

The University is grateful to its external examiners for their completion in full of this report. The report consists of questions where external examiners are asked to choose from a fixed range of responses, and questions where free text comments are requested. In respect of the latter this form includes a number of prompts for consideration/discussion as 'greyed out' text. These are intended to be suggestive rather than prescriptive, and external examiners are invited to comment on any issue they feel is relevant. To complete the free text questions, please click on the relevant section and you will automatically 'over-type' 'greyed-out' text.

External Examiners should feel free to make any comments they wish, including observations on teaching, module/programme structure and content, and degree schemes as well as assessment procedures. As the reports of external examiners are discussed widely within the University, we should be most grateful if external examiners would ensure that individual staff members or students are not referred to by name in their reports. Reports will normally be available for discussion widely within the University (including with student representatives via staff-student consultative committees), and may also be requested by certain external bodies, including the Quality Assurance Agency. An additional separate and confidential report may be sent to the Vice-Chancellor if the examiner considers this to be appropriate.

In accordance with the practice at most universities, payment of the examiner's fee is conditional upon receipt of satisfactorily completed Annual Report Forms and at the end of term of office of the separate final report. External examiners are requested to submit their forms within 4 weeks of the final meeting of the Board of Examiners.

*Note: moderators of undergraduate programmes in Combined Honours and Natural Sciences are asked to complete only the sections of this form which are applicable.*

Further information on External Examiner's Report, Fee and Claim forms, and on the External Examining process in general, can be found at <http://www.dur.ac.uk/external.examiners/>

**Please email completed report forms to [external.examiners@durham.ac.uk](mailto:external.examiners@durham.ac.uk)**

To ensure that you are paid correctly, please enter all of the programme(s) for which you acted as external examiner	
<b>Name of External Examiner</b>	
<b>Academic Year</b>	2011/12
<b>Level of Programmes Examined*</b>	<b>Undergraduate</b>
<b>Programme(s) Examined</b>	LLB
* external examiners who consider both undergraduate/integrated masters programmes <i>and</i> taught postgraduate programmes should complete two report forms	

## ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1:

Delete as appropriate

## External Examiner's Annual Report Form

a	Did you receive University policy and procedures relating to examinations and assessment?	<b>Yes</b>
b	Did you receive the external examiners' handbook and/or documentation on the University code of practice on external examining / moderating?	<b>Yes</b>
c	Did you receive the relevant core regulations (including university level and qualification descriptors and generic assessment criteria)?	<b>Yes</b>
d	Did you receive the relevant degree Programme Regulations?	<b>Yes</b>
e	Did you receive the relevant Programme Specification(s) and module outlines from the Department?	<b>Yes</b>
f	Did you receive the Programme Assessment Criteria from the Department?	<b>Yes</b>
g	Did you receive all the draft examination papers for comment?	<b>Yes</b>
h	Was the nature and level of the questions on draft examination papers appropriate?	<b>Yes</b>
i	If you had comments on draft examination papers, were these addressed to your satisfaction?	<b>Yes</b>
j	Was a sufficient sample of examination scripts made available to you?	<b>Yes</b>
k	Was a sufficient sample of assessed coursework made available to you?	<b>Yes</b>
l	Was assessed work marked in such a way as to enable you to see the reasons for award of given marks?	<b>Yes</b>
k	Please give further details below about any aspects of the issues referred to above. In particular, if you were not satisfied in relation to any of these issues please explain what you felt could be improved, if you found any aspect of this provision especially useful you may wish to give some examples of good practice.	
	Click here and type	

### QUALITY AND STANDARDS OF THE AWARD

For the questions that follow please use the following scale:

**1 (no/hardly at all)**

**2 (generally)**

**3 (consistently/fully)**

**2:**

Delete as appropriate

a	To what extent do the aims and objectives (intended learning outcomes) of the programme align with the subject benchmarks?	<b>3</b>
b	To what extent does the design of the curriculum enable the intended learning outcomes of the programme to be met?	<b>3</b>
c	Are the standards of the programme consistent with those required by the university qualification descriptors and so with the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications?	<b>2</b>

