

## **ANNUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2017-18**

### **Appendix 3: External Examiners' report**

This appendix contains Course Director's/Year Leader's responses to 2017-18 External Examiners' comments and updates to actions from 2016-17 External Examiners' report (if applicable).

As Course Director please ensure you reflect on External Examiners' comments in the Course Review section. Please ensure that any actions to be taken in response to these comments have been recorded in your Annual Quality Improvement Report.

For support or advice please contact Ana Filipovic, Academic Quality Officer 'Standards', [afilipovic@rvc.ac.uk](mailto:afilipovic@rvc.ac.uk), 01707666938

a. Update to actions from previous year:

Question	External Examiners comment	CD's response & Action	Update in 2017/18
<p><b>3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)</b></p>	<p>The assessment methods throughout the courses are and different years are appropriate and have been performed with rigour. A wide range of methods were employed, including short answers questions, problem-solving questions, multiple choice questions, project presentations, etc. In most modules and papers, there were essay-style questions. Whilst some of the questions had some structure and hence provided some guidance for the structuring of the answer, there were many instances when the essay questions were very open-ended and brief. Whilst the very best students frequently provided very good answers to this style of question, those students with less ability often seemed to perform poorly. I would encourage discussions between the teaching staff to decide whether such questions are appropriate for all subject matter.</p>	<p>CD takes note of this and will bring it up for discussion at the next Course Management Committee, to ensure that all module papers are balanced. We will also seek advice from the Director of Assessments</p> <p>Action Required: CMC secretary to include item on Autumn 2017 CMC Agenda for verbal report from CD on use of structured vs open ended and brief essay style questions in exams</p> <p>Action Deadline: 06-Nov-2017 CMC Secretary &amp; Course Director</p>	<p>COMPLETE</p> <p>1st and 2nd year papers no longer have essay style questions and the 3rd year papers are varied formats and can include open book elements as well as more straightforward essays and problem solving questions.</p>

# Collaborative Report

Exam board meeting: 28-Jun-2018

**BSc in Bioveterinary Sciences, 2017/18**

**Lead examiner: Professor Gary Baxter**

**Collaborating examiner(s): Professor William Holt, Dr Kerstin Baiker, Dr Lucy Green**

## The Programme

**Please comment, as appropriate, on the following aspects of the programme:**

### 1.1 Course content

This is a collated report covering BSc Comparative Pathology and pathways leading to BSc/MSci Biological Sciences awards. Comments relating to specific programmes, pathways or modules are indicated where appropriate.

As a general observation, course content is appropriate in all the programmes/pathways examined. There is considerable variety and choice available to students and the range of topics provides highly contemporary coverage of the veterinary and biomedical sciences. In the Biological Sciences pathways, arrangement of material and topics through years 1 to 3 reflects a steady academic exposition from foundational to advanced levels and a particularly noteworthy feature is the inclusion of supervised data-generating and data-handling projects at all levels.

**Response from college requested: NO**

### 1.2 Learning objectives, and the extent to which they were met

For the most part, learning objectives addressed by individual examination questions were indicated but this was not always done consistently and some omissions were noted. As a general observation, the complete range of learning objectives in each module required access to module handbooks; navigation of these online at speed and in high volume is cumbersome and practically impossible for the external examiners. Where it has been possible to review the learning objectives, these appear to have been met. However, the external examiners would value having ready access to printed materials containing this information (handbooks containing module descriptors, learning objectives, lecture lists etc). These should certainly be available during the examiners' visits – and ideally mailed (or e-links provided) much earlier in the academic session.

**Response from college requested: YES**

## COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson

### Course Director Response:

Since going paper free a number of years ago the college has not provided students or staff with printed module handbooks or other materials. However, it seems entirely appropriate to make hard copies of module handbooks available for External Examiners during their visit and to ensure that they have access to PDF or weblinks to the most up to date versions of these materials to aid their valuable work.

### Action Required:

CD to request course coordinator to arrange printing of module handbooks for external examiners during their visit

### Action Deadline:

20-Jun-2019

### Action assigned to:

course director course support team

### 1.3 Teaching methods

All programmes make use of a wide range of teaching and learning methods, including lectures, projects (including extended data-generating and data-handling research projects in Year 3 BSc and Year 4 MSci), directed private study, directed group activities and practical work. We also note the extensive provision of learning support materials and processes (e.g. online resources, lecture capture, tutorial support etc).

