics from the exam has been slow but we are informed this will now take place. This is seen as good practice. Early and initial investigations for summer 2016 show some interesting issues that have been commented upon in previous exam reports. It is hoped these will now be taken forward.

The changes in the unseen case format are to be commended.

There are a number of small points to be considered in the conduct of the examination. Some candidates attend with a name badge. This is poor practice. Candidates should only be identifiable by a number. It is easily rectified.

It is always difficult but standardisation of examiners is an important part of the process when so many examiners are used (for good reason).

It is hard to see the value of three written papers of identical format. 45 questions. It is possible for students to pass only 29 questions and still pass the examination. It is possible for them to fail whole subjects completely and yet still qualify. This is true for many exams, but the issue should be recognised and addressed as seen appropriate by the examinations team.

Standard setting must be introduced for all written examinations. This has been raised before and although explained its omission cannot be fully justified.

A timekeeper should be available for the unseen case discussions as examiners run on and it should be equal time for each examiner.

The student cases are only single marked. This requires a rethink as it is not best practice.

Overall the exam is well run and meets the standard required to ensure candidates are safe beginners for GDC registration.

**7. Comments on the Examination of Master's Dissertations (External Examiners for postgraduate Master's Programmes only, see also 9.23-9.29 below)**

Not applicable

**8. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)**

Not applicable at this time

## 9. Annual Report Checklist

Please include appropriate comments within Sections 1-8 above for any answer of 'No'.

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
<b>Programme/Course Information</b>				
9.1	Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?	x		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?	x		
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?	x		
9.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	x		
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	x		
<b>Marking Examination Scripts</b>				
9.6	Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	x		
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	x		
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?		x	
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	x		
9.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?	x		
<b>Coursework and Practical Assessments</b>				
9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	x		
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?			x
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?			x
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?			x
<b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b>				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			x
<b>Sampling of Work</b>				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	x		
<b>Examining Board Meeting</b>				
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?		x	
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?			x

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
9.19	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?	x		
<b>Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)</b>				
9.20	Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?			x
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			x
9.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			x
<b>Examination of Master's Dissertations (if applicable)</b>				
9.23	Did you receive a sufficient number of Dissertations to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?			x
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?			x
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?			x
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?			x
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?			x
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?			x
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?			x

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

[ExternalExaminers@cf.ac.uk](mailto: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:

External Examiners, Registry, Cardiff University, McKenzie House, 30-36 Newport Road, Cardiff, CF24 0DE