

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Name of Institution Examined: INTO UEA

Faculty/School:

Course Title(s):

1. Fnd Society and Culture [IF Business and Humanities]
2. Fnd Law [as above]
3. Fnd International & Developmental Studies [as above]
4. Int Year One Politics and International Development for International students [International Year One Development with Media]
5. Int Year One Social Anthropology and International Development for International students [as above]
6. GDip Contemporary World Issues [International Graduate Diploma]
7. GDip International Political Economy [as above]
8. GDip Social & Cultural Studies [as above]
9. GDip Applied Research Skills (Social Science related) [as above]

Academic Year: 2021/22

External Examiner Name: Dr. Christopher Byrne

External Examiner's home University / College or Other Professional / Institutional Affiliation:

Leeds Beckett University

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?	Choose an item.
b. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?	Yes
If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	Choose an item.
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?	Choose an item.
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?	Choose an item.
b. Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?	Choose an item.

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?	Choose an item.
--	-----------------

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

All of the assessments seemed to align well with the modules' objectives, which in turn fit well within the relevant degree structures.

The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable

Yes.

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

Yes, I was impressed by the academic rigour of the assessments and the way they were marked.

The curriculum is current

Yes, the curriculum is suitably up-to-date.

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

Yes. Although, I did notice that the marking scheme on some modules incorporated a useful 'how to improve' section, but not on others. This seems like an instance of best practice that should be more widely diffused.

Similarly, video feedback was used on some modules, but not elsewhere. It seemed very effective. Is it feasible to use this more widely? If there are plans to use it more widely, how is its effectiveness being monitored? (E.g., is there statistics tracking on the videos?)

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

Generally, yes. Although the sheer amount of work for the students to do on some modules seemed a lot. 3–4 separate assessments on single semester modules leaves little time for reading and other learning.

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

Yes. Marking was very thorough and consistent.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Relative to other institutions I have worked at, the standards and student achievement on the various modules/courses I observed was very high. With relatively few exceptions, the students demonstrated competence in a wide range of academic skills. This was reflected in the spread of marks, which were generally high, without academic standards having been compromised. The rigour of the assessments was impressive and students had clearly been well supported to understand and excel in them.

Enhancement of Quality

Please provide comment and recommendations on:

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

1. In many cases, the marking scheme incorporated a 'how to improve' section. This is a great way of getting around the negativity bias inherent in HE marking.
2. On one module (IYO Politics and International Development) students were given feedback in video format. This is an excellent innovation that removes some of the barriers to students really understanding their assessment feedback (a key to improving their skills). It also particularly helps students with specific learning difficulties. Whether it requires too much time and effort to incorporate into every module is for the university to decide. Student feedback on the video feedback should also be sought.
3. I was also impressed by some of the innovative assessments designed to improve group work skills. These are crucial skills for graduates, but are difficult to develop, and also to mark. Most institutions limit group work to presentations. The group work research project on Introduction to Research was an excellent example of how to develop group work skills in a more holistic and real-world relevant way.

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

Again, the overall standard was excellent. There are very few areas to improve. Some smaller incremental improvements it might be worth considering:

1. There were some inconsistencies in both the type of feedback given to students and the way it was presented.
 - a. On some modules the feedback utilised a specific section headed something like 'How to improve'. On others, this was not the case. Likewise, some modules used the rubric as a form of feedback and others did not. There was a lot of variation within particular forms of feedback also. E.g., some in-text comments were hand-written, others typed, and others in margin comments. Sometimes performance against particular criteria on the rubric was indicated with highlighting, sometimes with bold/font colour. The format of the rubric itself changed quite a lot also (sometimes the criteria were in rows, sometimes in columns; most of the time it included descriptions of individual criteria, but sometimes it didn't). There was also one module (Foundation Law) where the rubric overran the page.
 - b. Sometimes feedback was written, sometimes it was in the form of a video (i.e., IYO Politics and International Development). The form of the feedback was generally fine, but there is not an obvious reason for the inconsistency within or across modules. (Why was some feedback on PID written and some in a video?)
 - c. Where there were hand-written in-text comments, these were sometimes quite difficult to read. For students with English as a second language, it would likely be even more difficult. Are there opportunities for students to query feedback? (This would mitigate a lot.)
2. The sheer amount of work for the students to do seemed a lot. 3–4 separate assessments on single semester modules leaves little time for reading and other learning.
3. The video feedback seemed very effective. Is it feasible to use this more widely? If there are plans to use it more widely, how is its effectiveness being monitored? (E.g., is there statistics tracking on the videos?)

Also, please:

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

Yes.

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

NA.

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

NA.

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

NA.

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>The team may consider a brief review of marking schemes to ensure consistency within and across programmes.</p>	<p>SG (GDip); this does look like something which should be undertaken very soon. I would suggest PMs from GDip, IYO, and Foundation B&H begin this process.</p> <p>TC (IYO Dev/Media): this seems like a good idea, there is definitely more scope to standardise across modules but it may be ambitious to apply this for 2022-23.</p>	<p>SG et al</p> <p>See above</p>	<p>Suggested by SG: December 2022.</p> <p>See above, but would suggest 2023-24 intake implementation</p>		

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

Report completed by:

Signature

T.Cuming

Date: 12/10/22

COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

Generally pleasing comments with some good suggestions around consistency (SG).

A very thorough report with some nice endorsement of practice on the Politics module and some good recommendations around consistent use of criteria (TC).

Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader: T.Cuming

Date: 12/10/22

(Please print name and sign)

Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or equivalent)

Jeremy Moyle

Date:

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
Reviewed by A.Smith 24.10.2022	

To be completed by Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Partnerships and Apprenticeships:

Choose an action	B - Identified action and picked up appropriately
Reviewed by Z Butterfint 24.10.22	

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		