

Information and Guidance

1. Did you:	Y	N
Receive adequate access to any material needed (including assessment regulations, student handbook, programme specification and module descriptors) to make the required judgements?	X	
For newly appointed External Examiners:N/A		
Were assessment policies and your duties as external examiner adequately explained to you?		
Did you have adequate briefing and guidance sufficient for you to fulfil your role effectively as an external examiner?		
For existing External Examiners:		

2c: Please comment on each of the following with examples:

- x Whether the assessments (formative and summative) were well-designed, valid and reliable;
- x whether they assessed appropriately the learning outcomes set for the programme;
- x whether they were sufficiently challenging for students in the context of the subject matter and the course.

Type your text here

Whether the assessments (formative and summative)

*were well-designed, valid and reliable;

The assessments were designed to allow students to show their learning, with feedback which allowed development. Having examined the assignments I found marking was not always consistent with the criteria, this has been resolved

* whets2c]7.6(s)3.-1.4(m)7.1(e)9.3(n)-5.4(t)2.4(d(s)-1.4(s)7.5(e)0.5(s)-1(h)-5.5(e)5(/k48 0 c8d(t)

common across institutions though

Marking and Moderation

4a: Did you receive:	Y	N
A sufficiently broad sample of scripts across the marking range?	X	
Sufficient time for external moderation?	X	
Data to show whether marking was consistent across marking teams?	X	
If “No” to any of the above, please comment:		
<p>4b. Please comment on each of the following with examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Whether the method and general standard of marking was credible, consistent, fair and robust; x whether the marks awarded were reflective of the standards expected at that particular level and for all students; x whether the marking criteria was presented clearly and appropriately differentiated across bands; x whether the standard of work that you sampled was comparable across different locations (e.g., ULaw campuses and/or partnerships in the case of collaborative provision). 		
<p><i>Type your text here</i> As noted earlier, I had concerns about the marking which have now been resolved</p>		

Conduct of the Examination/Awards Board

5a: Did you:	Y	N
Attend the examination/awards board?		X
If “Yes”, how many and which ones?		
5b: Conduct of the Board:	Y	N

Were the Boards you attended conducted in accordance with the University Assessment Regulations, including procedures relating to students with concessions?		
Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?		
If “No” to any of the above, please comment below:		

Academic Standards of the Programme

6a. Do the modules that you sample allow students to develop relevant skills (e.g., cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences)? If “No”, please comment:	Y	N
<i>Type your text here</i>	X	
6b. Is the module/programme design, delivery and assessment informed by up-to-date research or professional practice and/or by current developments in teaching and learning, within the discipline or sector? If “No”, please comment:	Y	N
<i>Type your text here</i>	X	
6c. Does the curriculum design and assessment strategy enable students to meet the programme learning outcomes? If “No”, please comment:	Y	N
<i>Type your text here</i>	X	
6d. How well does the programme/module, in your opinion, prepare graduates for employment or further study?		
<i>Type your text here</i>		
I think the content and assessment prepares students well, however the quality of submissions is low		

Areas of Good Practice

