

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT

Name of Institution Examined: INTO UEA

Faculty/School: _____

Course Title(s): _____

Academic Year: Choose an item.

External Examiner Name: Dr Chris 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?	Yes
If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	N/A
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?	N/A
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 programmes – and the component parts which I consider – are aligned with the qualification descriptor and are at an appropriate level for the stage.

The programme reflects appropriate PSRB requirements where applicable

Not applicable to the foundation programme.

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

Assessments are in line with the standard to those in the other institutes of which I am familiar.

The curriculum is current

The curriculum is current and in keeping with other similar programmes.

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

Assessment criteria are clear and at the appropriate level for the content.

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 types of assessment are appropriate and follow the spirit of assessment as promoted by other universities and professional bodies such as the Institute of Physics. There is perhaps a slight over-assessment which has been remedied for future cohorts.

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

There is a comprehensive process of double-marking and vetting which ensure and displays the fair and appropriate nature of the assessments.

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

All procedures are followed.

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

Fair consideration to these issues has been given.

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**

The modules covered are at an appropriate level. At times the social science students taking the more mathematical modules perform less-well, but this is expected and not a reflection of the course or its teaching. More significant challenge is provided to the mathematical students in other modules on their programmes which are able to provide the stretch goals for those students. This cohort is performing at a similar level to previous cohorts and - while some underperformance has been shown by students who may have had their studies interrupted by Covid, this has been mitigated well and is consistent with the experience of other HEIs across the sector.

Enhancement of Quality

Please provide comment and recommendations on:

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

Marks for engagement helps ensure these foundation students start their studies with an understanding of the importance of engagement. A range of activities which develop subject-specific expertise as well as teamwork and practical skills provides a strong broad basis for future study. Double-marking indicating good communication between markers is always evident and a strong sign of the commitment to fairness.

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

A slight disparity had arisen between cohorts taking specific modules and how timely feedback could be provided in a way which is useful for the students. This has been corrected through small changes to assessment of those specific modules.

While this change is appropriate and useful, it would be good to be observant of how these changes affect the new cohort and report back on this.

Also, please:

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

Yes. Sufficient evidence was provided.

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

The course leaders continue to be fully responsive to my suggestions and all concerns 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

--

RECOMMENDATIONS, RESPONSE AND ACTION PLAN

Please list your recommendations for action by the course team:

<p>External Examiner's Recommendations for action <i>(to be completed by External Examiner)</i></p>	<p>Course Team's Response (action to be taken and measurable outcomes) <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i></p>	<p>By whom <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i></p>	<p>By when <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i></p>	<p>Progress as of February 20__ <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i></p>	<p>Progress as of end of Year <i>(to be completed by Course Leader)</i></p>
<p>Changes to the assessments of modules to be reflected upon in-year. As external I would quite like to be kept in the loop as to how these assessment changes are being received by students.</p>	<p>Will review update accordingly in due course</p>	<p>DW and MLs</p>	<p>Aug 24</p>		

Report completed by:

Signature



Date: 05/10/2023

COURSE TEAM'S GENERAL RESPONSE TO THE REPORT

We thank Chris for his helpful feedback and ongoing support

Responses and Action Plan completed by:

Course Leader: Dawn Wilkinson

Date: 18/10/23

(Please print name and sign)

Countersigned by:

Head of HE (or equivalent)



Date:

24/10/23

To be completed by the Academic Partnerships:

Choose an action	B - Identified action and picked up appropriately
Hannah Jackson Head of Partnerships 23 October 2023	

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

Choose an action	Choose an item.

--

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:

DOCUMENT OWNER: Academic Partnerships

DOCUMENT TYPE: Form

APPROVED BY: Academic Partnerships

VERSION NUMBER: 3

DUE FOR REVIEW: June 2023

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		
October 2022	4	Updated to move sign off boxes so they are sequential in terms of when the report is updated	Alexandra Smith	Academic Partnerships