|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bangor black** | **External Examiner’s Report for****Undergraduate Programmes*****delivered in partnership with other institutions:*****2022/2023** |

**Please note that your report will be made available in full to students.**

**Please DO NOT name individuals in your report.**

**Please return this form no later than 3 weeks following the Board of Examiners meeting**

This form is provided to External Examiners to help them make structured, evaluative comments on the quality of academic standards in all taught courses in the University. The aim of the Report is to ensure that the standards of teaching, learning and assessment are maintained and enhanced.

External Examiners are encouraged to make any additional comments should they so wish, either on this form, or as a separate report. A separate form should be completed for each scheme examined, except where schemes are closely related. In such cases, please indicate clearly the award and title of the scheme to which the Report refers.

Please note that External Examiners have a right to raise any matter of serious concern with the Vice-Chancellor, if necessary, by means of a separate confidential written report.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, this report may be released into the public domain. The University will assume that you give your consent to such disclosure if the University deems it appropriate.

The University is very grateful for your advice and any suggestions for quality enhancement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of External Examiner:**  |  |
| **Programme(s) Examined:**  |  |
| **List of Modules or Subject Area Examined:** (if less than the whole programme) |  |
| **Partner Institution:**   |  |
| **Date of Board of Examiners Meeting:** |  |

Please use **section 7** to identify any particular features of the programme and its assessment that are worthy of commendation*.*

Please use **section 8** to identify any particular areas where there is scope for enhancement.

If you answer No to any particular question, please indicate why in **section 9**.

You may tick both the Yes and the No boxes if the response to a particular question is *yes* in some instances and *no* in others. Please elaborate in section 9.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 1 |  |  |  |
| **Academic Standards** | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| 1. Were the academic standards of the award(s) consistent with the levels set out in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Where relevant, were the academic standards of the award consistent with the current professional body standards for the programme?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the standards of student performance comparable with those on similar programmes with which you are familiar?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the grading criteria appropriate?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 2 |  |  |  |
| **The Programme**  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the following made available to you:
 | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| * 1. Student handbook(s)?
 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Programme specification(s)?
 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Module descriptions (these may be in the programme handbook)?
 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Marking criteria?
 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Sufficient information and guidance about the programme(s) to prepare you for your role as External Examiner?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the structure and content of the programme meet the requirements of the appropriate benchmark statement(s) and professional standards, where appropriate?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 3 |  |  |  |
| **Assessment Strategy** | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| 1. Overall, were methods and standards of assessment appropriate in relation to the course content, learning outcomes and teaching and learning methods?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the weightings of the different elements appropriate?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was there evidence of double marking in line with the University’s Code of Practice?
 |  |  |  |
| **Coursework/continuously assessed work** |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you receive copies of a representative sample of draft assignments in good time to comment on them?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the nature and level of the tasks appropriate?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was sufficient coursework made available to you for moderation?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the method, general standard and consistency of marking satisfactory?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was feedback to students helpful and informative?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 4 |  |  |  |
| **Examinations**  | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| 1. Did you receive copies of draft examination papers in good time to comment on them?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. (i) Were you able to moderate a sufficient range and number of marked scripts?
 |  |  |  |
| (ii) If you did not receive all the scripts, was the method of selection satisfactory? |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the general standard and consistency of marking appropriate?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were the scripts annotated in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for the award of marks?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 5 |  |  |  |
| **Dissertations/Project Reports** | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| 1. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the method, general standard and consistency of marking satisfactory?
 |  |  |  |
| **Orals/Performances/Recitals** |  |  |  |
| 1. Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct orals and/or moderate performances/recitals?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the method, general standard and consistency of marking satisfactory?
 |  |  |  |
| **Appropriate Professional Placements**  |  |  |  |
| 1. Were suitable arrangements made for you to moderate any work of students undertaken during practice placements?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Where required by professional bodies, was opportunity given to meet students and placement staff?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Based on the information available to you, is the relationship between the University school and placement provider effective in meeting students’ learning needs?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the method, general standard and consistency of marking satisfactory?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 6 |  |  |  |
| **Final examiners' meeting** | **Y** | **N** | **N/A** |
| 1. Were you able to attend the meeting?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were you satisfied with the general arrangements for the meeting?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was due consideration given to each student, including evidence that special circumstances had been considered?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Was the meeting conducted to your satisfaction?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were you satisfied with the final recommendations of the Board of Examiners?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Were you the External Examiner in the previous academic year?
 |  |  |  |
| 1. Did you receive appropriate feedback on your last report? Were issues that you highlighted dealt with adequately?
 |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 7 |  |  |  |
| *Please use this section to identify any particular features of the programme and its assessment that are worthy of commendation.* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 8 |  |  |  |
| *Please use this section to identify any particular areas where there is scope for enhancement.* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section 9 |  |  |  |
| *Please use this section to indicate why you have answered No to any particular questions above.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| Section 10 For External Examiners in the final year of their appointment only |
| *If this is your final year as an External Examiner, please give an overview of your term of office.*  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Signature :** | **Date:**  |

This form should be returned to **Dr Sarah Jackson**, e-mail: qualityassurance@bangor.ac.uk , within 3 weeks following the Board of Examiners’ meeting. Please note that payment of fees can only be authorised after the Report has been received in the Quality Enhancement Unit.

Revised April 2023