ANNUAL MODULE EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT 2024/25 (GA3)

# Examiner Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Report ID | External Examiner | Email Address |
|  |  |  |

# Progammes Covered

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Institute | Academic Discipline | Partner |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programmes | Degree Apprentice Programmes |
|  |  |

# Appointment Details

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year of Appointment | Year of Tenure | Levels |
|  |  |  |

# Visit Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meet with students on the programme | Method of meeting |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Visted in person | Details of Visit |
|  |  |

# Undergraduate Report

## Module and Assessment Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Response |
| Did you have access to all relevant programme handbooks and regulations at an appropriate time? |  |
| Did you receive sufficient materials (e.g. assessment briefs, samples of student work, etc.) to enable you to fulfil your role? (If not, please give details below) |  |
| Do the aims and structure of the modules/programmes meet the needs of the students? |  |
| Do you consider the content of the modules to be appropriately inclusive and reflective of a diverse student body? |  |
| Are the assessments aligned with appropriate level of the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales ([CQFW](https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-02/level-descriptors.pdf))? |  |
| Were the methods of assessment well-balanced and fair? |  |
| Did the assessments reflect the intended learning outcomes? |  |
| Were assessments reliable and inclusively designed (to minimise the use of modified assessment, and over-assessment of learning outcomes)? |  |
| Were you asked to approve all the relevant draft assessment specifications (including any draft exam papers) for modules on the GA15? |  |
| Did you receive appropriate responses to any comments you may have made on assessments? |  |

## Marking and Moderation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Was the student work marked fairly, using the published marking and grading criteria? |  |
| Was the student work marked in such a way to enable you to understand the rationale for the marks awarded? |  |
| Was the student work appropriately moderated/second marked? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the quality of feedback provided to students by internal markers? |  |
| Were you given the opportunity to see borderline pieces of work? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the administration of the assessment process? |  |
| Was the amount of assessed work manageable for students and staff? |  |
| Where applicable, were suitable arrangements made for you to moderate placements outcomes (including international mobility)? |  |
| Where applicable, were suitable arrangements made for you to observe and review performances and/or presentations? |  |

## Student Performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Was student work compatible with the stated aims and objectives of the programme? |  |
| Was the quality of student work as you would have expected in a programme at this level? |  |
| Was student work comparable with that of their peers at other institutions you have experience of? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the quality and nature of teaching and learning as indicated by student work examined? |  |
| Are sufficient opportunities provided for students to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that is required to pass? |  |

## Multiple Iterations of a programme

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| For Examiners responsible for different iterations of the same programme: Are standards of work across the different iterations broadly comparable? |  |
| If not, are you satisfied that steps have been taken/are planned to reduce any performance gaps? |  |

# Undergraduate Summary Report

Please provide an overview of good practice and recommendations in the space below. This summary will provide ‘at a glance’ information for a wider audience than the teaching team. Teams are expected to share reports with students. As a minimum, we will make this summary available on our Virtual Learning Environment, but more usually we will share your full report with all students on the Programme. *PLEASE****DO NOT****REFER TO STUDENTS OR STAFF BY NAME OR NUMBER.*

## Good Practice

TEXT

## Any urgent matters for attention

Are there any areas which you consider require urgent attention that are not included elsewhere in your report?

Text

## Any other recommendations for the programme team

Text

## Any other recommendations for the University

Text

# Postgraduate Report

## Module and Assessment Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Response |
| Did you have access to all relevant programme handbooks and regulations at an appropriate time? |  |
| Did you receive sufficient materials (e.g. assessment briefs, samples of student work, etc.) to enable you to fulfil your role? (If not, please give details below) |  |
| Do the aims and structure of the modules/programmes meet the needs of the students? |  |
| Do you consider the content of the modules to be appropriately inclusive and reflective of a diverse student body? |  |
| Are the assessments aligned with appropriate level of the Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales ([CQFW](https://www.gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-02/level-descriptors.pdf))? |  |
| Were the methods of assessment well-balanced and fair? |  |
| Did the assessments reflect the intended learning outcomes? |  |
| Were assessments reliable and inclusively designed (to minimise the use of modified assessment, and over-assessment of learning outcomes)? |  |
| Were you asked to approve all the relevant draft assessment specifications (including any draft exam papers) for modules on the GA15? |  |
| Did you receive appropriate responses to any comments you may have made on assessments? |  |

