



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:	Guy Bradley-Smith		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Exeter Medical School		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	Clinical Epidemiology BSc		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2014 - 2015	Date of Report:	23/06/2015

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

Both the structure and content of this intercalated BSc remain largely the same this academic year with the welcome return of the, optional, Learning Disability module. Again, the only way to obtain credits through an examination is through the Research Methods module. Other modules are marked, as before, on both project work, either in report form and/or oral presentation. These modules offer students a large spread of medical subjects, allowing diversity of their applicability to the students' planned future career.

2. Academic Standards

The ability to review the full width of the curriculum was, again, offered in the delivery of all submitted examination papers and project files ahead of the examiners meeting. Similarly, challenges to the students about their understanding of research methodology, and their use thereof in project work was, more than exemplified in the interviews, of a range of students, in which I participated. Again, the teaching staff have reason to be proud of their course. Several students are planning to get some of their work published. Comparing these students with the, small number of, Year 4 students at the Peninsula College of Medicine and Dentistry (PCMD) who undertake a Student Selected Unit (SSU) with me, I would, again, affirm my belief in the academic equivalence of the two courses.

3. The Assessment Process

The significant change this year was the availability to markers of model answers for the Research Methodology examination (ME 3092). These were well prepared and laid out and appeared well used in my, limited, review of their use on several examination scripts. The availability of the marking grids for the paper helped the process to be easily moderated. There remains double marking of assessments with a third marker involved if there is a significant disparity between the first two. The ongoing assessment of oral presentations was, at the interview stage, again reported by the students to be a significantly positive process in terms of growing their confidence in the use of these skills. The students selected for interview gave thoughtful, intelligent and fluent responses to the interviewers' challenges.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

It is of note that all of the intercalated awards were First Class degrees. Certainly medical student selection in itself will discover high grade students and those who choose to intercalate are probably the most prepared, and committed, to such a route. In discussion with other members of the Board, I both challenged the universality of these awards and made it clear that I found the students' outputs and interviews to be comparable with each other and agree therefore with these excellent awards. Unlike last year's student cohort, there was no particular part of the teaching programme that attracted any negativity from the students.

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

Not applicable.

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

Discussions about student's aspirations to publish some of their work, led to thinking about how the more enduring utility of this course might do well to be investigated in the way of a small cohort study to evidence either the students' use of their learning as they enter their work in the clinical arena, or of their publication output? This is, of course, aspirational but may prove very encouraging?

The new 'model answer' approach appeared effective and useful. However, given some *ad hoc* feedback at the student interviews, there may be room to make small, but significant enhancements in seeking to improve both the quality of verbal and /or written feedback given to students by their subject leads?

I would be happy to discuss either of these possibilities further with the teaching team if that would be helpful.

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?			N/A
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