



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:	Eustace Johnson		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Chester		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	MSc Tissue Engineering		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2017-18	Date of Report:	9-11-2018

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

In continuance of last year's report, this course provides an excellent training in core subjects and skills relevant to tissue engineering, including research methods, molecular/cellular biology, cell-matrix and stem cell biology. The modules complement each other, progress and clearly help prepare the students for their research dissertations and further study/work. The structure is well thought out and the staff commitment and activity admirable.

2. Academic Standards

The learning outcomes are of an appropriate standard to meet with national academic standards and in line with my experience of other Masters courses. Assessed course work and exams are of a good/very good standard with examples of excellent performances.

3. The Assessment Process

- A varied combination of assessment methods is employed to evaluate how well the learning outcomes are met.
- The assessments are well aligned with the learning outcomes.
- A summary of feedback and individual feedback for the various assessments are in place on many occasions, but not for all exam scripts. It would be helpful if the scripts were annotated, even as a summary "overall feedback" as in DET002 (Research Methods).
- It might be an idea to consider how the "agreed" mark is arrived at, whether this is simply a mean of 2 independent marks, through a discussion following independent marking, or involves input from a 3rd party when there is a substantial difference between the two marks.

- Although assessments are well aligned with learning outcomes, I have written in my notes “is there too much assessment”? It could be that assessment models could be reviewed to consider whether 3 different assessments for each taught module are needed. This may not be resolved easily, but perhaps there are ways of assessing the learning outcomes more efficiently and I would suggest this is worth looking at.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

My previous comments stand for this year; overall, this is a strong programme where the structure, content, and assessment processes are well aligned and meet with national standards for this level.

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

NA

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

- Alignment of course content and research dissertations with research interests and expertise of the staff.
- Content that covers: the breadth and depth of tissue engineering; is up to date and looking to the future; translation of research to clinical application, including logistic/ethical issues; that encourages critical thinking and awareness.
- The fact that students experienced a variety of laboratory research techniques. This will enhance their knowledge and understanding, but importantly put them in a good position to progress to PhD/related employment. This activity must be well supported by underpinning funding.
- The numbers and breadth of staff involved.

7. Comments on the Examination of Master’s Dissertations (External Examiners for postgraduate Master’s Programmes only, see also 9.23-9.29 below)

- The dissertations were varied in content and generally of a very good standard, with some examples of really excellent work. The marks awarded are in keeping with those awarded for other Master’s programmes and seem fair.
- As commented earlier, I also would be keen to hear the students present/discuss their research, but I appreciate the difficulty of this.
- There was good summary feedback to help with understanding how marks were allocated.

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?			NA
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				
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	Y		

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
	opportunities to discuss the Programme and any outstanding concerns with the Examining Board or its officers?			
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?			NA
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			NA
9.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			NA
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?	Y		
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?	Y		
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?	Y		
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?	Y		
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?	Y		
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?	Y		
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?	Y		

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.