

**EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORT FORM FOR COMBINED PROGRAMME & SUBJECT DUTIES, 2021-22**

**Section 1: Details of External Examiner**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| External Examiner’s name |  | |
| Home institution |  | |
| Date report submitted |  | |
|  |  |
| Faculty |  | |
| School/Validated Partner |  | |
| Programme(s) |  | |
| Unit(s)/subject |  | |
| Mode of study examined (e.g. UG/PGT/both) |  | |

**Section 2: Matters arising from last report (if applicable)**

**NB**: ***Please do not refer to staff and students in this report by their name in order to protect their anonymity.***  
  
This section provides you with an opportunity to acknowledge whether actions, which you recommended in your last report, have been addressed, are in progress or are subject to further discussion. Please refer to your previous report(s). Have all items been addressed? If not, please provide details below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Outstanding item(s) |  |
| Additional comments  (if any) |  |

**Section 3: Process and procedures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The University’s [Guidance on External Examiner Procedures](http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=13287) states that all draft assessed core work that leads to the final degree classification is to be considered by the Subject External Examiner prior to it being completed by the students, to ensure the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are being met. This includes draft examination questions, essay questions, eLearning ‘discussion boards’, assignments and associated guidance for assessors, e.g. marking schemes or model answers. | |
| ***Please highlight relevant answer.*** | |
| (a) Did you receive all the relevant documentation relating to the programme(s), including programme handbooks, degree regulations, ILOs, unit outlines and assessment briefs/marking criteria? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (b) Did you receive the draft assessed work in sufficient time for you to review it before its completion by students? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (c) Were you provided with an appropriate-sized sample of marked assessed coursework, examination scripts and dissertations/project reports to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (d) Did you receive the assessed, marked work in sufficient time for you to review it before the Examination Board? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (e) Were the arrangements and instructions for the moderation of assessed coursework, examination scripts and dissertations/project reports adequate? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (f) Have you attended an Examination Board? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (g) If yes, was the Examination Board anonymous (i.e. students were not referenced by name)? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (h) Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Examination Board? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (i) Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (j) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| If you stated ‘No’ to any of the above questions, please expand on this in the box below. | |
|  | |

**Section 4: Subject and programme standards**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (a) From the draft assessed core work that you reviewed, were the ILOs met? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (b) Based on the sample of marked examination scripts, coursework and dissertations/project reports that you moderated, was the marking carried out consistently across the programme/units? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (c) Of the samples of assessed work (including dissertations/project reports) that you moderated, do you consider the standard of student work to be comparable with students at equivalent institutions? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (d) Do you consider that the overall academic standards for this subject area/programme at the University of Manchester are comparable to those of other institutions of which you have had experience? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (e) Were last year’s standards maintained/improved? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (f) Were the unit-level ILOs consistent with the expectations of the appropriate national subject benchmark and/or professional body requirements (where relevant)? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (g) Do you consider that the programme aims and ILOs were appropriate for the level of the award, when compared to the level descriptors of the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (h) Did the Examination Board apply appropriate standards in assessment and decision making? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| If you stated ‘No’ to any of the above questions, please expand on this in the box below. | |
|  | |

**Section 5: Unit-level assessment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (a) Were the assessment methods appropriate to the ILOs? | Yes / No |
|  |  |
| (b) Were the nature and level of assessments appropriate? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (c) Did you find the diversity of the assessment design and methods to be appropriate? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| (d) Did you find that consideration had been given to the design and variety of assessments used across cognate programmes? | Yes / No / N/A |
|  | |
| If you stated ‘No’ to any of the above questions, please expand on this in the box below. | |
|  | |

Yes / No

(e) Did the types of assessment have any impact on the quality and/or volume of feedback to students?

**Section 6: Mark review/classification review and viva voce**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| (a) Were you involved in either mark /classification review and/or giving viva voce examinations? | Yes / No |
| (b) Was the process handled fairly and transparently? | Yes / No |
|  | |
| If you stated ‘No’ to the above question, please expand on this in the box below. | |
|  | |

**Section 7: Detailed comments**

Please use this section to provide more detailed comments for the use of the University. We would also welcome your comments on any other matters you feel are relevant but which are not listed below.

MATTERS FOR ATTENTION

Please provide a list of individual actions you recommend either for consideration by the programme team or as matters for urgent attention. Also please note that these items should be carried forward to next year’s report and be acknowledged in ‘Section 2: Matters arising from last report.’

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **For consideration** | **For urgent attention** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

GOOD PRACTICE

If there is any good practice that you feel worthy of recognition, please state below. Please note that individuals’ names may be quoted for the purposes of recognising and disseminating good practice.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

OTHER COMMENTS  
  
Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form. For Examiners who have reached the end of their tenure, you may wish to include summary observations that cover the whole period and may be of use to your successor and the programme team.

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

**Section 8: External examining process & experience feedback**

In the spirit of continuous improvement, we would like to receive any feedback that you might have on the overall External Examining process and experience. Please provide any comments or suggestions that you have below.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Section 9: Submitting your report**

Please email your completed report to [external.examiners@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:external.examiners@manchester.ac.uk)

Please return the report **no later than four weeks** after the final Award Examination Board (or local equivalent) meeting has taken place.

In addition to this report, you may also send a note in confidence to the Vice-President (Teaching, Learning and Students), at the following address:

Vice-President (Teaching, Learning and Students)  
Office of the President  
John Owens Building  
University of Manchester  
Manchester  
M13 9PL

April 2022