

## **INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2013-2014 - BA in Ancient History**

Dear Dr Liddel,

I am writing further to your External Examiner's report for the above programme(s). Your Report has been considered by the Cardiff School of History, Archaeology and Religion 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.

1. **[3, first para, final sentence] your suggestions for future sampling policy;**
2. **[3, para 6] in the context of a "very detailed and effective" exam-setting and scrutiny process, your further suggestions "that in future summatively-assessed tests be sent to scrutiny meetings" and that consideration be given to "setting resits at the same time as first-sits, and considering these at scrutiny as well.**

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

1. *"Dr Liddel is referring to the practice of moderating each item of assessment separately, rather than selecting the moderation sample at the end of the module on the basis of students' overall mark. In doing this, we believe we are following University regulations and guidance."*
2. *"We have agreed to set resit papers at the same time as the first-sit papers from 2014/15 onwards, and they will be scrutinised at a staff meeting in the same way as the first-sit papers. Sending summative class tests to the same scrutiny meetings as exam papers would raise practical difficulties, as class tests are held at different times throughout the year. However, tests for non-language modules are already checked by a second member of staff, and we have agreed that as of this year, tests for language modules will also be checked in the same way."*

Your observations on the impact of changes in the weighting of year 2 and year 3 have been noted and will inform the evaluation of outcomes from the implementation of revised policy and practice arising from the Assessment Matters project.

Your suggestion that a second external examiner be appointed has also been noted and the School is considering bringing forward a case for increasing the number of External Examiners for this provision.

### Positive Comments

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

- a. **[1, 2 and 3] your positive indications regarding the programme structure, academic standards and assessment process**
- b. **[1] your commendation of the support provided to students on independent study modules;**

- c. [2] your particular praise for the achievements of students in their dissertations;
- d. [3] your commendation of the “very good range of assessment methods” and for the “excellent and detailed feedback” provided to students;
- e. [4] your further commendation of “appropriate use” of the upper ends of the mark range.

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