



## EXTERNAL EXAMINER ANNUAL REPORT FORM

The completion of this Report is supported by *Annual Report Form – Guidance to External Examiners*. The Guidance and this Form are available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/regis/ifs/exex/rep/index.html>. Fee information and claim forms are available at: <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/regis/ifs/exex/fees/index.html>.

|   |   |                 |        |
|---|---|-----------------|--------|
|   | For completion by External Examiner:            |                 |        |
| Name of External Examiner:                          | Dr Chris Baker                                  |                 |        |
| Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:   | University of Chester/William Temple Foundation |                 |        |
| Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report: | Mth/Diploma in Chaplaincy Studies               |                 |        |
| Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:      | 2013/14   | Date of Report: | 1/8/14 |

For completion by External Examiner in the spaces provided. Please extend spaces where necessary. **Please note this Form will be published online.**

### 1. Programme Structure

The structure of the programme delivers well on its stated aims and learning outcomes. There is a logical flow and progression within the constituent parts of the modules to the developmental and educational arc of the programme as a whole.

### 2. Academic Standards

#### General comments

Standards of assignments are wide-ranging, reflecting the eclectic range of abilities of the students doing the course. There is pleasing evidence to show that at dissertation stage (i.e the end of the programme), the quality of work produced shows those whose academic achievements are relatively low are well supported during the programme to improve the standard of their work. Meanwhile those with more natural ability/academic experience have clearly been properly mentored to get the proper support and encouragement to attain very high standards of Masters level work. This level of work is at least comparable to, if not better than, similar Masters programmes in other British universities that I know.

Having said that, and notwithstanding the constraints of a 4,000 word assignment, I would like to see more encouragement, at Masters level, of direct engagement with primary texts of key thinkers – for example Kant, Rawls, Bentham et al. Reportage from secondary sources seems to be the default position in many assignments. This seems particularly apparent in those modules looking at ethical issues associated

with chaplaincy. RTT 207 (Perspectives and Skills in the Educational Context) shows evidence of use of sociological and missiological frameworks rather than pedagogical ones.

One area of academic performance that does need considerable improvement is attention to accuracy and consistency of spelling, punctuation and referencing protocols (especially lack of page numbers). Lack of attention to this becomes a matter of focus with regard to issues of potential plagiarism and academic malpractice. These issues will have to be addressed more rigorously with the introduction of mandatory software checks of all submitted work at the start of the next academic year. I would suggest that circulation of an exemplar essay (for example RTT 207....) would be helpful in this regard.

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

There has been a shift to a more streamlined and easier to understand proforma for student feedback which is to be welcomed. Feedback is generally accurate to the agreed mark. However the application of this new assessment tool by the markers is too uneven and would suggest the possible need for a simple directive to ensure consistency. For example, the feedback offered for module RTT 207 I would consider exemplary and could be used as a model for others to emulate with its concise but considered feedback under both summative and formative sections. Feedback on RTT 202 by contrast for example offers no formative feedback and somewhat brief summative comments. In the absence of double marking, a short sentence identifying why the moderator agrees with the marks so consistently of the marker (or not) rather than a single word would be desirable.

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

I am aware that this has not been an easy year for the programme in terms of external events beyond its control, but I am pleased to say that overall high standards of work have been maintained. This indicates high levels of professionalism and dedication by all concerned with the programme: academic staff; administrative staff and students.

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

n/a

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

The originality and contribution to knowledge and professional development generated by this programme at dissertation level.

### **7. Appointment Overview (for retiring External Examiners only)**

N/a

## 8. Annual Report Checklist

Please include appropriate comments within Sections 1-7 above for any answer of 'No'.

|  |   | Yes<br>(Y) | No<br>(N) | N/A<br>(N/A) |
|--|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| <b>Programme/Course Information</b>          |   |            |           |              |
| 8.1  | Did you receive sufficient information about the Programme and its contents, learning outcomes and assessments?                                       | x          |           |              |
| 8.2  | Were you asked to comment on any changes to the assessment of the Programme?  |            | x         |              |
| <b>Draft Examination Question Papers</b>     |   |            |           |              |
| 8.3  | Were you asked to approve all examination papers contributing to the final award?   |            |           | x            |
| 8.4  | Were the nature, spread and level of the questions appropriate?   |            |           | x            |
| 8.5  | Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?  |            |           | x            |
| <b>Marking Examination Scripts</b>           |   |            |           |              |
| 8.6  | Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? |            |           | x            |
| 8.7  | Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?  |            |           | x            |
| 8.8  | Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?   |            |           | x            |
| 8.9  | Were you satisfied with the standard and consistency of marking applied by the internal examiners?  |            |           | x            |
| 8.10   | In your judgement, did you have the opportunity to examine a sufficient cross-section of candidates' work contributing to the final assessment?       |            |           | x            |
| <b>Coursework and Practical Assessments</b>  |   |            |           |              |
| 8.11   | Was the choice of subjects for coursework and / or practical assessments appropriate?   | x          |           |              |
| 8.12   | Were you afforded access to an appropriate sample of coursework and / or practical assessments?   | x          |           |              |
| 8.13   | Was the method and general standard of assessment appropriate?  | x          |           |              |
| 8.14   | Is sufficient feedback provided to students on their assessed work?   | x          |           |              |
| <b>Clinical Examinations (if applicable)</b> |   |            |           |              |
| 8.15   | Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?  |            |           | x            |
| <b>Sampling of Work</b>                      |   |            |           |              |
| 8.16   | Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?   | x          |           |              |
| <b>Examining Board Meeting</b>               |   |            |           |              |

|  |   | Yes<br>(Y) | No<br>(N) | N/A<br>(N/A) |
|--|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| 8.17   | Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?  |            |           |              |
| 8.18   | Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?   |            |           |              |
| 8.19   | 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? |            |           |              |
| <b>Joint Examining Board Meeting (if applicable)</b> |   |            |           |              |
| 8.20   | Did you attend a Composite Examining Board, i.e. one convened to consider the award of Joint Honours degrees?   |            |           |              |
| 8.21   | If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?  |            |           |              |
| 8.22   | Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?   |            |           |              |

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:

Clive Brown, Registry Officer, Registry & Academic Services, Cardiff University,  
McKenzie House, 30-36 Newport Road, Cardiff, CF24 0DE