

## 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:	Susan Condor		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Loughborough University		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	BA/BSc Education (Psychology) <i>BA/BSc in Education (Education (Psychology))</i>		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015-2016	Date of Report:	21/07/16

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

From my discussions with the programme team, I am happy with the general structure of this programme in its current form, and believe that future developments in the form of the new Human and Social Sciences programme will further enhance the educational experience of students.

However, is slightly difficult for an External Examiner to comment on the programme structure, because the modules are divided between two external examiners, and no one examiner has a general overview. In addition, as a programme that is accredited by the British Psychological Society, first year modules can count towards professional accreditation. In future, it would be helpful if external examiners were presented at the outset with written information on the structure of the entire programme.

### 2. Academic Standards

Academic standards are very high. The second year modules that I saw were intellectually demanding, and the third year modules were of a level more usually seen in MSc programmes. Although expectations of students are high, in general, students rise to meet these challenges.

### 3. The Assessment Process

Students undertake a variety of assessed work. In all cases, the marking criteria are clearly specified and fairly applied.

Markers use the full range of the scale. Feedback is very clear, with markers taking care to relate their comments to the stated aims and objectives of the module. Markers also provide students with “feed forward”, drawing students’ attention to specific areas in their work that have potential for improvement.

The School guidelines on moderation are excellent. Care should be taken to ensure that new member of staff fully understand the difference between moderation and second marking.

#### **4. Year-on-Year Comments**

This is my final year, and I am very happy to note that the Social Sciences BPS programme continues to deliver a unique and stimulating curriculum, and to equip students with a wide range of transferrable intellectual and practical skills. The Department continues to display an active concern for student achievement and welfare. Over my four years’ service as external examiner I have witnessed a number of improvements to the assessment procedures, including the drafting of improved guidelines for moderating practice, and the use of the full range of the marking scale.

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

#### **6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement**

- Unique curriculum, embedding psychology in the social sciences.
- Excellent guidelines on moderation practice.
- Impressive concern for student welfare.
- Exemplary chairing and conduct of the Boards.

#### **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)**

The BA/BSc Education (Psychology) is a unique programme. Over the past four years, I have witnessed this programme develop. I have been delighted at the way in which many of my suggestions concerning assessment have been taken on board.

Generally, the communication with external examiners has been effective. This year, however, there were numerous breakdowns, with the result that (for example) I did not always have the opportunity to check exam papers, my

request to see additional examination papers for one of the modules (for which I had not been given a sufficiently large or diverse sample) went unanswered, and I did not receive all of the necessary paperwork (mark breakdown statistics, moderation reports, generic feedback etc.) for many of the modules that I examined.

I understand that these problems were the result of unusual circumstances, and that time pressures around the examination period can make it difficult to provide External examiners with information at short notice. Nevertheless, I would recommend that in future External Examiners be provided with (a) a named contact from the administrative staff; (b) names and contact details of the programme director and of the coordinator of each of the modules with which s/he is dealing. In addition, the problem of insufficient samples might in part be dealt with by giving External Examiners access to all coursework marked through Grademark, and reinstate the procedure of making all dissertations available for External Examiners to inspect on-site the morning before the Award Board.

## 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)
<b>Programme/Course Information</b>				
9.1	Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?	X		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?		X	
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?			
9.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?	X		
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?		X	
<b>Marking Examination Scripts</b>				
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?		X	
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	X		
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	X		
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	X		
9.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?		X	
<b>Coursework and Practical Assessments</b>				
9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	X		
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?		X	
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	X		
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	X		
<b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b>				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			
<b>Sampling of Work</b>				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?		X	
<b>Examining Board Meeting</b>				

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	X		
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	X		
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?	X		
<b>Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)</b>				
9.20	Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?			
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			
9.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			
<b>Examination of Master's Dissertations (if applicable)</b>				
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?			
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?			
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?			
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?			
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?			
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?			
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?			

Please return this Report, preferably in a Microsoft Word format, by email to:

[ExternalExaminers@cf.ac.uk](mailto: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.