

EE report – how to submit a response

You will receive an email from Portico with a link to your intray to review EE report.
Please click on the link. Your Portico intray will look like below.

Initiator	Sent	Status	Subject	Action	Task Code
EEXR_RCRIT04_000002_1508		*New*		Click	Examiner Annual Report - Chair
EEXR_TROSK03_000001_1508		Read		Click	Examiner Annual Report - Chair

TROSK03 is the UPI code that identifies the external examiner – e.g. Terry Roskin

Please click under 'Action' to review the Examiner's Annual Report.

[Redacted] has submitted a report to the Postgraduate Mechanical Engineering Umbrella Board.
The Report was submitted on [Redacted] and since then:

- 1 comments have been added
- 0 requests for feedback have been made
- 0 feedback responses have been received

Any response or comments submitted online will be automatically added to the report and be visible to the External Examiner, students and other colleagues at UCL.
Responses submitted offline to Student and Registry Services may be recorded manually through this task.
Hover over the buttons below to see what each does.
We hope you will find this to be a fairly straightforward process and thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the process.
If you require any assistance in accessing or completing this form please contact: examiners@ucl.ac.uk

Keep in intray **Review report** Add a comment

Please click on “review report” at the bottom of the screen and read the whole report (40 questions).

Once you have reviewed the report, at the end of the page, please click on “add a comment” and write your response.

2.18	Were the processes for examination, assessment and determination of awards generally sound and fairly conducted? QAA Quality Code Part B	Yes
2.19	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 relevant other Professional, Statutory and Regulatory bodies? QAA Quality Code Part B	Yes
2.20	Does the partnership provide a framework for effective learning?	n/a
2.21	Does rigorous moderation of partnership institutions take place?	n/a
2.22	Were systems to monitor quality appropriate and effective?	n/a
2.23	Was there a common assessment for all students?	n/a
2.24	Where students are not taught together, were the different cohorts examined at the same standard?	n/a
2.25	Were you fully inducted into UCL's examination policies and procedures?	Yes
2.26	Did you receive clear guidelines on UCL's reporting requirements for External Examiners reports?	Yes
2.27	Did you receive information about relevant UCL policies that was required to fulfil your role?	Yes
2.28	Did you receive contact details for the departmental /divisional examination liaison officer?	Yes
2.29	Did you receive previous External Examiners' reports and any responses?	No
2.30	Did you receive copies of relevant programme / module documents in good time (e.g. syllabuses, marking schemes etc)?	No
2.31	Were you given access to the Virtual Learning Environment (e.g. Moodle)?	Yes
2.32	Did you see a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work, including those of all borderline students and all those awarded distinction, to be able to assess whether the internal marking was appropriate and consistent?	Yes

Recommendations

Essential	
3.01	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. The examination papers were sent in advance to be assessed however in a number of cases the solutions and marking schemes were not provided and this made it difficult to judge the detail expected from the student and if there were potential mistakes in the questions set. All solutions and marking schemes should be provided with the examination papers so that a better assessment can be made.
Advisable	
3.02	Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved. Some examination papers did not indicate the marks available for a correct answer for each section of the paper and instead grouped a number of sections together. It is preferable to provide a 'maximum' mark for each section so that students can use this to get an impression of the level of detail required and the amount of time they should spend on completing each part of the question. There was concern over the choice made for some student Individual Projects and the level of engineering content and relevance to the MSc programme being studied. It is recommended that greater attention is paid to advising the students on their project selection. Also, there were some cases when the difference between the 1st and 2nd marker was very large (over 40%) and an agreed mark was arrived at. I would suggest that a 3rd marker be asked to assess the Individual Project in cases where the 1st and 2nd assessment differs by more than 10%.
Desirable	
3.03	Areas where, in your opinion there is potential for enhancement.
Additional Comments	
3.04	Please include any additional comments you may have for instance, suggestions for improving the University's procedures or observations of good practice. If this is your final year as an External Examiner, please comment on developments at the programme or procedural level, during your period of tenure. Unfortunately there were a couple of issues with examination administration which impacted on student performance, however I was happy with the way in which the Exam Board dealt with this under the circumstances. During the Preliminary Examination Board meeting a great deal of time was spent discussing borderline failures for a large number of students and I would have expected that these case would have been dealt with prior to this meeting.
Uploaded Document	
3.05	If you wish to attach a document with reference to your recommendations, please upload it here. Limited to one.

[Back](#)
[Keep in In tray](#)
[Add a comment](#)
[Remove from In tray](#)

Once you have responded, please click on “submit comment”

Please enter your comment below and click Submit

Thank you for your report.
Please see below the response your comments.

Ess:

Advis:

Desir:

Add Com:

[Back](#) [Submit comment](#)

Please scroll down to the bottom of the page and click on “Keep in intray”. Reports will automatically be removed from your intray when reports are closed by the Central team.

3.03	Please include any additional comments you may have for instance, suggestions for improving the University's procedures or observations of good practice. If this is your final year as an External Examiner, please comment on developments at the programme or procedural level, during your period of tenure.
Additional Comments	
3.04	Unfortunately there were a couple of issues with examination administration which impacted on student performance, however I was happy with the way in which the Exam Board dealt with this under the circumstances. During the Preliminary Examination Board meeting a great deal of time was spent discussing borderline failures for a large number of students and I would have expected that these case would have been dealt with prior to this meeting.
Uploaded Document	
3.05	If you wish to attach a document with reference to your recommendations, please upload it here. Limited to one.

[Back](#) [Keep in intray](#) [Add a comment](#)

For any questions, contact your Faculty team in the first instance. For any Portico link related query, please contact externalexaminers@ucl.ac.uk.