**Response from college requested: NO**

#### Dr L.G

Informal conversation with staff and a student representative suggested that students are tending to substitute the private viewing of online video lectures for the opportunity to see the 'live' face-to-face lecture. Some even regard this as 'extended study' and may be missing the idea of wider reading. It would be worth considering how to work with or counter these trends.

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response**

We are looking closely at reasons for non-attendance and carried out a short "mentimeter" survey with 1<sup>st</sup> year students in May 2019 to find out some of their thoughts. We will work with student reps early in 2019-20 to try to engage the new cohort in f2f lectures and particularly practicals and small group teaching

### 1.4 Resources (in so far as they affected the assessment)

We have no reason to believe that resources available to deliver effective teaching and learning, or to support students in their study, are deficient. The College is clearly making extensive and impressive infrastructure investments to support a high quality educational experience for its students. However, no specific information has been provided in relation to resources for assessment. We would observe that the single largest and most valuable resource relevant to assessment, academic staff time, is at risk of being over-stretched given the volume of assessment and the rapidly increasing number of students. The College will need to evaluate the sustainability of current approaches to assessment within the context of student numbers and academic staffing levels. This relates to comments below on the nature and volume of assessments.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response:**

This is very timely. The Deputy Principal has commissioned a Work Load Allocation Model Study to define the hours related to all aspects of course delivery and assessment. This information will be used to inform our design of future assessment instruments

#### **Action Required:**

Course director to discuss the findings from the Work Load Allocation Model with the BSc/MSci leadership and course support team to ensure that delivery of course and assessments remain robust but also sustainable

#### **Action Deadline:**

01-Jun-2019

#### **Action assigned to:**

Course Director

**1.5 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme**

**Response from college requested: NO**

## Student performance

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

### 2.1 Students' performance in relation to those at a similar stage on comparable courses in other institutions, where this is known to you

The performance of students in all programmes is comparable to what we have observed in Russell Group universities offering similar or related programmes of study (Birmingham, Nottingham, Southampton and Cardiff).

Response from college requested: **NO**

### 2.2 Quality of candidates' knowledge and skills, with particular reference to those at the top, middle or bottom of the range

In all programmes, we were able to sample assessed material across the range of student ability. The range of performance was broadly in line with expectations although there are indications of "skewing" for some papers. For example in BSc year 2 Applied Pharmacology, Section A marks were noticeably better than Section B. In all programmes, mean marks may be noticeably lower for some modules. There will be a number of possible reasons for these variations in quality of performance, so long-term analysis of patterns across several examination diets and student cohorts is recommended to identify causes, consequences and potential remedies for these variations.

The Gateway Programme examiners noted that the spread of marks was right or left skewed in some questions. For example, IGE and AH1 were left skewed, indicating that there were quite a few students who struggled with these modules. The problem may be attributable to the simple arithmetic requirements in these questions. On the other hand, TMA was right skewed, with average mark for TMA1 of 66%; this question was not dependent on arithmetical ability. Our interpretation is that the arithmetical issue is a problem that needs to be solved as it evidently disadvantages some students. One simple solution may be to change the order of questions on the exam paper, and not placing all the arithmetical questions together as a panic-inducing block. In discussion with the Gateway examiners it was apparent that this problem was not specific to the Gateway students and the same trends could be seen in BSc1 answers. On the whole, there was no statistical difference between the Gateway and BSc1 marks.

