



## 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:	Dr Andrew Dilley		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Brighton and Sussex Medical School		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	BDS Year 1 – Anatomy		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2014-2015	Date of Report:	19/06/15

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

The structure and content of the programme is appropriate for the level of study. The anatomy component incorporated all of the relevant structures at a sufficiently high level of detail that is appropriate for a first year dentistry course. From reading the year one handbook, I could not locate details of the learning outcomes for each teaching session (other than a short 'milestones' section). I am assuming these are elsewhere? If not, it would be worthwhile incorporating the learning outcomes into the handbook. I was not aware of any redundant material.

### 2. Academic Standards

Academic standards are high and, as far as I am aware, are comparable to similar programmes elsewhere. From my visit, it was clear that there is a dedicated team of academics maintaining standards.

### 3. The Assessment Process

The course leader has developed a rigorous and thorough assessment process, which involves multiple types of summative and formative assessments (including written tests, essays, posters, information sheet and spot test). The assessments are appropriately designed for the level of the study, testing a range of academic skills and providing a clear measure of student achievement. On review of the draft exam papers I had several concerns regarding how marks were going to be awarded for some questions. However, on examination of a number of scripts, it was evident that

the question setters had taken into account my comments and improved the model answers/mark scheme for the short answer questions. Despite the inherent difficulty with marking exam essays, there are clear guidelines for the overall mark, ensuring a good consistency. However, there were very few high scoring essays, which may reflect difficulty in allocating marks for the listed criteria, such as demonstrating evidence of further reading. I scrutinized a range of scripts, which included all of the fails, borderlines and top scorers. The papers were all carefully marked, with the appropriate allocation of marks. It was evident that the weak students tended to score low in all three exam papers, as well as the ICA's and spot test. I did not find reasons to change any of the results. A small concern was that some of the borderline students were passing the module by doing well in one or two areas only. I read one script where the student appeared to get a lot of the anatomy wrong in each assessment but passed the course. I should state that the top scorers performed exceedingly well, demonstrating an exceedingly high level of knowledge. This reflects the excellent standard of teaching. From conversations with the course leader, there were issues incorporating the marks into the Student Information Management System (SIMS) that need to be resolved. Finally, I would like to commend the effective assessment process.

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

The standard appears to be comparable to the previous academic year.

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

The induction procedures were sufficient.

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

The assessments were robust and well thought out. I was particularly impressed by the extent of material covered in the assessments. The depth of anatomical knowledge that was examined was also extensive. There was a range of different types of questions with a good mix of those that were difficult (testing finer details) and easier. As previously stated, most of my comments following review of the draft papers were concerning allocation of marks in the model answers. It was clear on looking through several scripts that the majority of my comments had been incorporated into the final papers. It became apparent from reviewing the scripts that some students (especially the weaker students) need guidance on how to answer the short answer questions. These students tended to write fairly lengthy answers for one mark questions. I am not familiar with the academic skills guidance that these students receive. The overall mark sheets for the exam essays were very clear. However, the breakdown of marks for individual facts within essays was less clear. Also, for some titles it was difficult to incorporate evidence of further reading, as well as grade this information. It may be worth reviewing the marking of essays. I am concerned about the pass mark for each component, which is set at 40%. It may be worth reviewing the standard setting procedure for each component. I also reviewed several of the information sheets that the students produced on diabetes. I was impressed by this assessment, although it was unclear whether the information was aimed at the patient or expert. As part of this assessment the students are asked to write a reflective statement. I didn't completely understand the point of this statement, as it doesn't appear to be taken into account when marking the assessment. From the scripts that I reviewed, there also appeared to be

considerable variability in the quality of this statement. Finally, several anatomy questions should be revised for future use. One such question asked the student to draw branches of the maxillary and mandibular nerves. For this question, the marking of incorrect branches was unclear. A question on the phases of the masticatory cycle also appeared to be difficult to mark. Overall, I was very impressed by the level of the assessment.

## **7. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)**

## 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)
<b>Programme/Course Information</b>				
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		
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
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		
<b>Marking Examination Scripts</b>				
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		
<b>Coursework and Practical Assessments</b>				
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		
<b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b>				
8.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			N/A
<b>Sampling of Work</b>				
8.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	Y		
<b>Examining Board Meeting</b>				

		<b>Yes (Y)</b>	<b>No (N)</b>	<b>N/A (N/A)</b>
8.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	<b>Y</b>		
8.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	<b>Y</b>		
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?	<b>Y</b>		
<b>Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)</b>				
8.20	Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?			<b>N/A</b>
8.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			<b>N/A</b>
8.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			<b>N/A</b>

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:

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