



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:	Helen White		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Birmingham City University		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2012/13	Date of Report:	July 2013

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 programme covers the range of content expected to meet the requirements of the HCPC and the Society and College of Radiographers. The programme is appropriately structured and students are provided with clear guidance on how they complete assessment as well as feedback on how they could improve to better meet learning aims and outcomes.

There is explicit reference to the patient view within the programme, through use of patient input through scenarios within OSPE assessment as well as written case study. As the HCPC is introducing a requirement for the inclusion of service users into the delivery and content of regulated programmes, this is an area that could be further explored and developed by the programme team.

2. Academic Standards

Standards are comparable with those at other HEIs with which I am familiar, as are the achievements of the students.

Students achieving highly are those who show evaluative and analytic thinking and draw on a wide range of reading to support their work.

3. The Assessment Process

There is evidence of markers adhering to clear marking criteria aligned with the module learning outcomes. Moderation and blind second marking is also evident. I have been able to 'choose' which assessment pieces I wish to consider, showing a transparent approach to the scrutiny process.

A variety of assessment types are used across the programme and across each level. Assessments across each level are of a comparable standard. Students are provided with clear guidelines on how to approach their assessments and are offered tutorial support if they do not pass. Use of practical based OSPE, written and numerical based assessment and communication assessment ensures the width as well as breadth of competence is being assessed.

The introduction of electronic submission and marking, I feel, has added to the quantity of feedback students received. There might be some scope in considering how second marking is approached as a result of this change, as some students (those being moderated) are receiving two sets of comments, whilst those not moderated do not. This could be perceived as inequitable by some students.

Students at the exam board to which I attended were awarded '0%' due to late submission. Whilst I agree there should be a penalty for late submission, I wonder whether 0% is helpful to the student, particularly with electronic submission where students are remote to the University if they might be in need of help. At my institution, we offer a capped 40% if submitted late but within 5 working days of the initial assessment deadline on the first submission opportunity. Submission after 5 days and 0% is awarded and the student work is not marked.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

Previously I commented on the potential for 'discretion' in the awarding of classification of degrees, and the potential for subjectivity in decision making. It was therefore pleasing to note that there are now clear guidelines for the decision making process. These guidelines were adhered to at the Exam board at which I was present.

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

N/A – second year in role.

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

The use of OSPE assessment linking the theory and practical in a University setting is to be commended.

The rigorous nature of the clinical assessment process in practice, enabled by the clinical tutor, provides clear reassurance that the students exiting the University are competent and fit to practice. Students are also provided with clear and objective feedback on their performance across the key areas for safe, caring and effective practice.

7. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)

N/A

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?	X		
8.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?		X	
Draft Examination Question Papers				
8.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?			
8.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	X		
8.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	X		
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?	X		
8.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	X		
8.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	X		
8.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	X		
8.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?	X		
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
8.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	X		
8.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?	X		
8.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	X		
8.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	X		
Clinical Examinations (if applicable)				
8.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?	X		
Sampling of Work				
8.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	X		
Examining Board Meeting				

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
8.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	X		
8.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	X		
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?	X		
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?		X	
8.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			X
8.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			x

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