

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 is available [here](#) on Cardiff University's Intranet to help you complete this report, or contact ExternalExaminers@cardiff.ac.uk.

	To be completed by the External Examiner:		
Name of External Examiner:	Elain Price		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Swansea University		
Programme and / or Modules covered by this report	Welsh Medium Provision JOMECC Modules: MC2167, MC2618, MC3625 and MC3626		
Academic Year / Period covered by this report:	2018-19	Date of report:	26/6/2019

Please complete all information in the spaces provided and submit within **six weeks** of the Examining Board (the dissertation stage Examining Board in the case of postgraduate Master's programmes).

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 level and structure, teaching and learning methods)

Once more this year we looked at four modules which are available through the medium of Welsh in the second and third years. In accordance with every other year of my time as an external examiner, it was not possible to give attention to how these modules sit within the School's wider provision. I asked last year whether it would be possible to see several English language modules this year, in order to compare them, but that did not happen. I feel that the institutional answer for 2017-18 has misunderstood my request in this regard – I did not want to compare similar modules, as I understand that there are not modules which correspond in English to the Welsh provision. Rather, I wanted to compare processes such as marking, how many comments were noted on essays/scripts and moderating processes across a range of the School's provision. I suppose it would be useful to offer this to the next examiner that is appointed to look over the Welsh provision.

2018-19 was a unique and challenging year in terms of provision as the teaching team has had a complete change, with one member on maternity leave and another has left for another job. Therefore, two new members joined in the teaching work and, as a result, the provision had not grown and expanded this year for the first time

in several years as a result of that. Despite this, the numbers of students on the provision are remarkably healthy, with each module attracting between 10 and 12 students. I can only emphasise how great it is to see these good numbers on the provision – and that you are continuing to run viable modules. The Coleg Cymraeg Cenedlaethol defines a sustainable course as one which has a minimum of six students in every year of study, and you succeed in passing that threshold comfortably every year. I would like to encourage you therefore to continue to develop and invest in a provision which is clearly attractive to Welsh medium students.

With regard to specific modules, the assessments continue to evolve for Newsroom 1 (MC2617) and Newsroom 2 (MC2618) with the essay having now disappeared from Newsroom 1. Despite this, I still question whether these modules reach the suitable word threshold for a 20 credit Level 5 module. The 3,000 words for the two modules is low in my experience (and therefore incompatible with the requirements in other Universities). From the institutional answer last year, I understand that the department's point of view is that the practical tasks reflect the industry's requirements with regards to story length, and can therefore be different to the traditional academic provision. I am not recommending adding a further assessment in order to raise the number of words, as returning to four assessments would be unwise. What should be done perhaps is to look again at the assessments' descriptions, and consider for example if the word count noted for the Bulletin Practice under test conditions (1,300) for Newsroom 1 clearly reflects what is produced by the students, or does the fact that the test is two hours long mean that the students produce closer to 2,000 words under those conditions.

'Cymru Fyw Story Coverage' was the new assessment that was introduced for Newsroom 1 (MC2617) this year – I think that the word 'Coverage' or 'Treatment' perhaps gives a false impression of the task's nature. To me, 'Treatment' means offering an idea for a story. Rather than this, this task asked the students to reflect critically on the article that they had drawn up, and in my opinion therefore, the task should be called a 'Reflective Essay'.

There was an addition to the assessment on Newsroom 2 (MC2618) – an addition that was not in the official module description. What was done was to add a News Statement (500 words) to the task, where the students were expected to use the same base of knowledge and quotes to create a News Statement and an Article for the Press, both of which were 500 words each. This was a suitable and interesting addition. It raised the module's word count to the 4,000 threshold and made it a far more useful and revealing assessment for the students, as it asked them to consider the clear differences between the intentions of a statement and an article. This task was introduced after a discussion and agreement with the students, but I would like to note that problems could arise from doing this in such an ad-hoc fashion – if students had failed or complained, it would have caused a number of problems in the case of an appeal. If the intention is to adapt this task to follow this pattern officially in the future (as I would recommend), I also suggest that you offer a mark separately for the two elements, and that the average of the two marks should constitute the final mark for the assessment.

2. Academic Standards (comparability with other Higher Education Institutions in the UK, student achievement, any requirements by the Statutory and Regulatory Professional Bodies)

Once again I feel that this year the marking is almost there, relatively speaking. There were several marks I disagreed with of course. Some marks were too generous and some too harsh, but these were exceptions for the most part. The marking is proportional to the marking standards in other institutions with which I am familiar.

