

## **INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013-2014 - BSc/BA in Economics (and related programmes) (Microeconomics)**

Dear Professor Mukherjee,

I am writing further to your External Examiner's report for the above programme(s). Your Report has been considered by the Cardiff Business School in accordance with our approved procedures. I am, therefore, now in a position to respond on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor to the main points you had raised.

### Issues Highlighted

Your Report raised issue(s) which have been referred for consideration by the School.

**[6] your bullet-pointed suggested enhancements to the assessment process (annotation of scripts, visibility of part-marking, categorical marking, location of marks on scripts and information about the programme provided to you).**

The following response has been provided on behalf of the School.

*"On the issue of Professor Mukherjee's request for "more information about the programme" (fifth bullet point section 6), the Economics Section was under the impression that the examiner had been provided with all necessary documentation relating to the Economics programmes, including a copy of the Economics programme handbook by the Business School's Academic Quality Office. This will be addressed for 2014-15.*

*On the issue of categorical marking (third bullet point in section 6), for non-mathematically based examinations, members of the Economics Section were informed at the start of the academic session 2013-14 that the University considered it best practice to mark individual pieces of assessment (e.g. an essay, be it as part of continuous assessment or as part of an examination) using categorical marking, with marks ending only in '2', '5' or '8'. The system was adopted in at least one module during 2013-14, namely Modern British Economic History. While such marking indicates clear lines of demarcation for each essay or piece of assessment, where an exam comprises several essays and/or a module comprises several different assessments, it does not however preclude the possibility of the overall exam or, indeed, module mark ending in any number, including a '9'.*

*On the issue of providing annotations and comments on scripts sent to the external examiner for review in order to justify the marks awarded (first bullet point section 6), this is considered by the Section to be best practice. It is, however, recognised that many markers fail to follow this practice and action is being taken to encourage section members to comply with this practice in the future. Likewise, the writing of marks inside the script for each part of a question (second bullet-point section 6), and the resultant total for the question, both inside the script as well as on the cover (fourth bullet point section 6), will also be encouraged."*

### Positive Comments

The School and University are pleased to note your positive comments on the School's provision including:

- a. **[1, 2 and 3] positive indications regarding the programme structure, academic standards and assessment process.**

I hope that you will find this response satisfactory and thank you for your service as External Examiner.

In order to meet the expectations of the QAA Quality Code, both the External Examiner Annual Report and this Institutional Response will be published on Registry web pages and will be available publically.

The University's provision of the formal Institutional Response is not intended to constrain direct communication between schools and their External Examiners. Schools are encouraged to discuss with their External Examiners any matters of detail raised in their Reports and, more widely, any issues impacting on the quality and standards of awards, including possible changes to programmes.

We are most grateful for your comments and for your support in this matter.

Dr S L Williamson

for Dr C B Turner  
Academic Registrar