

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Name of Institution Examined: INTO UEA

Faculty/School: _____

Course Title(s): International Foundation Business and Humanities, and International Foundation Science and Mathematics

Academic Year: 2021/22

External Examiner Name: Dr Christopher D Murphy

External Examiner’s home University / College or Other Professional / Institutional Affiliation: University of York

NB – External Examiner reports are widely circulated, therefore students and staff should not be individually identified. Course Teams will respond to the recommendations made by the External Examiner in the boxes provided. The response should be counter signed by the Head of HE or equivalent within ten working days.

An electronic copy of this report should be emailed to the Head of HE (or equivalent) at the partner institution, to arrive no later than one month after the main assessment board meeting. You will receive a copy of the report with the Course Team’s response completed.

Sufficient Evidence Checklist

Please can you confirm the following:

SECTION 1
Please complete this section

Programme materials

Did you receive:

a. Programme handbook(s)?	Yes
b. Programme regulations (these may be in the programme handbook)?	Yes
c. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?	Yes
d. Assessment briefs/marketing criteria?	Yes

SECTION 2

If the course(s) you examine do not have any examinations then please go to section 3

Draft examination papers

a. Did you receive all the draft papers?	Yes
If not, was this at your request?	N/A
b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	No
If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes
c. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Yes

Marking examination scripts

a. (i) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts?	Yes
If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory?	Yes
b. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?	Yes
c. Were the scripts marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of given marks?	Yes

SECTION 3

If the course(s) you examine do not have any dissertations/projects then please go to section 4

Dissertations/project reports

a. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?	N/A
b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	N/A

SECTION 4
Please complete this section

Coursework/continuously assessed work

a. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for assessment?	Yes
b. Was the method and general standard of marking and consistency satisfactory?	Yes

SECTION 5
If the course(s) you examine do not have any Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements, please go to section 6

Orals/performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements

a. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals/appropriate professional placements?	N/A
--	-----

SECTION 6
Please complete this section

Final examiners' meeting

a. Were you able to attend the meeting?	Yes
b. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes
c. Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes

SECTION 7
Please complete this section

Maintaining Threshold Academic Standards

Please provide feedback on whether:

The programme and its component parts are coherent with learning outcomes aligned with the relevant qualification descriptor and subject benchmark statements where applicable

The programme (in the case of the physics and mathematics pathway) and the component parts (of all programmes) are coherent with learning outcomes aligned to the qualification descriptor. The content covers the A-level syllabus preparing students well for entry onto physics degree programmes in England and Wales.

The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable

Not applicable at the Foundation level.

Assessments in modules of the same level are of a comparable standard to those in other UK HEIs

The assessments are at the same level as comparable foundation programmes at other UK HEIs such that progression is as likely at INTO UEA as at other university programmes.

The curriculum is current

The curriculum is current in terms of content and – like the York programme – goes beyond the A-level in the mathematical rigour with which the physics is taught. This serves students well.

Assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level

The assessment criteria are robust and the mark schemes are clear and appropriate. The grading is appropriate for progression. In terms of classification, this is not applicable to the foundation year programme.

**SECTION 8
Please complete this section**

Measuring Achievement, Rigour and Fairness

Please provide feedback on whether:

The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the level of study and the expected outcomes

The modules are assessed via continuous assessment, experimental reporting and more traditional moderated examinations. This is appropriate for the subject and student cohort, preparing them well for the rigour of university assessments. There is sometimes a push away from traditional closed-book examinations which I would resist due to the practice this afford students. It is likely that, due to the PSRB requirements for robust assessment, these will likely be in place for the degree onto which they hope to progress.

The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied, and internal marking is of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable

The marking scheme is clear and has been applied fairly and consistently. There is good evidence of double-marking throughout indicating robust assessment and removal of error to a high level.

The assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the institution's regulations and procedures

All assessment processes have been carried out in accordance with the institution's regulations and procedures.

Procedures governing mitigating/extenuating circumstances, academic integrity/ misconduct and borderline performances have been considered fairly and equitably applying institutional regulations

Cases of academic misconduct have been considered fairly and equitably. The opportunity for repeat assessment has been given in the appropriate cases and rules applied with equity.