There was a span of marks from the third class to the high first class, although the marks in the third class are very rare because of the high standard of the students that select these modules. Once again this year, I was keen to check whether those students that received several marks of 80+ obtained corresponding marks in their other modules during the Examining Board, and this was once again the case this year. The students that would receive marks of 80+ tended to get high first class marks across their Welsh and English modules.

Once again this year, there were challenging and contemporary essay questions which asked the students to discuss the modern challenges which face journalists and the media in Wales and beyond. The questions enabled the best students to combine academic research with research and modern examples very effectively. It is great to see students turning to reports by the Welsh Matters Institute and OFCOM in order to find evidence to confirm their arguments.

The Whose Story? module (MC3626) continues to offer an opportunity for the students to create advanced and effective campaigns. There were several examples of exceptional work on this module once more this year. Despite this, I worry a little that those students that have good technical skills, and the ability to create slick videos with attractive graphics can exceed the module's remit, and that those that have not developed those skills beyond the class find it slightly harder to reach the highest marks. I wonder whether there is room to offer additional workshops or practical sessions as part of this module's provision in order to offer some of these further skills to the students that need them?

I still consider that losing elements of group assessment from the assessing span is somewhat disappointing. In the second year especially, there is room to give opportunities for students to work with each other and get a taste for the reality of the working world. It was noted in the institutional answer last year that assessing group work is challenging, but that is not a sufficient reason to avoid it as an assessment in my opinion. There are a number of very effective means of assessing a group as well as examples of good practice in other Universities, to ensure that group members are marked differentially.

3. The Assessment Process (enabling achievement of the objectives and learning outcomes; extending assessments; comparability of standards with modules at the same level)

With new members of staff responsible for provision this year, feedback was submitted that, in my opinion, exceeded expectations. On almost every one of the assessments of the four modules, one can see thorough and detailed comments for the students from two markers. This meant that every student got detailed and valuable feedback from not one but two specialists in their field of work – and students can only profit greatly from that. Despite this, one must acknowledge that this is not a situation that can be maintained in the long term, especially after

considering time restrictions that are put on staff to complete marking and moderating work.

The moderating period was due to the above pattern of noting the detailed comments of two markers in Grademark of course, and on almost every assessment, it was entirely clear to me how the final mark was agreed upon, as it was noted on the moderating excel form. By now I feel that there is room to rationalize the process that is used for referencing and the 'tick sheets' that are used. This year saw 2 tick-sheets (one per marker), the detailed comments of two markers on Grademark, a record of those comments and the marks that were chosen by them individually and the marks that were agreed upon on a moderating sheet. In order to rationalize this process, I feel that there is room for the learning team to consider using the rubric system that is available on Grademark to take the place of tick-sheets. It can also be used to offer feedback to students under each one of the criteria that are specified for an assessment. One can then rationalise the present moderating sheet to be a place where the moderator notes his/her comments on the work and the mark given and where the module's coordinator can note the decision on the final mark. I am more than ready to share examples of similar sheets with the team for their information.

I still feel that there are too many criteria for the number of assessments – it is not unusual to see 9 or 10 criteria, with some being duplicated. I am aware that a process of rationalising has happened this year, but I still feel that there is room to rationalise further and cluster some criteria with each other. Sometimes, too many criteria can lead to a situation where 'tick-sheets' do not necessarily reflect the final mark that is given to the student.

One matter I have drawn attention to in every year is the need to recognise language errors in the students' work. This year I was much happier with this process, with the lecturers not only recognizing errors with regards to mutations, typing and expression in the work, but also noting clearly in the feedback how these errors effected the student's mark and on several occasions that further care and correctness could lead to higher marks. This care is sure to derive from the lecturers' very thorough attitude this year towards the assessment process – which is reflected in the double marking I mentioned, but I would like to emphasize the importance that any workload model that is used in the future does not erode the ability to recognise these errors.

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

[Where possible please complete this section following the dissertation examining board determining the final award.]

N/A

5. Year-on-Year Comments

[You can see previous External Examiners' Reports on Cardiff University's website [here](#).]

