

## 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:	Dr Vincent Cooper		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	Keele University		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report	Masters in Medical Education (e-Learning)		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015-2016	Date of Report:	16 Oct 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

This is a very well-constructed and balanced programme, with clear progression in complexity from PgCert to Masters level. The interactive elements and timed release and deadlines of course components provide students with structure and guidance within a fairly flexible programme.

### 2. Academic Standards

Amongst other medical education courses, this sets very exacting standards, with high expectations that students will engage with educational and social science theory and some literature. However, this is balanced by the expectation that students will show evidence of practical teaching and personal reflection. Overall, this is rightly perceived as a prestigious course and qualification.

### 3. The Assessment Process

I am particularly impressed by the robustness and extent of the assessments and feedback to students that I have seen. There are clear and consistent processes for resolving disparities between markers and all assessment is done by senior academic staff. Overall, the system is fair, consistent and transparent.

### 4. Year-on-Year Comments

In my second year as an external examiner, I have a better perspective of the students' trajectories. Initially, I had some concerns about the number of students not completing or failing course modules and I have now seen a good proportion responding well to the feedback they received and producing much better work at a second attempt.

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

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

Constant evaluation and development of the course is evident and team members openly discuss issues and difficulties. Some students have struggled with the revised Educational Media and Technologies module and attention is being paid to this. The Peer Review module is challenging in this e-Learning environment and some students really do not engage with the process, though it is clearly an important activity for developing clinical teachers. I look forward to seeing further developments in these modules.

The small course team is the programme's greatest asset and the student numbers, success rate and complexity of developing and running a high level distance learning course are evidence of its dedication and skill. I hope that this is amply recognised by the University and I highlight the need for adequate support and succession planning.

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

I have reviewed a significant proportion of dissertations, with a range of marks and including re-submissions. I am totally satisfied with the process and outcome of the assessments and with the extensive feedback given to students.

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

**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/A
<b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>				
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
<b>Marking Assignments</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?	Y		
<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		

		Yes (Y)	No (N)	N/A (N/A)
9.14	Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?	Y		
<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?	Y		
9.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	Y		
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?			N/A
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?	Y		
9.24	Was the sample in accordance with the University's sampling guidelines (guidelines provided below)?	Y		
9.25	Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the Internal Examiners?	Y		
9.26	Were you able to attend the Master's Degree (Dissertation) Stage Examining Board?	Y		
9.27	If so, was the Examining Board conducted properly and in accordance with established procedures?	Y		
9.28	Were the schemes for marking and classification correctly applied?	Y		
9.29	Were the standards of the awards recommended appropriate?	Y		

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:

**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.