Response from college requested: **YES**

## COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson

### Course Director Response:

We thank you for this important observation, and we thank you for highlighting it. We are aware of some students finding arithmetic more challenging and our Learning Technology team are developing online tutorial material using authentic and relevant (laboratory/field) problems to work through different types of calculations. It is hoped that this will be offered to all students entering the programme in 2020 with a pilot version for 2019 entry. Great emphasis is put on the importance of calculations and several directed learning sessions (small group problem solving) are focused around the sorts of problems students may encounter when conducting laboratory or field experiments. Additionally there is a workshop dedicated to calculations in first year and there is a recap session in second year, as well as one to one (or small group) support available for all students via our Education Development team. For 2018-19 we have moved to two examination periods and will encourage students to reflect on their first exams in January and seek help and advice from ED before undertaking their term two module exams and research projects in term three

### Action Required:

Course Director to liaise with Learning Technology team, Education Development team and tutorial leads to ensure that students have opportunity to discuss and develop their numeracy skills. Gateway, first, second, third year leaders to encourage students to reflect on exam performance and seek help from ED before the start of the second examination period

### Action Deadline:

01-Jun-2019

### Action assigned to:

Course Director, year leaders, tutorial leads

### 2.3 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the students' performance

In a number of instances, the poor handwriting of students in exam scripts was noted but it is unclear to us if there is a formal strategy for handling illegible scripts. This should be considered since illegibility of student responses can add considerable work to the assessment process. For example, if more than 1 in 5 words are illegible then a student could be called in to transcribe their answer prior to marking.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

**Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for this observation and agree that over the past few years handwriting skills have declined, probably due to relatively less handwritten work now we have gone paper free. Course Director will discuss the possibility of asking students to transcribe their work. This may be challenging due to the short turnaround time for papers to be marked

**Action Required:**

Course director and Exam Board Chair to discuss with Examination Officers

**Action Deadline:**

01-Mar-2019

**Action assigned to:**

course director; exam board chair; examination officers

Please comment, as appropriate, on:

### 3.1 Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)

In all programmes, there is a good range of assessment procedures; this variety provides students with a number of ways to demonstrate knowledge and learning, and there is no reliance on a single method of assessment. The balance between in-course assessments and formal written examinations in modules is broadly consistent across programmes and is in line with wider practice in the sector.

We do note, with concerns, the heavy reliance on the essay as a vehicle of examination in all programmes and modules. This strikes us as being disproportionately high in comparison with practice in natural sciences programmes in other comparable institutions (i.e. Russell Group universities outside of Oxbridge). One concern is that the reason for this reliance on the examination essay is unclear; it may well be articulated in a general assessment philosophy which we have not seen. However, there are a number of questions to be addressed to justify continuing inclusion of (usually more than one) essay for practically every module examination. A key question is, what is the essay examining that cannot be examined by in-course assessment, short-answer or MCQ format? If it is factual information, then that is clearly inappropriate. However, many of the model/indicative answers suggest that factual recall is a major requirement of the student response in the essay. If the essay is testing for integration and synthesis of knowledge plus demonstration of extensive study beyond the syllabus of lectures, there is little indication that even the best-performing students demonstrate this (few if any make reference to academic literature or coverage beyond the lectures). If the essay is testing for ability to present a cogent and well-reasoned argument, then a single essay in a single examination sitting could be sufficient, although arguably a project report or dissertation would be a fairer, more rigorous and more authentic form of assessment to test this ability.

Another area of concern we have about essays is the marking load associated with them and the rigour with which the common grading scheme for essays is applied. We would suggest that programme committees and/or the Learning and Teaching Committee/Academic Board (or equivalent) review the modular and programme schemes of assessment with particular focus on the essay question format, its purpose/rationale, the practicalities of marking essays in massive volume, and appropriate facilitating/protective systems for ensuring sustained fairness and rigour in the setting and marking of essay questions (see 3.2 below).

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for their comments. Year leaders and module leaders have looked at the use of essays in exams in some detail, and agree that the essay style questions may not be fulfilling their intended purpose. For 2018-19 no exams in first or second year will have essay style questions, instead we have introduced short answer questions for some papers and have maintained longer problem solving questions. For first year papers multiple choice questions are used but these have been for second year papers. All papers have at least two different assessment styles (MCQ and PSQ or SAQ and PSQ etc.). These forms of assessment enable team marking of questions and so help to reduce staff overload. One third year module (Endocrine and Metabolic Syndromes) has piloted an open book exam based on critique of a relevant manuscript which students have prior sight of. This may be a more satisfactory way of testing students critical analysis particularly at the latter stages of the programme of study

#### **Action Required:**

Module leaders and year leaders to monitor use of assessment instruments other than essays and share best practice, with guidance from exam board chair. Education development to hold exam techniques workshops including timed essays

#### **Action Deadline:**

01-May-2019

#### **Action assigned to:**

module leaders, year leaders, exam board chair, Education Development



### 3.2 Extent to which assessment procedures are rigorous

The procedures on the whole are rigorous, but the examiners identified a few issues that could be improved.

