

1. For sections 1 - 4 please type your comments in the spaces provided. You are asked to indicate if you expect to receive a response from the College.
2. For section 5, please delete as appropriate (Yes, No or N/A). You are asked to provide additional comments, particularly if you answered 'No'.
3. Names of all students and staff should be omitted

Please comment on the areas detailed below, highlighting the appropriateness and strengths and/or weaknesses.

		[ ]	
1.1. Course content	The course content at all levels- Certificate, Diploma and Masters was appropriate	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name



s and strengths and/or weaknesses.

3.		[ ]	
3.1. Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)	The assignments were representative of the outcomes.	[ ]	Action (if any) date & name:

comments for the  
students. Five



If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully here. We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:

Do you have any suggestions for improvements based on experience at other institutes? We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:





		[ ]	
6.1. Course content	Content has been well planned, mapped and developed	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
6.2. Learning objectives	Clear	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
6.3. Teaching methods	Appropriate	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
6.4. Resources (in so far as they affected the assessment)	N/A	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the Programme:		[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:

		[ ]	
--	--	-----	--

7.1. Students' performance in relation to those at a similar stage on comparable courses in other institutions, where this is known to you

8.		[ ]	
8.1. Assessment methods (relevance to learning objectives and curriculum)	Generally good with excellent detailed feedback given on the patches	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
8.2. Extent to which assessment processes are rigorous	Largely – my only reservation relates to the oral assessment and the weighting for such a subjective piece of judgement	[ ]	Response: Please see response to 3.5. Action (if any) date & name:
8.3. Consistency of the level of assessment with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)	consistent	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
8.4. Standard of marking	Sound process of double marking in place. Striking consistency when double marking used implies that rubric descriptors are working well	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
8.5. Opinion on changes to the assessment process from previous years in which you have examined	I was interested and impressed by the inclusion of the video diary reflection in ELTT	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
Please provide any additional comments and recommendations regarding the assessment process:	Regarding my point in 3.2 above, it was clear whilst observing the orals process and subsequent marking	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name: This was raised during the exam board meeting and the current marking scheme for the oral exams. This has been discussed at

that the rubric being used for this assessment was not appropriate. I therefore strongly recommend that if the oral continues to be summatively assessed then a more appropriately aligned rubric should be developed to help markers be absolutely clear about what is being assessed during the oral.

the CMC, and forwarded to MSc Co-ordinating committee. The committee agreed

		[ ]	
9.1. In your view, are the processes for assessment and the determination of awards sound and fairly conducted? (e.g. Briefing, Exam administration, marking arrangements, Board of Examiners, participation by External examiners)	Yes although we discussed at the board meeting that given the increasing numbers of candidates and complexity of the		

		Additional comments, particularly if your answer was no:	[ ]	
10.1. Comments I have made in previous years have been addressed to my satisfaction		Partially – I recall both externals expressed some concerns last year about the oral/ weighting/ clarity on what was being assessed issue	[ ]	Response: Please see the response to 3.5.  Action (if any) date & name:
5.13. An acceptable response has been made		See above	[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
5.14. I approved the papers for the Examination			[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
5.15. I was able to scrutinise an adequate sample of students' work and marks to enable me to carry out my duties			[ ]	Response: Action (if any) date & name:
5.16. I attended the meeting of the Board of Examiners held to approve the results of the Examination				

If you have identified any areas of good practice, please comment more fully here. We may use information provided in our annual external examining report:

Do you have any suggestions for improvements based on experience at other institutes? We may use information provided in our annual external examining report: