

External Examiners Annual Report

Introduction

Thank you for your professional services as an External Examiner for a taught programme and for logging on to this site to submit your annual report for the **[NAME] Board**.

Your comments will be made available (but not limited) to the Faculty Lead, Chair, Deputy Chair and Administrator(s) of the Board of Examiners to which you have been appointed and to the Chair of the relevant Faculty Board of Examiners.

If you have drawn attention to matters with implications for UCL as a whole and/or matters which raise serious issues, your report will also be made available to the Chair of UCL's Education Committee (or their nominee).

The report will be made available to students (and where appropriate, to partner institutions) so please consider any reference to individuals ensures their anonymity. An opportunity to raise confidential matters will be provided at the meeting of the Board of Examiners.

When completing a report, examiners should refer to the information provided in their letter of appointment relating to data protection issues.

Please contact: examiners@ucl.ac.uk if you have any queries when completing the report.

Process Description

The report has three sections:

1. Content and the Assessment Process
2. Examination, Awards and Standards
3. Recommendations

Please answer all questions before moving to the next section. **The Portico pages can time out if there is limited activity, therefore it is advisable to draft your comments in a word document first and copy these in Section 3 to avoid losing any entries.** You can save the report and return to it later. More information on individual fields is provided by hovering over the relevant field.

Use the 'Back' button at the bottom right of the screen to go to previous sections. You will have the opportunity to review the full report before submitting the final version.

2023-24 External Examiners Report

<i>External Examiner Detail</i>	
Master code:	
Name:	
Home institution:	
Board currently being assessed:	
Department for this board:	
Faculty for this board:	
Modules for this board linked to me:	Modules confirmed (please list modules here) <input type="checkbox"/>
Other boards appointed to:	

The modules you are linked to for this board are listed above. Please check these details carefully and select 'OK' if the details are correct.

If there are errors, please select 'Not OK' and you will be given an opportunity to provide details of the discrepancies before proceeding with your report. Your query will then be sent for investigation, and you will be contacted once this has been resolved. Please note, you will not be able to submit your report until these queries have been resolved.

- OK
 Not OK

Overall standard of Programme / Modules examined (select one): QAA Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Assessment and External Expertise

Meets UK expectations

Requires improvements to meet UK expectations

Does not meet UK expectations

<i>Attendance</i>	
Date of Final Board meeting:	
Did you attend this meeting:	
Sufficient advance notice given:	

Detail of other meetings:		
Section 1 and 2: Please answer the questions with a Yes, No or NA. If you indicate an issue, please provide further details in the appropriate comments section in section 3		
<i>Content and the Assessment Process</i>		
1.01	Was the balance and content of the degree programme in accordance with the stated programme objectives?	
1.02	Was the content of the programme of study coherent overall?	
1.03	Were the compulsory modules / course units appropriate in relation to stated programme objectives?	
1.04	As reflected in the work presented by candidates, were the methods and adequacy of teaching suitable?	
1.05	Were there any issues concerning a candidate's performance, including their proficiency in the use of English Language; and where appropriate, their aptitude to practice, and their development as reflective professionals in their chosen field. Please do not identify the candidate in this report.	
1.06	Was the balance of assessment tasks, and the balance between them including content, spread and level of the questions, appropriate and proportionate for the programme in general?	
1.07	Was the quality of assessment, including the application of the marking criteria, appropriate. (e.g. for the award of honours, or for a Master's level programme including a PG Diploma/Cert, including where there is an award of Distinction); and whether appropriate account has been taken of the requirements of the relevant Professional statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs)?	
1.08	Was there evidence that comments and suggestions made by you last year had been considered and the programme team had provided appropriate feedback on your last report? If you are a new Examiner, had recommendations of the previous External Examiner been acted upon?	
<i>Examination, Awards and Standards</i>		
<i>Setting Coursework Assessments</i>		
2.01	Were the objectives of assessments clear and appropriate?	
2.02	Did students receive properly structured and focused feedback on assessments (formative and summative)?	
2.03	Was the content, spread and level of the assessments satisfactory?	
2.04	Were the assessments related to the relevant Professional Statutory or Regulatory Bodies?	
<i>Marking assessments</i>		
2.05	Was the subject for assessments/reports/dissertations satisfactory?	
2.06	Was the general method and standard of marking satisfactory?	

2.07	Were the criteria for marking/grading assessments clear and appropriate?	
2.08	Was all assessed work, or an appropriate sample double-marked internally?	
2.09	Were satisfactory marking criteria provided?	
2.10	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of practical/clinical examinations?	
Draft assessments (e.g. examination papers or coursework titles)		
2.11	Did you receive all new draft assessments?	
2.12	If not, was this at your request?	
2.13	Were the content, and level of the questions satisfactory?	
2.14	Were your comments relating to approval of assessments considered, where appropriate?	
2.15	Was the moderation process clear and transparent that led to the Internal Examiners' recommended grade/outcome in each case?	
Results		
2.16	Were you satisfied with the outcomes of the Board of Examiners?	
2.17	Were the processes for assessment and the determination of awards fairly conducted? QAA Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Assessment and External Expertise	
2.18	Does the standard achieved by students in the assessment compare with the standards of the national university system of higher education in the UK with which you are familiar, including Ofsted and satisfy the requirements of all other relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies? QAA Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Partnerships, Work-based learning and External Expertise	
Effective framework for partnership management of Quality Assurance		
2.19	Does the external UCL partnership provide a framework for effective learning?	
2.20	Does rigorous moderation of external UCL partnership institutions take place?	
2.21	Were systems to monitor quality appropriate and effective?	
2.22	Was there a common assessment for all students?	
2.23	Where students are not taught together, were the different cohorts examined at the same standard?	
Administration		
2.24	Did you receive induction materials?	
2.25	Did you receive clear instructions for completing the External Examiners report?	
2.26	Did you receive information about your role and responsibilities?	
2.27	Did you receive contact details for the departmental /divisional Examination Liaison Officer and/or Board Administrator?	
2.28	Did you receive External Examiners' reports and any responses from the previous year?	
2.29	Did you receive copies of programme / module documents in good time (e.g. handbooks, marking criteria etc)?	
2.30	Were you given access to the Virtual Learning Environment (i.e. Moodle)?	

2.31	Where modules are on AssessmentUCL, our digital assessment platform, were you given access and guidance to it?	
------	--	--

Recommendations

Please enter your comments in the appropriate section. If you have no concerns or comments, please enter 'N/A'. Please do not leave the boxes blank.

Essential (is a serious risk to academic standards on the module/programme)		
3.01	Serious areas of concern which, in your opinion, place academic standards and/or the student learning experience at immediate risk and requires action before the start of the next academic year.	<i>Character limit: 3000</i>
Advisable		
3.02	Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.	<i>Character limit: 3000</i>
Desirable		
3.03	Areas where, in your opinion there is potential for enhancement.	<i>Character limit: 3000</i>
Good Practice		
3.04	Areas of UCL module/programme good practice potential for wider dissemination.	<i>Character limit: 3000</i>
Further General Comments on the Programme		
3.05	Further General Comments (optional)	<i>Character limit: 3000</i>