We note the sampling approach for moderation that is in place for all programme assessments. Part of this moderation is that no further action is taken on discrepancies between the first and moderator markers unless the moderator has selected “yes” on the form. It may be worth considering additional actions such as moderating an expanded sample of scripts if more than two discrepancies are noted. This would provide additional assurances for individual students to whom a difference of a few % could make a very significant difference.

The objectivity of the marking scheme for essays is not always evident and including more MCQs and FIBs to increase the validity and robustness of the assessment may be a future alternative to the majority of long answer / essay questions. We observed in several instances that the words used by the examiner to summarise the essay standard (“very sound answer”, “quite good answer”, “excellent account” etc) and the grade awarded did not line up with the common grading scheme descriptions (for example, an “excellent account” attracted a mark of 65%). While this may not be a systemic issue (most markers’ comments were in line with the marks awarded), it is a concern because of the heavy reliance on essays in every module assessment and the potential for subjective interpretation of the common grading scheme. We are aware that markers may feel that the common grading scheme is not well tailored to each programme of study; it may be the case that the College will wish to review the common grading scheme and its application.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for these comments. This is an issue that has recently been highlighted on other programmes within the college. Course Director will bring this up with the Chair of Learning Teaching and Assessment committee to determine whether the CGS should be tailored for each programme, or indeed whether a rubric should be developed for each individual question so that written feedback can be exactly tailored to the question

Within the bounds of the current CGS, examiners will be reminded to use words in their feedback that are consistent within the descriptors of the CGS for the mark they have awarded for a particular question

#### **Action Required:**

CD to discuss review of the common grading scheme and descriptors either for biosciences or for the college as a whole

Exams officer to remind examiners to use words from the descriptors in the CGS that reflect the mark they are awarding

#### **Action Deadline:**

01-May-2019

#### **Action assigned to:**

course director exams officer

### 3.3 Consistency of the level of assessment with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)

The level of assessment in all programmes is consistent with the FHEQ.

**Response from college requested: NO**

### 3.4 Standard of marking

The standard of marking is good overall and a number of developments in recent years have continued to demonstrate improvements in clarity and consistency. For example, indicative answers with indications of mark allocation, have been helpful and application of these marking schemes is consistent, particularly in short-answer format questions.

A general comment is that the quantity and quality of annotation on the scripts was variable, although there has been a clearly improving trend during the last few years. In some instances the handwriting of markers was illegible (pharmacology has a particularly notable culprit whose pencilled commentaries were almost entirely illegible), and there were many instances where a summary statement (useful for feedback to students and a guide to other examiners) was completely absent at the end of a long answer / essay script. These deficiencies must be corrected to facilitate the quality assurance of the assessment process and to aid feedback to students.

A particular issue was noted in the Principles of Pathology paper 2: the absence of scale bars on pathology images, when students were required to comment about organ/lesion size for defined marks within the marking scheme, clearly disadvantaged all candidates. This necessitated adjustment of the marking scheme – but only after intervention of the external examiner at a very late stage; we were surprised that the issue had not been addressed earlier.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for these comments and for highlighting the need to ensure that all figures and tables are appropriately annotated including scale bars for specimens and micrographs. We will ask exams officer to remind examiners of the need to include this important information when preparing questions and that it should form part of the scrutiny during exam paper setting meetings.

The instructions for examiners includes the need to provide written comments on the scripts they mark. CD will ask the exams officer to also include instructions to ensure that these comments are legible! It is noted that some examiners provide their written comments on a sticker. Although this may be time consuming to set up it may be helpful where handwriting is a known issue

#### **Action Required:**

course director will highlight the need for legible comments from examiners on scripts and will ask colleagues for their ideas on how to achieve this during our course management committee meeting  
exams office will add the need for comments to be legible to the instructions for examiners  
chair of exam board and exams officer to ensure that all figures and tables used in papers are suitably annotated at the paper setting meeting stage

#### **Action Deadline:**

01-May-2019

#### **Action assigned to:**

Course director; exams officers; chair of exam board

### **3.5 In your view, are the procedures for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted? (e.g. Briefing, Exam administration, marking arrangements, Board of Examiners, participation by External Examiners)**

The procedures are absolutely sound and fair. Determination of final degree results follows an agreed algorithm which is applied consistently and fairly.

