



## 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:	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:	2015-2016	Date of Report:	23/06/16

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 structure and content of the programme is appropriate for the level of study. The anatomy component incorporates the majority of relevant structures at a sufficiently high level of detail that is appropriate for a first year dentistry course.

### 2. Academic Standards

Academic standards are high and are comparable to similar programmes elsewhere. It was clear that there is a dedicated team of academics maintaining standards.

### 3. The Assessment Process

The course organisers have developed a robust assessment procedure that includes three exam papers, three in course assessments, two posters, a patient information leaflet, a spot test and a viva. This extensive range of assessments seems appropriate for a year one dentistry programme. I scrutinised a number of exam papers, including papers from failing students as well as the top students. The majority of students clearly demonstrated an exceptional knowledge of head and neck anatomy. However, there were a few papers where the students could name complex anatomical detail but were unable to label a vertebra, which is core basic anatomical knowledge. There is no doubt that the assessment process is effective and discriminates between students of different abilities. I was thoroughly impressed by the top students who provided 'textbook' answers to the majority of exam questions. This clearly reflects the excellent standard of teaching. Similar to last year, I had issues regarding the essay component of the written exams. From the model answers, it is often unclear how marks are awarded. Looking over the essay

questions, I had concerns over whether it was possible with the current criteria for students to achieve full marks. For each of the essay papers, less than 4 students achieved grades over 80%. In contrast, more than 10 students scored below 40% for each of the papers. This also raises concerns as to whether the students have had sufficient practice at writing essays under exam conditions. A final issue is regarding the pass mark for the exam papers, which is set at 40%. There is no indication as to how the papers were standard set. However, having raised this issue, I understand that this will be addressed for the following academic year.

#### **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)**

N/A.

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

I am thoroughly impressed by the range of assessments undertaken by the students. My main criticism is however regarding the anatomy questions. The majority are dependent on memorising minutia of detail and are simply testing recall. Although there are a handful of clinical scenarios, I would like to see more applied questions, whereby the students have to work things out. In addition, for the drawing questions, there is no start point, i.e. the students are given a blank box to draw in. Having looked over a range of answers for some of these questions, I feel that it would be more appropriate to provide a starting point, such as a diagram/outline to complete (students could add nerves, vessels or muscles etc). Also, there are no labelling questions. I am particularly impressed by the patient information leaflet as well as the posters. However, I am not sure why the students are required to complete two posters (a group and individual poster)? For the group poster, the mark scheme is unclear. Although all of the posters are marked by the course leader, there seems to be no detailed marking procedure. I am pleased to see peer marking of the posters, although I didn't fully understand how their mark contributed to the final mark for individual students. At the exam board, I raised a question regarding the academic support for failing students. From the response it was clear that there is an effective process for detecting these students and that additional resources are available.

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

N/A.

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

N/A.

## 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?	Y		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?		N	
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?	Y		
9.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	Y		
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Y		
<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?	Y		
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Y		
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Y		
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	Y		
9.10	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>				
9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	Y		
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?	Y		
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	Y		
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	Y		
<b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b>				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			N/A
<b>Sampling of Work</b>				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	Y		
<b>Examining Board Meeting</b>				
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	Y		
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	Y		

		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?	Y		
<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?			N/A
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			N/A
9.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			N/A
<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?			N/A
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?			N/A
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?			N/A
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?			N/A
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?			N/A
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?			N/A
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?			N/A

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

#### **SAMPLING OF TAUGHT MASTER'S DISSERTATIONS BY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS**

External Examiners shall be expected to see prescribed numbers and ranges of Dissertations, but not to mark them, on the following basis:

At least 10% of Dissertations for a postgraduate taught Master's Programme, or a minimum of 10 (whichever is the higher figure) must be seen by the External Examiner(s). Where the total number is less than 10, all Dissertations must be seen by the External Examiner(s) #.

Dissertations seen by External Examiners should include examples from across the whole range of achievement (i.e. Pass with Distinction, Pass, Fail).

External Examiners will retain the right to see other Dissertations at random.

- # Where more than one External Examiner is appointed on a Programme, at least 10% of Dissertations, or a minimum of 10 (whichever is the higher figure), should be seen collectively by the External Examiners.