



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:	James Puryer		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Bristol		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	Primary BDS (Part 2C)		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015/2016	Date of Report:	1 st July 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 has not changed from the previous academic year and relates well to the Learning Outcomes for this part of the curriculum.
- 2. Academic Standards:** The Primary BDS (Part 2C) appears to be maintaining appropriate academic standards and the ability of Cardiff undergraduate students at this stage of the curriculum are comparable with other UK institutions offering a similar undergraduate degree programme.
- 3. The Assessment Process:** There are some aspects of the assessment process that are very encouraging. As detailed in part 6, the quality of questions is excellent and fairly measures students' learning across a wide range of learning outcomes of the programme. The questions produced a wide range of marks, which made it easier to discriminate between the more-able and less-able students. The marking process involving 'independent double marking' is very fair, and there appeared to be good calibration among examiners. Having sampled a number of examination scripts, I am confident that the students were marked fairly and I was in agreement with the marks awarded to those students by the internal examiners. I am confident that the overall assessment process was conducted in line with the University's policies and regulations.

However, I do have a strong concern about the lack standard setting procedures applied to this assessment. The General Dental Council document "Standards for Education" (revised 2015) which applies to all training establishments within the UK states that "*An appropriate standard setting process must be employed for summative assessments.*" I understand that an appropriate standard setting exercise took place prior to the assessment, and that the standard setting panel

comprised sufficient numbers of appropriate staff as to follow contemporary good practice. A 'standard set' cut score for the "minimally competent student" was duly reached. However, this cut score was not applied to the assessment, and instead, the University standard "40% pass mark" was applied. The reasons for not applying the standard set pass mark to this assessment have not been made clear.

The application of standard setting is essential to the quality assurance process of this assessment in order that we can be confident that those students who have been deemed to have 'passed' this assessment do have the appropriate level of competence. This really must be addressed at the earliest opportunity.

- 4. Year-on-Year Comments:** There are none to address.

- 5. Preparation / Induction Activity (for new External Examiners only):** N/a

- 6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement:** There are some very noteworthy and commendable aspects to this assessment. The development (and resultant quality) of the assessment items is excellent. The structure of questions (along with very detailed model answers and marking scheme) is a strong part of this assessment. The assessment items fairly test 'application of knowledge' rather than simply 'recall', and these higher levels of learning are essential in any clinical programme.

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

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

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)
Programme/Course Information				
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/A
Draft Examination Question Papers				
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		
Marking Examination Scripts				
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		
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?			N/A
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?			N/A
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?			N/A
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?			N/A
Clinical Examinations (if applicable)				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			N/A
Sampling of Work				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?			N/A
Examining Board Meeting				

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
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		
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?		N	
Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)				
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
Examination of Master's Dissertations (if applicable)				
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

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.