



EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT FORM

Guidance notes are available to support the completion of this Report via the Cardiff University Intranet [here](#) and from ExternalExaminers@cardiff.ac.uk.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| | For completion by External Examiner: | | |
| Name of External Examiner: | Prof Simon Gaisford | | |
| Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner: | University College London | | |
| Programme and / or Modules Covered by this Report | MPharm | | |
| Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report: | 2016-17 | Date of Report: | 15/11/17 |

Please complete all information in the spaces provided and submit within **six weeks** of the Examining Board (the **taught stage** Examining Board in the case of **postgraduate Master's programmes**).

Please note this form will be published online and should not make any reference to any individual students or members of staff in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998).

Please extend spaces where necessary.

1. Programme Structure (curriculum design, programme structure and level, methods of teaching and learning)

I am satisfied that the programme structure is appropriate and provides education and training to meet the requirements of the GPhC. The syllabus is comprehensive and well organised.

2. Academic Standards (comparability with other UK HEIs, achievement of students, any PSRB requirements)

I reviewed a significant proportion of the examination booklets and project dissertations and it is clear that academic standards are high and appropriate. The academic level at which answers are provided increases through years 1-4 and are certainly comparable with those of other UK institutions I have reviewed

3. The Assessment Process (enabling achievement of aims and learning outcomes; stretch of assessment; comparability of standards between modules of the same level)

The assessment process is clear and fair. As has been the case every time I have reviewed material, excellent feedback was evident on the examination papers and I particularly liked the codes that indicated where answers fell short – this is a system that is both easy for the examiners to use, but very informative for reviewers. Project reports varied in the extent of evidence of feedback in the documents themselves, but all had a summary sheet properly filled in. It was also clear where work had been second marked. I made specific comments on various aspects of the course which I discussed with the course team and at the Exam Board, but have reproduced below for the record;

Year 4 general:

The spreadsheets were very well explained and the coding system is clear. The secondary rule was also clearly explained and is clear and uniformly applied. There are a number of cases where a student missed a degree classification through the secondary rule because of either a 69% in the project (4116) or a 69% in a year 3 module. In cases where the low mark is in 4116 it is possible for the Externals to check and verify, but care is needed when reviewing year 3 results to ensure borderline marks are fair.

PH4117:

I reviewed exemplars of high, middle and low grades and am satisfied that the marks are fair in comparison to the mark scheme. The marker's comments are clear, as are the awards of individual marks. I could see no evidence of second-marking. The students were able to write clearly and even in the cases which scored the lowest marks the it was a general lack of information that was the problem, not an inability to write. I note that across the exemplars Q2 was always the lowest scored Q.

Year 3:

PH3114: Class tests – I reviewed the exemplars, which ranged from nearly 100% to the low 40s. There is a clear range of abilities expressed, and those at the higher end of the marking range are clearly well prepared and error free. The exemplars at the lower range contained significant errors that might have affected the patient, so the marking is very fair. Excellent annotation of marks and also highlighting of errors. Even better, marks awarded are in green, while marks deducted are in red – very clear and easy to understand.

Exam – There were potential issues with three questions. QA2. Summary stats sheet shows B as the correct answer, while model answer shows C as correct answer. The majority of students answered C. Has this been incorrectly accounted for? QA9 poorly answered – it was the only answer containing two potential mechanisms so I wonder if this confused students? QA13 had no correct answers – perhaps check what was taught? Most students answered 0.2 μm rather than 2 μm . On checking, it was found that the QA2 issue had already been corrected, but my spreadsheet was an old version, but the QA9 issue had not been previously accounted for – so a correction was made prior to the board.

Year 2:

PH2107: Exam – the exam has a large MCQ component and unlike 3114 there are quite a few questions incorrectly answered. The notes provided suggest the answers

have been checked but I was not provided with a set of model answers – the paper I reviewed earlier in the year has changed since review. In cases where the majority of students have answered the same, but incorrect, answer, I think it would be best practice to review the actual material taught, so that the marker can be satisfied the question is genuinely incorrectly answered. For instance, Q33; 72.1% of students answered C, whereas the correct answer is B; Q34; 72.1% of students answered D, whereas the correct answer is E.

Summative assessment sheets: I could see clear evidence of marking and where marks were lost, although unlike the 3114 papers all marking was in red. No model answers were provided, so I was unable to check the marks awarded against them, but the marks seemed fair relative to those stated in the paper. There was clear evidence that the lower marked scripts contained more errors and/or lacked detail than the best scripts.

PH2203: Exam – Again, Q2 shows B as correct on model answer but C on the marking report but this was corrected. Q9, Q11, Q12 and Q13 have a broad range of answers, while Q10 was answered 100% correctly. These questions appear to cover similar material, so check what is taught here. Part B papers – exemplars provided and reviewed. Very clear evidence of marking and feedback on poorer answers – also very clear that in cases of lower marks, information is simply not provided in the answer books.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

[Previous External Examiner Reports are available from the Cardiff University Website [here](#).]

This was my fourth and final year as External and I was pleased to see feedback from last year had been incorporated into the course. We were provided with a whole day to review papers and scripts and we were able to talk with a selection of students. All exam papers and supporting documents were sent to me for review in good time and the lines of communication are clear. It was particularly helpful for the structure of the results reports, and university regulations, to be explained before the exam board. It was good to see that each student's marks were discussed and that all staff were engaged with the process and knew the academic regulations. Where students were on a borderline or had an unusual case I am happy that the discussions and decisions reached were fair and in the best interests of the student

5. Preparation for the role of External Examiner (for new External Examiners only) (appropriateness of briefing provided, visits to School, programme handbooks and supporting information)

n/a

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement (good and innovative practice in learning, teaching and assessment; opportunities for enhancement of learning opportunities)

As noted above, I like the coding system during marking for noting where answers fell short and the system used for reporting marks. No vivas are permitted, which is a shame as meeting the students is an excellent way to assess quality, but the chance to talk with a selection of students is excellent.

7. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only) (significant changes in standards, programme/discipline developments, implementation of recommendations, further areas of work)

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? | Y | | |
| 8.2 | Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme? | Y | | |
| Draft Examination Question Papers | | | | |
| 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 | | |
| 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? | 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 | | |
| Coursework and Practical Assessments | | | | |
| 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 | | |
| Clinical Examinations (if applicable) | | | | |
| 8.15 | Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments? | | | |
| Sampling of Work | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| 8.16 | Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work? | Y | | |
| Examining Board Meeting | | | | |
| 8.17 | Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting? | Y | | |
| 8.18 | Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction? | Y | | |
| 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? | Y | | |
| 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? | | | |
| 8.21 | If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees? | | | |
| 8.22 | Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules? | | | |
| Examination of Master's Dissertations (if applicable) | | | | |
| 8.23 | Did you receive a sufficient number of Dissertations to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? | | | |
| 8.24 | Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)? | | | |
| 8.25 | Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners? | | | |
| 8.26 | Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board? | | | |
| 8.27 | If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures? | | | |
| 8.28 | Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied? | | | |
| 8.29 | Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate? | | | |
| 8.30 | Comments on the Examination of Master's Dissertations. <i>Please provide any comments you may wish to make on the issues raised above.</i> | | | |

Please return this Report, **in a Microsoft Word format**, by email to:
externalexaminers@cardiff.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