SECTION 9

Please complete this section

Comparability of Standards and Student Performance

Reflecting on your experience at other institutions please provide feedback on:

The comparability of standards and student achievement:

- **across the modules within a single programme**
- **across programmes within a single subject area in an awarding institution**
- **across programmes within a single subject area across institutions of which you have experience**
- **any of the above, across cohorts during your period of appointment**

Again the cohort is small and so a statistical approach to judging performance is of limited use. It was clear that some students were more engaged, or capable, than others which led to a range of marks consistent with expectations. These patterns of performance were seen across modules indicating fair assessment and robust assessment of student capability. The grades achieved are consistent with the performance of other students enrolled on INTO programmes and are comparable with students at York. There are small fluctuations year-on-year with this small cohort, but this group is not anomalous in its performance.

Enhancement of Quality

Please provide comment and recommendations on:

Good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment you have observed

The provision of an additional module on geophysics and meteorology (which is 'off syllabus' when compared to the A-level) is excellent. It provides an opportunity for students to witness the breadth of applications of physics and mathematics.

Assessment methods are relatively standard compared with other programmes, but the level of double-marking and the clarity with which this is presented is excellent.

Opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students

The teaching and assessment of the modules are delivered in a diligent and robust manner providing a high quality student experience. This likely results in a heavy workload for staff on the programme. It could be worth looking at options for automated assessments and marking for smaller components within specific modules where this might be beneficial. Current technology would likely be able to provide randomisation of questions too which can help mitigate any risk of misconduct or plagiarism.

Also, please:

State whether you received sufficient evidence to enable your role to be fulfilled. If not, please provide details

Sufficient evidence was provided to allow me to fulfil my role.

State whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to your satisfaction

Yes. All comments from the previous report have been addressed to my satisfaction.

Use this space to address any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional body

None

Give an overview of your term of office if this is your final year

N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

Please list your recommendations for action by the course team:

External Examiner's Recommendations for action <i>(to be completed by External Examiner)</i>	Course Team's Response (action to be taken and measurable outcomes) <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	By whom <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	By when <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	Progress as of February 20__ <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>	Progress as of end of Year <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i>
<p>Consider whether the introduction of web-based assessment with automatic marking might reduce workload on staff. (Caveat: In many cases the workload associated with implementing these can overshadow any workload savings)</p>	<p>For the maths/chemistry induction tests and knowledge check quizzes for each topic, we use automated marking as these are rolled over year on year. For the course tests and exams then the outlay in time to create these for single usage with relatively small no. students in each cohort on balance is unfortunately unlikely to save significant time on manual marking. However, this is something to consider for smaller elements on some modules for 23-24 as we review assessment strategies across the programme</p>	<p>DWI</p>	<p>ongoing</p>		

--	--	--	--	--	--

Report completed by:

Signature

Christopher Murphy

Date: 13/10/22

COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

We thank Chris for his helpful and constructive feedback and advice, which we are taking on board for future course review and developments

Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader:

Date: 20/10/22

Dawn Wilkinson

(Please print name and sign)

Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or
equivalent)

Date:

Jeremy Moyle

20/10/22

MID-YEAR REVIEW OF ACTIONS (FEBRUARY 20)

To be completed by Course Leader:

Mid-Year Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:

YEAR END REVIEW OF ACTIONS (MONTH 20)

To be completed by Course Leader:

Year End Review of Actions Completed:	Signature:	Date:
External Examiner Notified:	Signature:	Date:

To be completed by the Academic Partnerships:

Choose an action	B - Identified action and picked up appropriately
<p>INTO to check with External Examiner response in section 2 relating to appropriate questions on exam papers. This looks to be a typo and the course team have confirmed no issues have been raised about this previously.</p> <p>Reviewed by A.Smith 24.10.2022</p>	

To be completed by Academic Director of Partnerships:

Choose an action	B - Identified action and picked up appropriately
<p>Reviewed by Z Butterfint 24.10.22</p>	

DOCUMENT OWNER: Academic Partnerships

DOCUMENT TYPE: Form

APPROVED BY: Academic Partnerships

VERSION NUMBER: 2

DUE FOR REVIEW: June 2020

VERSION LOG:

Date	Version no.	Summary of changes	Author	Approved by
May 2019	2	Updated to include table for mid-year review of action plan	Academic Partnerships	Academic Partnerships
October 2021	3	Updated to include drop down boxes		