

## 2015/16 External Examiners Report

### Hide History of Additions

History of Additions			
Date	Type	Content	Who
16/09/16	Comment	<p>Professor [REDACTED] submitted the desirable recommendation that consideration be given to the variability of mark distributions across courses. We thank him for this recommendation and intend to increase our vigilance on this issue.</p> <p>Although, this was a particular problem this year with two extreme distributions of marks, (which we have taken remedial action to remedy). We believe we have a process in place that will point out problems with these distributions across modules and allow us to address these at an early stage. At the point of submitting grades, moderators are required to comment on the distribution. Then the chair of the exam board must view the grades before they are submitted to the external examiner. These distributions are then explicitly reported and commented upon in the examinations board itself.</p> <p>We will, however, change the guidance we give to moderators to emphasise the desired range of mark distributions. It would also help if there was less time pressure upon examiners, so these matters could be given proper consideration.</p> <p>• Professor [REDACTED] also comments on the new extenuating circumstances procedure. This was something we struggled with and look forward to getting additional guidance on this from the faculty.</p> <p>Finally, there is the issue of annotating scripts. We, also, believe this is a useful practice and will give it consideration.</p>	Professor [REDACTED] Board

### Hide Report

## Provisional

External Examiner Detail	
Master code:	JTEMP18
Name:	1 [REDACTED]
Home institution:	University of Bristol
Board currently being assessed:	Undergraduate Economics Board of Examiners
Department for this board:	Economics
Modules for this board linked to me:	1 Modules confirmed 1 Show linked modules
Other boards appointed to:	Not currently appointed to any other boards.

Overall standard of Programme / Modules examined.

### Meets UK expectations

Attendance	
Date of Final Board meeting:	15/Jun/2016
Did you attend this meeting:	Yes
Sufficient advance notice given:	Yes
Detail of other meetings:	

Content and the Assessment Process		
1.01	Was the balance and content of the degree programme in accordance with the stated programme objectives?	Yes
1.02	Was the content of the programme of study coherent overall?	Yes
1.03	Were the compulsory modules / course-units appropriate in relation to stated programme objectives?	Yes
1.04	As reflected in the work presented by candidates, were the methods and adequacy of teaching suitable?	Yes
1.05	Were there any notable performance issues of candidates, 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.	No
1.06	Was the balance of methods of assessment, and the balance between them including nature, spread and level of the questions, appropriate and proportionate for the programme in general?	Yes
1.07	Was the quality of assessment, including the application of the assessment criteria, appropriate for the scheme of award (i.e. 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?	

Examination, Awards and Standards		
2.01	Were the objectives of assignments clear and appropriate?	Yes
2.02	Did students receive properly structured and focused feedback on assignments (formative and summative)?	n/a
2.03	Was the nature, spread and level of the assignments satisfactory?	Yes
2.04	Were the assignments related to the relevant Professional statutory or regulatory bodies?	n/a
2.05	Was the choice of subject for coursework/reports/dissertations satisfactory?	n/a
2.06	Was the general method and standard of marking satisfactory?	
2.07	Were the criteria for marking/grading assignments clear and appropriate?	
2.08	Were all scripts, or other assessed work, or a sufficient proportion of assignments double-marked internally?	Yes
109	Was there a satisfactory marking scheme for individual questions (where applicable), individual papers and the programme of study overall?	Yes
2.10	Were satisfactory arrangements made for the conduct of practical/clinical examinations?	n/a
2.11	Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct oral examinations?	n/a
2.12	Did you receive all the draft papers / assignment titles?	Yes
2.13	If not, was this at your request?	n/a
2.14	Was the nature, spread and level of the questions satisfactory?	Yes
2.15	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments relating to approval of the written question papers, coursework, report and dissertation topics, where appropriate?	Yes
2.16	Was the reasoning that led to the Internal Examiners recommended grade/outcome transparent in each case?	Yes
2.17	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
118	Were the processes for examination, assessment and determination of awards generally sound and fairly conducted? <a href="#">QAA Quality Code Part B</a>	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? <a href="#">QM Quality Code Part B</a>	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?	Yes
2.30	Did you receive copies of relevant programme / module documents in good time (e.g. syllabuses, marking schemes etc)?	Yes
2.31	Were you given access to the Virtual Learning Environment (e.g. Moodle)?	
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?	

## 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.**  
I did not identify any such areas of concern.

### Advisable

- 3.02 **Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.**  
Please see below.

### Desirable

- 3.03 **Areas where, in your opinion there is potential for enhancement.**  
Some consideration could perhaps be given to variability in mark distributions across courses. Some variability is both inevitable and desirable, but nevertheless, a review of the relevant guidelines and procedures would be worth considering, to ensure that these are robust in the widest possible range of circumstances.  
Please also see my comments below

### 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.**  
I understand that the university-wide procedures for considering extenuating circumstances are new this year. They differ significantly from the approach used at my own institution, the University of Bristol. In future years as an External Examiner at UCL. I will seek to get a better sense of the relative merits of the two approaches.

A second procedural issue is that internal examiners often kept separate records of detailed marking comments, rather than annotating scripts directly. For the moderation process and the review of scripts by external examiners, direct annotation of scripts may have advantages that are worth considering.

**Uploaded Document**

3.05 j **If you wish to attach a document with reference to your recommendations, please upload It here. Limited to one.**

---