## Marking and Moderation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Was the student work marked fairly, using the published marking and grading criteria? |  |
| Was the student work marked in such a way to enable you to understand the rationale for the marks awarded? |  |
| Was the student work appropriately moderated/second marked? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the quality of feedback provided to students by internal markers? |  |
| Were you given the opportunity to see borderline pieces of work? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the administration of the assessment process? |  |
| Was the amount of assessed work manageable for students and staff? |  |
| Where applicable, were suitable arrangements made for you to moderate placements outcomes (including international mobility)? |  |
| Where applicable, were suitable arrangements made for you to observe and review performances and/or presentations? |  |
| For dissertations/projects: Was the choice of subjects appropriate? |  |
| For dissertations/projects: Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate? |  |

## Student Performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Was student work compatible with the stated aims and objectives of the programme? |  |
| Was the quality of student work as you would have expected in a programme at this level? |  |
| Was student work comparable with that of their peers at other institutions you have experience of? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the quality and nature of teaching and learning as indicated by student work examined? |  |
| Are sufficient opportunities provided for students to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that is required to pass? |  |
| Where applicable, was the work of students on Part 1 of a professional doctorate programme appropriate to progress to doctoral level study? |  |

## Multiple Iterations of a programme

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| For Examiners responsible for different iterations of the same programme: Are standards of work across the different iterations broadly comparable? |  |
| If not, are you satisfied that steps have been taken/are planned to reduce any performance gaps? |  |

# Postgraduate Summary Report

Please provide an overview of good practice and recommendations in the space below. This summary will provide ‘at a glance’ information for a wider audience than the teaching team. Teams are expected to share reports with students. As a minimum, we will make this summary available on our Virtual Learning Environment, but more usually we will share your full report with all students on the Programme. *PLEASE****DO NOT****REFER TO STUDENTS OR STAFF BY NAME OR NUMBER.*

## Good Practice

TEXT

## Urgent matters for attention

Are there any areas which you consider require urgent attention that are not included elsewhere in your report?

Text

## Any other recommendations for the programme team

Text

## Any other recommendations for the University

Text

# Examination Boards

## Attendance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Invited to attend | Attended |
|  |  |

## Regulations and Recommendations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Was (Were) the Examining Board(s) conducted properly and in accordance with the University’s regulations? |  |
| Were you satisfied with the recommendations and decisions of the Examining Board(s)? |  |

## Comments on Examination Boards

TEXT

**Comments on Professionally Accredited or Recognised Awards (including Teaching Practice)**

## Professionally accredited or recognised awards

Text

## Teaching Practice Modules

Text

## Pearson awards

Are you responsible for any HNC or HND programmes?

If Yes, how well does the HNC/HND programme meet the needs of the industry and its graduates, and what suggestions can you offer for improvement, considering the sector requirements?

Text

# Follow-up to Previous Year’s Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response** |
| Did you receive a written response to last year's report? |  |
| Was this provided within a timely manner? |  |
| Were any specific recommendations suggested to the programme team in last year's report? |  |
| Were the recommendations addressed by the programme team? |  |
| Were any specific recommendations suggested to the University in last year's report? |  |
| Were the recommendations addressed by the University? |  |

Further Information on previous year’s report

TEXT

# Final Year Report

*Please provide an overview of your period of tenure as an External Examiner for UWTSD.  You are asked to comment on your overall experience of the role, including development of the curriculum, changes to assessment and feedback practice and student performance since you took up post.  Please also include any points that you would like to highlight to your successor or suggestions that might assist the University in developing its procedures for External Examining.*

Text