Given the volume and complexity of contributing assessments (e.g. several dozen discrete components contribute to a 3-year Biological Sciences programme), administration of the assessment procedures is very efficient. We would like to commend and thank the administrative staff who assisted us so ably. However, this scale of activity does raise questions about sustainability in relation to the academic and administrative staff workload, and recognising the increasing number of students. Multiple component in-course assessments coupled with multiple examination papers for multiple modules across an entire degree programme, pose considerable risks for the College. We have a strong impression a high assessment load which may not be appropriate or academically justified; an increasing staff burden of assessment; and increased risks of marker and administrator error. We are not aware of a general or unifying assessment philosophy that underpins the generation of the complex and voluminous schemes of assessment but we suggest that a major review is now urgent. We would strongly recommend that the College prioritises a thoroughgoing academic review of its assessment practices for these programmes. External examiners could contribute to this review but as a minimal response we would expect to understand the rationale for any particular scheme of assessment, especially if it is more complex and onerous than one in-course assessment plus one written exam paper per taught module.

Evaluation of in-course assessments and projects has to be undertaken using an online system that is rather cumbersome for external examiners. As there are a large number of in-course assessments, and the examiners would ideally like to have a reasonably objective method of comparing the grades awarded, it may be useful to develop a sampling strategy. If in-course assessments titles could be shown alongside the student's names and marks, it would help the examiners to identify topics within their field of expertise as well as helping them to select a sample of low, middle and highly graded pieces of work. At present the titles are not visible and the titles are shown in obscurely coded format. For BSc Biological Sciences final year projects, the quality of independent markers comments was variable (some were extremely detailed; some were perfunctory). Greater standardisation is required to enable consistency of feedback to students.

The Boards of Examiners meetings (on 29 and 30 June) were conducted with rigour and gave all examiners the opportunity to voice opinions and offer comment.

**Response from college requested: YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

#### **Course Director Response:**

We thank the External Examiners for their comments. The programme will be undergoing Periodic Review in 2020 and the suitability/sustainability of the assessment load should be one of the areas under scrutiny. A document was drawn up some years ago (Assessment Tariff) by the Academic Registrar and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Learning and Teaching to try to ensure equal assessment load across different modules and programmes. Some of the BSc3 modules predate this but have been changing to ensure that their in course assignments and exams are within the guidelines. It is hoped that this ensures parity between different forms of assessment at the same level. The work load allocation model also takes assessment time into account and so also offers valuable insight into the marking load for individual modules and courses. Module leaders and year leaders will be reminded to use the Assessment Tariff when designing new assessments. Regarding release of titles for ICA to External Examiners, the exams officers will be asked to provide this information to enable more effective scrutiny.

#### **Action Required:**

Exams office to remind module leaders to utilise the Assessment Tariff when designing different types of assessment. Where their assessment doesn't fit with those described in the document they should seek advice from the Academic Registrar.

Course Support team and Exams officers will be asked to provide the titles of summative in course assessments and provide them on the spreadsheet alongside marks and student information

#### **Action Deadline:**

01-May-2019

#### **Action assigned to:**

exams officers; course support

**3.6 Opinion on changes to the assessment procedures from previous years in which you have examined**

We are not aware of major changes to the assessment processes or marking conventions since last year.