## External Examiner's Annual Report Form

d	Were the academic standards of student work comparable with similar programmes with which you are familiar?	<b>3</b>
e	Do the assessment criteria permit a confident judgement of student achievement against the learning outcomes?	<b>2</b>
f	Was the marking consistent with the assessment criteria?	<b>2</b>
g	Did the assessment policies and procedures appear to you to be appropriate?	<b>2</b>
h	Were the assessment policies and procedures adhered to?	<b>2</b>
i	Was the choice of subjects for dissertations/major projects appropriate?	<b>3</b>

**3. Please give further details about any aspects of the programme or its assessment relevant to the topics covered in question 2a-2i above. In particular where you have indicated 1 or 2 on the scale to questions 2a-2i please explain what you felt could be improved; where you have indicated 3 it would be helpful if you could particularly highlight examples of good practice.**

For the 2s two reasons. First, examiners across all subjects left a large number of students on 69. In my very wide experience as an external examiner this is unprecedented. Given that your rules do not allow externals to raise or lower marks this was I felt problematic. Second on the company law course one examiner had entered the exact same marks as the first examiner for every single question. This was resolved satisfactorily when queried but I think the role of the second examiner should be made clearer within your system.

**4. Please comment on the quality of students' work, the quality of the awards made (including the classes for undergraduate degrees and distinction for postgraduate degrees) and comparability with other institutions.**

- The quality of work was at the level I would expect save for the very large number of students on 68 and 69 across the board.

### MANAGEMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

**5. Please comment on the management of the assessment process, e.g. the provision of samples of student work, the operation of the Board of Examiners and the level of involvement of the external examiner in the assessment process.**

- This was excellent and our involvement was managed particularly well.

### PROGRAMME(S) DESIGN AND OPERATION

**6. Please add any comments on other aspects of the learning, teaching or assessments of the programme(s). These may include: curriculum design; modes of learning, teaching or assessment; learning resources; links between research and teaching; suitability of the programme as preparation for study at the next level (Masters or PhD as appropriate); suitability of the programme as a preparation for employment; alignment with the requirements of professional bodies (if applicable).**

- I have only one concern with the design of the programme and that is to do with the dissertation. Admirably the dissertation mark counts for double in your system. Given that the average mark for a dissertation is 67% this is a significant boost to students marks. Fair enough as you have decided to prioritise and encourage the students research. I was however deeply uncomfortable with your rules on discretion that require the dissertation to be given added weight in the exercise of the boards discretion. This caused lots of debate at the Exam board and in my view should be reviewed.

### COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

## External Examiner's Annual Report Form

**THESE QUESTIONS NEED ONLY BE ANSWERED BY EXTERNAL EXAMINERS FOR COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMMES (e.g. articulation agreements, validations, multiple awards, joint awards)**

**7a. Were you offered sufficient information about the collaborative partnership?**

NA

**7b. Did you have the opportunity to compare the achievement of students on the collaborative programme with those of students taught on programmes delivered solely by the University? If YES, were the standards achieved by students on the two types of programme comparable? If NO, do the academic standards achieved by the students indicate that appropriate learning opportunities are being provided through the collaborative partnership?**

Click here and type

### GOOD PRACTICE FOR DISSEMINATION

**8. Please highlight any examples of good or effective practice that you have identified in the programmes and modules which you examine, that are worthy of particular commendation and wider dissemination within Durham University.**

▪ NA

### PROGRESS ON RECOMMENDATIONS MADE LAST YEAR

**9. If you raised any issues for further consideration or action in your last report, have these been effectively considered by the academic department/school in which you are examining? Have you received a response from the academic department/school indicating the action taken in response to your comments and recommendations? If you raised issues regarding University policy and practice, have you received a response to this from the relevant University faculty?**

NA

### FURTHER COMMENTS – OPTIONAL

**10. If you wish to provide any further comments, in relation to the questions above, or to provide additional information not covered in this form, please feel free to do so in the box below.**

Click here and type