



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 Charlie Laughton		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Nottingham		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	M Pharm <i>MPharm (Medicinal Chemistry)</i>		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015-16	Date of Report:	20-7-16

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

Subject to, and satisfying, the requirements of the GPhC, the staff at Cardiff seem to me to have produced a rigorous, challenging, and satisfying MPharm degree programme. On the face of it the programme uses a fairly conventional discipline-specific module structure, but “under the hood” there is a fair degree of interdisciplinary content that helps to avoid students adopting a silo approach to their acquisition of knowledge, and helps them make connections between science and practice.

2. Academic Standards

On the basis of the extensive sample of student work and assessment that I examined, I conclude that academic standards at Cardiff are high, student achievement is generally good and is graded comparably to equivalent performance at my own institution.

3. The Assessment Process

On the whole the assessment process is rigorous and contains appropriate checks and balances to ensure standards are applied consistently. In a few places there could be better documentation of how moderation and consistency checks on marking have been done. I am pleased to see elements of peer assessment in the process, though I know the staff are aware that some development here would be good to make these components more discriminatory. The marking sheet used for

assessment of projects (PH4116) might benefit from revision, as the current version tends to magnify relatively small differences in opinion between double markers.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

Again, I am pleased to see continuous development in the consistency of exam script annotation, marking and feedback.

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

N/A

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

PH2112

- a) Coursework component. As I have noted in past reports, this is a very nicely designed activity that provides a wonderful “joined up” experience for the students in theory, practice, group work and self-directed study.

PH3101 Optimisation of Drug Design

- a) Group presentations. It was nice to be able to see videos of some of the group presentations, students had clearly put a lot of work into producing high-quality teaching aids, though their presentation skills were in the main very obviously at an early stage of development. It is good to see an element of peer assessment here, and ways of developing the students’ willingness to provide critical feedback will be a good focus for development.
- b) Exam component. This is unusual in format as students are given some weeks in advance ten questions, of which four will eventually appear on the exam paper and have to be answered. Though this looks like an interesting pedagogic exercise, it obviously needs a lot of care if it is to be appropriate. I looked at the data carefully, and also spoke at length with the sample of students who met with us during the external examination process. My conclusion is that this experiment is so far a success; students say very positive things about the format, but it is clear that it is not because it makes the examination easy: with a mean of 69.3% and standard deviation of 14.2, it compares well with other conventional written exams on the course – in fact the range of marks is broader than in many.

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?	Y		
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?	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		
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?	Y		
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?	Y		
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.