**Response from college requested: NO**

**3.7 Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the procedures**

**Response from college requested: NO**

### 4.1 Comments I have made in previous years have been addressed to my satisfaction

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Answer = Yes (although in some instances these were made by other external examiners)

Response from college requested: **NO**

### 4.2 An acceptable response has been made

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: **NO**

### 4.3 I approved the papers for the Examination

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: **NO**

### 4.4 I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

We would ask you to note that the volume of written work that needs to be sampled has increased markedly in the last three years and that a more stream-lined approach would aid the examiners working in the short time-frame of their visit. For example, bundles of scripts could be pre-prepared with samples from high- medium- and low-performing candidates already selected and identified. IT access continued to be a major limiting factor for us this year. We request that dedicated, secure computers, with log-in done in advance, are available for us to review all on-line materials. For the BSc programmes, exam scripts and projects were available but the full-range of in-course assessments was not available.

Response from college requested: **YES**

## COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson

### Course Director Response:

We appreciate the huge volume of documents that need to be sampled by the External Examiners in a short space of time, and are very grateful for your tireless work. We will endeavor to ensure that high - medium - low scripts and ICA are made readily available either in paper or electronic format and that there are enough computers available and accessible for you to carry out the sampling. In general, the Exams Office does not give External Examiners a batch/sample of scripts, instead they are provided with a range of scripts

### Action Required:

Exams office to work with course support and IT to ensure access for External Examiners during the visit. To make available online course work and projects as well as low - medium and highly marked scripts from each question / module exam

### Action Deadline:

01-Jun-2019

**Action assigned to:**

exams officer; course support team; IT

**4.5 I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination**

**Yes**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

**Response from college requested: NO**

**4.6 Candidates were considered impartially and fairly**

**Yes**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

**Response from college requested: NO**

**4.7 The standards set for the awards are appropriate for qualifications at this level, in this subject**

**Yes**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

**Response from college requested: NO**

**4.8 The standards of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which I am familiar**

**Yes**

**Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:**

**Response from college requested: NO**

#### 4.9 I have received enough support to carry out my role

No

##### Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

To a great extent, the external examiner's role is rather unclear. It would be helpful to external examiners if the College sets out clearly its expectations of the external examiner role, and any specific objectives for external examiner action in advance of the visit. We would value the development of a policy document which set out clear guidance for external examiners. We are unclear as to our role in relation to scrutinising or validating the marks of individual students, particularly those who have had individual circumstances or who sit at a critical mark boundary. Issues such as this could be more clearly articulated.

The induction day(s) for new external examiners could be improved by an indication of if/how it wishes them to contribute at all stages of the assessment process. At the exam paper review stage we spend much time correcting errors or ambiguities that should be picked up earlier. During the time-constrained visit days, we are confronted by a large assemblage of exam scripts with little or no commentary. The development of an examiner's handbook or policy document would be very helpful.

As noted previously, we would value printed module descriptors, learning objectives and lecture lists being available during our visit (and ideally mailed or link emailed prior earlier in the academic session)

Response from college requested: **YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

##### Course Director Response:

Thank you for your comments. The course management team appreciate the need for clarity for the role of External Examiners and agree that a handbook is an excellent idea.

##### Action Required:

Course Director to discuss the development of an External Examiner handbook with the Academic Registrar and the Director of Assessment, for approval at the relevant academic committee

##### Action Deadline:

01-Jun-2019

##### Action assigned to:

course director, academic registrar, director of assessment

#### 4.10 I have received sufficient information to carry out my role (where information was insufficient, please give details)

No

##### Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

See linked question 4.9 above

Response from college requested: **YES**

**COURSE DIRECTOR: Dr Charlotte Lawson**

##### Course Director Response:

Course director will look into the possibility of clear guidelines for the role of the External Examiners with the Academic Registrar and Director of Assessment

##### Action Required:

Course Director to discuss the development of an External Examiner handbook with the Academic Registrar and the Director of Assessment, for approval at the relevant academic committee

##### Action Deadline:

01-Jun-2019

##### Action assigned to:

course director; academic registrar; director of assessment

4.11 Appropriate procedures and processes have been followed

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO

4.12 The processes for assessment and the determination of awards are sound

Yes

Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:

Response from college requested: NO



## Completion

If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully here. We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:

**5.1 Do you have any suggestions for improvements based on experience at other institutes? We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:**

No further comments

**Response from college requested: NO**

**5.2 External Examiner comments: For College information only (Responses to External Examiners are published on the College's website. Please only use this box to add any comments that you wish to remain confidential, if any)**

No further comments

**Response from college requested: NO**

