

## **INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE: EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT 2012-2013 - MSc in Neurorehabilitation and MSc in Physiotherapy**

Dear Dr Kuisma,

I am writing further to your External Examiner's report for the above programme(s). Your Report has been considered by the School of Healthcare Studies 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

Your Report raised issues which have been referred for consideration by the School. The following response has been provided on behalf of the School.

***"1: [3] the External Examiner's suggestion that the "assessment criteria and feedback forms could be brought together more closely e.g. by common assessment grids that could be more transparent and specific to the student in their grading and language";***

*Regarding assessment criteria it is intended now to introduce the generic Cardiff University criteria in 2014/15, which has been based on Sector-wide practice. It is envisaged that this generic documentation will provide further consistency and transparency in the marking process. As soon as this is available feedback forms will be adjusted to align with this.*

***2: [6] comments and suggestions on the format and presentation of the dissertation***

*As you know currently the student s produce a 20,000 word dissertation which allows them to study a particular topic in some depth and indeed as you say we do see some exceptional pieces of work. However, it is true that in many Universities the format is different and is often presented as in a journal paper format (relevant to the topic) with an extended literature review. Indeed our external examiner for the MSc Sports and Exercise Physiotherapy commented that this is the format that their student presents in combination with an oral presentation.*

*With the increasing requirement to publish it is worthwhile considering this, as indeed our students do produce worthwhile research studies and we should endeavour to get many more of these published, particularly where they have used patient populations, as we have an ethical obligation to do so. We will look at the potential variations in presentation formats that would be suitable for the award of 60 credits and will discuss this at the next Board of Studies."*

### Positive Comments

The School and University are pleased to note your positive comments on the School's provision including:

- a. **[1, 2 and 3] your positive indications regarding the programme structure, academic standards and assessment process;**
- b. **your concluding comments on the professional and efficient operation of Examining Boards.**

I hope that you will find this response satisfactory and thank you for your service as External Examiner.

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 Registry web pages and will be available publically.

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.

Mrs Jill Bedford  
Director of Registry and Academic Services