

## 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:	Professor CJ Lim		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	The Bartlett, UCL		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	BSc Architecture		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015 - 16	Date of Report:	18 June 2016

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

The course is well organised. The unit system is a good teaching and learning framework for the school; however there is little evidence of academic and creative diversity (apart from one Unit).

### 2. Academic Standards

Design Module: I "observed" the presentations/examinations of 15 students from a selection of Units, and from a range of marks including 4 fails. In general, there is some improvement compared to previous year in the spatial planning of buildings. What is disappointingly missing are understanding of site/cultural/social/political context, scale and human habitation. The general academic achievements demonstrated by the students are predictable and solid, and at the same time naïve in their critical thinking.

However there was the exception: students' works from [redacted] unit were intelligent, rigorous and confident. The spatial and contextual understanding and architectural knowledge and finesse of this particular group were far more superior than anything else within the entire cohort. This was the only unit that demonstrated poetic ambitions in material studies, technology and construction possibilities. Fabulous work from students and great teaching!!

Issues of Contemporary Architecture module: I sampled reviewed this module  
Please refer to my comments in (4)

### **3. The Assessment Process**

The external examining process changed from previous year – there was no opportunity for external examiners to engage in fruitful discussions with students and internal examiners. We were not allowed to ask students any questions. We were told that our role as external examiners was to “observe” and ensure a fair process. This cowardice decision by the school/university was most disappointing and showed little respect to the external examiners.

On the basis of my unfortunate experience, I have announced to the school my resignation as external examiner.

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

The “Issues of Contemporary Architecture” written work module should have a symbiotic relationship to the design module. It will enable especially weak students to articulate and formulate a more convincing critical thinking position. “I want ...” and “I like...” were the most frequently used terms by students to defend their lack of critical thinking positions.

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

N/A

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

My recommendations are similar to previous year:

- A holistic integration of design, history & theory and technology will strengthened the design development and final design output.
- A compulsory synthesis of context and thorough understanding of the site. All students must have a scale 1:500 site plan with their proposal located.
- Finesse in spatial planning and building form. Efficiency cannot be mistaken for spatial elegance and innovation.

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

N/A

**8. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)**

Please refer to my comments in (3)

**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?	Y		
9.2	Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?		N	
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?		N	
9.4	Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?			N/A
9.5	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?			N/A
<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?	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?		N	
<b>Coursework and Practical Assessments</b>				
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?			N/A

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
<b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b>				
9.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			N/A
<b>Sampling of Work</b>				
9.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	Y		
<b>Examining Board Meeting</b>				
9.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?		N	
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?			N/A
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		
<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.