

Cardiff University

McKenzie House
30-36 Newport Road
Cardiff CF24 0DE
Wales UK

Tel please see below
Fax +44(0)29 2087 4130

www.cardiff.ac.uk

Prifysgol Caerdydd

Tŷ McKenzie
30-36 Heol Casnewydd
Caerdydd CF24 0DE
Cymru Y Deyrnas Unedig

Ffôn gweler isod
Ffacs +44(0)29 2087 4130

www.caerdydd.ac.uk

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:	Professor Chris LANGLEY		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Aston University		
Programme and / or Modules Covered by this Report	Pharmacy (MPharm)		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2017-2018	Date of Report:	27 th June 2018

Please complete all information in the spaces provided and submit within **six weeks** of the Examining Board.

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 General Data Protection Regulation (2018).

Please extend spaces where necessary.

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

From what I have seen of the programme structure and assessment, and the development of the programme over the time I have been visiting as an external examiner, I am happy that the MPharm programme is based around a well-designed curriculum which should meet the requirements of the accrediting body (the General Pharmaceutical Council).

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

As highlighted in my reports from my previous visits, it continues to be evident that the programme is maintaining the threshold academic standards in accordance with the QAA Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies. In addition, the academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which I am familiar. As in previous years, I was able to look at all the relevant examination papers in advance of the examinations taking place and it was evident that changes had been made based on my suggestions.

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

I undertook specific reviews of assessment material from the following modules.

PH4118 – The student examination scripts are annotated very well and it is clear to see why students did or did not get marks. While the copy of the examination paper the students received had been amended based on my comments, the one with the mark scheme had not. I am assuming that this was because the only comments I had were a minor formatting issue and an issue with the edition of the BNF to use; however, I would recommend that any more substantive changes are captured in both the examination paper the student sits and the one used for the marking. I looked at the results from the OSCE assessments and there was one student with a critical fail. I examined the reason for this and would agree with the markers that this was a critical fail incident. The comments sections of the sheets are very good as they contain feedback on the positive as well as any negative aspects which will be of use to all students irrespective of their pass/failure status.

PH4116 – I was able to have a look at the Pharmacy Practice projects which seemed appropriate for the level of study.

PH3110 – As with the OSCEs assessments for PH4118, I looked at the reasons for the two critical fails and would agree with both of them. The comments sections of the sheets are very good as they contain feedback on the positive as well as any negative aspects. The examination marking was clear and the use of the marking codes made it very clear why students were not awarded marks for particular questions. I am aware that the student version of the examination paper had one page missing, which removed part of the scenario for a question. I have been informed how the module team managed the revised marking and I am happy that no student was disadvantaged by this error. I would encourage the School/University to investigate the issue as appropriate as had this occurred on a different page of the examination paper, a bigger issue may have resulted. The Pharmaceutical Care Planning Coursework is a nice assignment and I was pleased to see the inclusion of a peer-review aspect to the exercise. However, for the peer-review sheets I reviewed, everyone gave all group members (including themselves) 5 out of 5 for every aspect. I wonder if the module team could look into this aspect of the exercise to make the process more meaningful and discriminating. There is an additional component mark from the tutorial, which further nuances the final mark. Having reviewed the spreadsheet, I do wonder if further scaling needs to take place as it is theoretically possible to score more than 100% for the component (although I assume in practice that this would be capped at 100%).

PH3000 – The marking is clear and the failed students (n=16/105) definitely are fails. One question kept getting the same wrong answer and from review it is clear what the students had done and it was down to a lack of self-checking. Other fails were down to a lack of following the assessment instructions (providing units and providing answers to the correct number of decimal places), or the full dosage instructions (... up to a maximum of ...). From the reasons for failure, I would recommend that some form of feedback is provided to these students before any referred assessment as the results showed some fundamental gaps within the students' ability or understanding of the assessment. Although less of an issue for the fails within this module, I would echo my

comments on the issue around units and half marks I make below in relation to the PH200 calculations test.

PH2110 – OSCEs; it is clear why students had failed the exercise and good feedback was provided. The examination paper had clearly been revised following my feedback on the questions. The Practice of Pharmacy workbooks cover appropriate material and are assessed consistently. I was unclear about how the assessment works in practice in relation to any resubmission. I discussed with representatives from the module team around any resubmission, which focusses on a different selection of previously-completed prescription exercises, and whether the students have had sufficient opportunity to learn from mistakes to correct any errors in this second set.

PH2000 – Calculations; as with PH3000 it was clear why students had received zero for an answer. However, the answer sheets are marked with half marks, for example, if the units have been omitted. This is actually contrary to the instructions on the front of the paper (for the resit paper [and the PH300 paper], although not the main paper) which states that marks will be 1 or 0. In addition, the instructions on the front of the examination paper do not say that you need to state the units and two failing students on 6/10 did this twice (i.e. the 6/10 contains two questions where only half a mark was awarded). While I agree that the inclusion of units is very important, if you require the students to include the units to obtain a mark, I would include this in the rubric on the front, and not just on the answer sheet itself, and not award half marks to those students who do not include the units. Alternatively (akin to the GPhC answer sheet for the Part 1 assessment), provide the units for the students on the answer sheet. Additionally, the answer sheet states “Remember to include units in your answers, where appropriate”, which I think with the use of “... where appropriate” is adding to the ambiguity as the correct units are on the answer sheet. I was able to find a passing paper where all answers were correct, but only seven scored as in six cases, the units had been omitted (in two cases, they had been actively crossed-out by the student). The issue here is the current half-way house where the units are in effect provided as part of the “Accuracy required” column, which could cause confusion. Having spoken to the calculations lead, I am happy that the students are informed that they need to include the units so would recommend the rubric makes this instruction clear and answers with no units are not given a mark.

4. **Examination of Master’s Dissertations** (sample of dissertations received, appropriateness of marking schemes, standard of internal marking, classification of awards)

See above (under PH4116).

5. Year-on-Year Comments

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

As external examiner, I am pleased to see how comments from previous years have been taken into consideration and the importance the programme team places on the external examiner system.

6. **Preparation for the role of External Examiner (for new External Examiners only)** (appropriateness of briefing provided by the programme team and supporting

information, visits to School, ability to meet with students, arrangements for accessing work to review)

N/A.

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

The methodology employed to annotate the examination scripts clearly where marks have and have not been awarded, alongside the reasons (using codes) where marks have not been awarded is very good. This makes it clear for the external examiner to review the marking and for students to see clearly where marks were and were not awarded.

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

N/A.

9. 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				
9.1	Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?	✓		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?	✓		
Commenting on draft examination question papers				
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?	✓		
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	✓		
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?	✓		
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	✓		
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	✓		
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?	✓		
9.10	In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?	✓		
Coursework and practical assessments				

9.11	Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?	✓		
9.12	Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?	✓		
9.13	Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?	✓		
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	✓		
Clinical examinations (if applicable)				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?	✓		
Sampling of work				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	✓		
Examining board meeting				
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	✓		
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	✓		
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?	✓		
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?			✓
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?			✓

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