I have noted a number of points already raised last year. Please see the following points which refer back to the report and institutional response for 2017-18:

- Access to English modules – Point 1, Paragraph 2
- The total number of assessments for Newsroom 1 and 2 – Point 1, Paragraph 3
- Group Assessments – Point 2, Paragraph 5
- Criteria – Point 3, Paragraph 3
- Linguistic errors – Point 3, Paragraph 4.

6. Preparing for the role of External Examiner (for new External Examiners only) (appropriateness of the briefing paper provided, visits to the School, manuals and supporting information)

N/A

7. Notable Practice and Improvement (good and innovative practices in learning, teaching and learning; a chance to improve the learning opportunities)

The link with the industry has been one of the strongest parts of the provision, and this has been further strengthened this year with the temporary appointments. The insight into the industry that is given to the students due to the teaching experiences and the thorough marking and remarking seen this year has been exceptionally valuable to the students and one to be praised highly.

I would like to note that the Bulletin Practice assessment (test conditions) for Newsroom 1 (MC2617) this year has been notable due to the fact that it has extended the students' skills further than simply discussing News Values as was done in the past. This year saw students not only explaining their logic for choosing particular stories but also discussing how they would go about presenting those stories in a television bulletin. This was done by using the industry's terminology and acronyms. This gave the best students an opportunity to show not only their academic ability to analyse news values but also their creative skills to devise diverse and interesting bulletins to an audience. I hope this element will continue on this assessment.

For the presentations this year, I saw not only slides but video recordings of these presentations via Panopto. This was of great help in considering the relevance of the feedback to the students' performances. This is good practice and should be maintained in the future.

8. Overview of the Appointment (for External Examiners who are retiring only) (significant changes in standards, discipline / programme developments, implementing the recommendations, other work areas)

This is the fifth and final year I have examined the Welsh medium provision in JOMEC. I have seen the provision grow from one module where the second and third years were taught together and a relatively small number of students to the four modules provided today which attract a very healthy number of students, with 10-12 on each module I would like to emphasize again that these numbers compare very favourably with Welsh medium provision in other institutions and higher than the minimum number of students as noted by the Coleg Cymraeg Cenedlaethol as a

sustainable number for Welsh medium provision. It is a testament to the appeal of the provision that they regularly attract so many students every year. I hope very much to see the provision develop further over the years to come, especially after considering the industry's demand for confident bilingual communicators – the very students being developed by this provision.

The provision has evolved since 2014-15 to include communication modules to compliment the journalism provision, and these two fields naturally suit each other. Hopefully it will be possible to appoint a communications specialist permanently in order to continue to develop these elements of the provision with the journalistic provision.

There are practical modules with a clear connection to the industry in this provision – although there are opportunities within the modules to undertake academic work on the journalism and communications industry and to study critically in the context of academic ideas in the field, as presented in the lectures. One way the provision can be extended further in the future is to present traditional academic modules in conjunction with this provision and further promote the fact that it is possible to do a Dissertation through the medium of Welsh.

What has obviously changed during my time as an external examiner is the nature of the feedback and the moderating processes that the teaching team uses. The feedback is now much more comprehensive and constructive, and the moderating processes and the marking decisions are much clearer. As I noted above, it is now possible to rationalize those processes in order to somewhat reduce the administrative burden, without missing anything on how thorough and clear the discussions and decisions are to the external examiner.

I would like to wish all the best to the teaching team and to the provision, whilst hoping that I will see it go from strength to strength over the years to come.

9. Annual Report Checklist

Please include appropriate comments within Sections 1-7 above for any 'X' answers.

		Pleas e ✓	Or X	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 in the Programme?		X	
Draft Examination Papers				
9.3	Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?			N/A

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
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?			N/A
9.7	Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?			N/A
9.8	Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?			N/A
9.9	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?			N/A
9.10	In your opinion, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work which was contributing to the final assessment?			N/A
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
9.11	Was the choice of 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 of assessment, and its general standard, appropriate?	✓		
9.14	Are students given enough feedback 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 Joint Examining Board meeting (i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees)?			N/A
9.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			N/A
9.22	Was the Joint Examining Board conducted in accordance with its rules?			N/A

Please return this report, in **Microsoft Word format**, by email to:

externalexaminers@cardiff.ac.uk

Your fees and expenses claim form should be sent electronically to the above email address or in hard copy to the address below:

External Examiners, The Registry, Cardiff University, McKenzie House, 30-36
Newport Road, Cardiff, CF24 0DE