



## 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 Simon Gaisford		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University College London		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	MPharm		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2015-16	Date of Report:	17/6/16

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 programme structure is very well constructed and organised and clearly meets the requirements of the GPhC. Talking with the student representatives, it is also clear that they are well engaged with the programme, and have plenty of opportunities to feedback to the course team.

### 2. Academic Standards

I reviewed a lot of examination booklets and project dissertations and it is clear that academic standards are high and appropriate. The academic level at which answers are provided increases through years 1-4 and are certainly comparable with those of other UK institutions I have reviewed.

### 3. The Assessment Process

The assessment process is clear and fair. Excellent feedback was evident on the examination papers and I particularly liked the codes that indicated where answers fell short. Project reports varied in the extent of evidence of feedback in the documents themselves, but all had a summary sheet properly filled in and it was possible to interrogate specific marks because of the clear audit trails. It was also clear where work had been second marked.

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

All exam papers and supporting documents were sent to me for review in good time and the lines of communication are clear. It was particularly helpful for the structure of the results reports, and university regulations, to be explained before the exam board. It was good to see that each student's marks were discussed and that all staff were engaged with the process and knew the academic regulations. Where students were on a borderline or had an unusual case I am happy that the discussions and decisions reached were fair and in the best interests of the student. The Externals had requested that opportunities to interact with students would be good, given that there are no longer viva examinations, and it was great a group of students came along to talk with us. Specific comments in respect to various coursework elements are below – these were raised and discussed at the board and are here for record only;

PH3114:

I didn't have sight of MCQ books, but long answer questions were provided. All marks are appropriate with clear evidence of where marks are awarded against the scheme. Also evidence of second marking on some (lower mark) papers. In some books it was not totally clear where the marks for Question B3 were derived, but the mark recorded is fair and appropriate. There was an issue with 3 of the MCQ questions but I am happy with the steps taken to resolve these issues. The practical work is comprehensive and clearly marked. The average marks are quite high, but I gather this is because the students were given a practice test first.

PH2203:

I only had sight of the answer book for part B, not the MCQ, but the answers are good and clearly/fairly marked. The average grades for this module seem high based on the exemplars given (mid-range 79-80%).

PH2107:

Formulation science practical work – exemplars provided show comprehensive work by the students and clear evidence of fair marking. Again, mid-range exemplars are quite high (83%). With regard to the exam, it is clear that the average marks are much lower than the coursework (mid-range exemplars 60%), perhaps indicating a need to ensure students are tutored appropriately in examination technique. MCQ marks are not shown on the exam paper, which makes checking of the total mark impossible. Question 3D is shown as being removed on review, but was clearly answered by some students – was this decision made before or after the exam was sat? The student who sat the paper externally made no attempt at the section A questions.

PH4116 Projects:

These are in general very well written and the project hypotheses well thought out and constructed. Reports are consistent in style and comprehensive and marking/feedback is very clear.

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

N/A.

**6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement**

I like the coding system during marking for noting where answers fell short and the system used for reporting marks. I also like the structure of the review (a full day to review work prior to the Board) and the fact that the university regulations are so clearly explained at the start of each visit.

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

## 8. Annual Report Checklist

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

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

		<b>Yes (Y)</b>	<b>No (N)</b>	<b>N/A (N/A)</b>
8.17	Were you able to attend the Examining Board meeting?	Y		
8.18	Was the Examining Board conducted properly, in accordance with established procedures and to your satisfaction?	Y		
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?	Y		
<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?			<b>N/A</b>
8.21	If so, were you made aware of the procedures and conventions for the award of Joint Honours degrees?			<b>N/A</b>
8.22	Was the Composite Examining Board conducted according to its rules?			<b>N/A</b>

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