



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 Jeni Harden		
Home Institution / Employer of External Examiner:	University of Edinburgh		
Programme and / or Subjects Covered by this Report:	Professional Doctorate (Social Sciences)		
Academic Year / Period Covered by this Report:	2012-2013	Date of Report:	18/2/14

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 module I examined fits well within the programme. I noted that some student comments in the evaluation of the module reflected its timing in relation to the other modules but that this has been addressed.

2. Academic Standards

Overall the academic standards were appropriate for the degree and stage within the degree and there were some very good pieces of work. However there were also areas of weakness that were noted:

- Lack of critical engagement in relation to concepts (eg triangulation, validity)
- Limited theoretical engagement. This issue is always difficult when working with students who do not have social science backgrounds, but as these are going onto PhDs, it seems particularly significant.
- Quality of writing was noted as an issue for a number of the students.
- Statistics: there seemed to be a limited knowledge of statistical analysis presented in the task 2 assignments.

3. The Assessment Process

On the whole I felt that the assessment process was thorough and appropriate. Marking criteria were consistently applied across the 7 students, within both Task 1 and Task 2. A few more specific points:

- **Marking criteria:** I received the generic marking criteria for the Professional Doctorate but it was not entirely clear how the criteria were applied for these specific assessments or how the % allocation of the different criteria was applied in arriving at the marks awarded.
- **Feedback:** very useful comments given in relation to the draft and final submissions. It was very interesting to see the development in (some) of the students' work from draft to final submission. It may also be useful to link feedback directly to marking criteria. There were times when the wording in feedback did not match the descriptors in the marking criteria table, for example the phrase a 'thorough understanding' is only used for 70+ marks but was used in a comment relating to a lower grade assignment.
- **Second marking:** there was some confusion about including the second markers' comments in the feedback to students rather than a synthesis of first and second marker comments. This was discussed at the board and has been clarified.

4. Year-on-Year Comments

N/A

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

I had meetings with Programme director, the module organiser and another external examiner whose term was coming to an end. These meetings were very useful in providing background to the programme and module.

6. Noteworthy Practice and Enhancement

- The quality of the feedback given to students' draft assignments was very high and seems to be a very useful exercise for students to improve their work.
- Communication from the administrative team was excellent.
- The exam board was very well run with papers collated in a very useful manner.

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)
Programme/Course Information				
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	
Draft Examination Question Papers				
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
Marking Examination Scripts				
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
Coursework and Practical Assessments				
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		
Clinical Examinations (if applicable)				
8.15	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of clinical assessments?			x
Sampling of Work				
8.16	Were you afforded sufficient time to consider samples of assessed work?	x		
Examining Board Meeting				

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

Please return this Report, preferably in a Microsoft Word format, by email to:

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