



Academic & Student Support Services
Academic Registrar Simon Wright LLB
Gwasanaethau Academaidd a Chefnogi Myfyrwyr
Cofrestrwydd Academaidd Simon Wright LLB

Cardiff University
McKenzie House
30-36 Newport Road
Cardiff CF24 0DE

Tel *Ffôn* | +44(0)29 2087 9189
www.cardiff.ac.uk

Prifysgol Caerdydd
Tŷ McKenzie
30-36 Heol Casnewydd
Caerdydd CF24 0DE

Sent by email to P.Twigg@bradford.ac.uk

23 January 2018

Dear Dr Twigg,

Re: Institutional Response: External Examiner Annual Report 2016–2017

I am writing further to the receipt of your External Examiner's Report for the BEng/MEng in Medical Engineering.

Your Report has been considered by the School 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

1. The policy of considering adjusting marks where the average for a module lies outside the range 45-65%.
2. Exam scripts did not contain question papers, which limiting the value of the exercise.

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

1. The Year Tutor or Module Leader would normally be responsible for plotting the assessment data graphically for review by the Exam Board, and making a proposal as to how moderation might take place. Depending on the specific circumstances, distribution of marks, incidence of "zeroes", etc., then the Exam Board will come to a group decision on how best to moderate the full set of marks to bring the average within the bounds of 45–65%.

Cardiff University
McKenzie House
30-36 Newport Road
Cardiff CF24 0DE
Tel *Ffôn* | +44(0)29 2087 9189
www.cardiff.ac.uk

Prifysgol Caerdydd
Tŷ McKenzie
30-36 Heol Casnewydd
Caerdydd CF24 0DE
Tel *Ffôn* | +44(0)29 2087 9189
www.caerdydd.ac.uk

This mechanism of adjustment will therefore vary depending on the background to the low/high marks. It is our preference to leave the decision about the precise mechanism to the Exam Board, advised by the External Examiner(s).

2. This was an oversight, for which we apologise. It will be taken care of for the forthcoming academic session.

The University is pleased to note your positive comments including:

1. Your positive indications regarding the programme structure, academic standards and assessment process;
2. The support offered by the outgoing programme lead and the administrative and academic staff of the department.
3. Student feedback on the Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering group project in the MEng fourth year. This gave them an opportunity to tackle a real world issue in a substantive way and to adopt the sort of working practices they may need in graduate employment.

I hope that you will find this response satisfactory and we thank you for your continued support of the programme.

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 the University website and will be available to all students and staff.

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.

Yours sincerely,



Mr Simon Wright
Academic Registrar