



External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1 Summary

Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Lisa Boden
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security, University of Edinburgh
Role	External Examiner
Year of Service <i>[Typically up to four years; extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]</i>	3rd
Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report (e.g. BSc Economics, MA Cultural and Intellectual History)	Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health Distance Learning
Subject Area or Modules covered <i>[if applicable]</i>	VPM013-01 Advanced statistical methods in veterinary epidemiology LVM004-01 Epidemiology and animal health economics LVM017-01 Management of infectious disease outbreaks in animal populations VPM012-01 Statistical methods in veterinary epidemiology VPM015-01 Surveillance and investigation of animal health LVM006-01 Veterinary public health
Academic/calendar year covered (e.g. 2015-2016 or 2016)	2017-2018
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	05/12/2018
Date of the report	06/12/2018

1.1 Standards

- (a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes
- (b) If not, please explain why.

1.2 Student performance

- (a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar. Yes
- (b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.	
The Masters programme is set at a very high standard for the disciplinary field.	
1.3 Conduct of processes	
(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.	Yes
(b) If not, please explain why.	
(c) If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.	
The examiners hold the students to a high standard in this field.	
1.4 Area for commendation	
(a) Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences. Please highlight any items of good practice in programme arrangements and/or procedures for external examination.	
LVM004, LVM017, and VPM015 have extremely thorough records of examiner comments for each individual question as well as a summary of student performance in each question. This is best practice. It enables a forensic approach to external examination, provides useful information for future lessons learned and a defensible process should students query their marks.	
(b) Please provide comments on any aspect of the programme that you would like to be conveyed to current students.	
This is an excellent course- in which graduates will be well-prepared for a career in veterinary epidemiology	

Part 2 Standards

(a) Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ). • For the <i>International Foundation Programme</i> please refer to the Qualification and Component Levels. • Where applicable, please refer to the Subject Benchmark Statements. 	
The programme is well-aligned to learning objectives. It is a complete and coherent course which covers the fundamentals of veterinary epidemiology.	
(b) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level.	Yes
(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London Member Institutions.	Not applicable
<i>[This question is aimed at Examiners who are appointed to University of London Boards of Examiners and are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing students based at a Member Institution.]</i>	
(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own Member Institution of the University of London.	Not applicable
<i>[This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the Member Institutions of the University of London.]</i>	

(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level.	Yes
(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the relation to the specified learning outcomes candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes. 	
In the taught component of the course, the students are generally performing well. This year, there was a relatively high failure rate in the research component of the course. External examiners are not included in the marking of these theses and do not necessarily get to view the work. Some reflection on what can be done to better support students to a successful outcome, would be worthwhile.	

Part 3 Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter.	Yes
(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (<i>i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.</i>) in relation to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the subject the students the respective level of study the expected learning outcomes. 	
The assessments and fair and robust.	
(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.	
NA	
(d) Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.	
The overall quality of the programme design and structure is excellent.	

Part 4 Assessment Process

4.1 Information	
(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes
(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment (<i>e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marketing criteria</i>)?	Yes
(c) Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes
(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes
(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	
I had access to all the relevant examination materials and student answers. Where examiners had supplied written answers - it was extremely helpful. There are three courses (VPM013, VPM 012, LVM006) which did not provide any additional information about allocation of marks on the exam papers or as supplementary material, This is extremely problematic if there are borderline marks	

and it would be difficult to defend a mark (where there are differences of opinion) in the absence of this information. I requested access to TMA materials- this revealed a lot of variability within question between markers.

4.2 Paper-setting *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see? | Yes |
| (b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate? | Yes |
| (c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments? | Yes |
| (d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process. | |

No other comments - beyond the mention that the examination questions were fair, robust and at an expected standard.

4.3 Marking and sampling *[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]*

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment? | Yes |
| (b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent? | Yes |
| (c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail? | Yes |
| (d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking? | Yes |
| (e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked? | Yes |

[Assessed work for University of London Track C programmes is second marked and moderated on a sample basis as per the Guidelines for Examinations.]

Dissertations / project reports *[if applicable]*

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate? | Yes |
|---|-----|

Oral assessment *[if applicable]*

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment? | N/A |
|---|-----|

- (h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.

Overall, students are performing well in these courses. This year, there were a higher proportion of fails in the research project (LVM200).

Model answers with broad marking guidelines were provided for exam questions. Where this was provided in combination with detailed examiner feedback, it was very easy for an external examiner to see how marks were justified and defended (e.g. see EAHE(LVM004), MAD0 (LVM017), SIAH (VPM015)). However, in other courses, there was no detailed feedback from examiners provided (i.e. ASMVE (VPM013), SMVE(VPM012), VPH (LVM006)). In VPM013 and VPM012, there was at least 1 exam in which there was a significant discrepancy between examiners (where one examiner gave 0 marks, while the other applied a mark of 27). There was only minor mark-up of the exam paper and no additional commentary from examiners so it was difficult to see how examiners were breaking down the marks. In the LVM006 course – there were no comments provided on the exam papers or as supplementary information because marks were submitted late. This was quite problematic. There was 1 paper which was a borderline fail. This mark would be difficult to defend if the student enquired, in the absence of examiner notes. There are no comments which tie the

paper to the recorded aggregate marks- meaning it is difficult to forensically double check against recording errors or forensically explore marks in borderline cases.
TMA marks appear to be sound, although there is variation between examiners on the same topic within the same subject which may have implications for borderline students.
One paper (SMVE course) had some issues associated with the print quality of one question (Q2). However, this was adequately resolved and taken into account in the marking by the examiners.

4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results

- | | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners? | Yes |
| (b) Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners? | Yes |
| (c) Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting?
<i>[Final Board of Examiners' meeting' – a meeting where awards are confirmed.]</i> | Yes |
| (d) If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board? | N/A |
| (e) Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction? | Yes |
| (f) Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners? | Yes |
| (g) Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions. | |

No further comments.

Part 5 Other Comments

- (a) Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.

NA

- (b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?

Consistent.

- (c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.

- (d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the University of London or the School of Advance Study.

NA

- (e) Please provide any other comments you may have.

NA



External / Intercollegiate Examiner's Annual Report

Part 1 Summary

Name of External / Intercollegiate Examiner	Neil Donald Sargison
Home institution and/or professional affiliation	University of Edinburgh, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies
Role	External Examiner
Year of Service <i>[Typically up to four years; extension to 5th year of service under exceptional circumstances only]</i>	5th
Award(s) partially or wholly covered by this report (e.g. BSc Economics, MA Cultural and Intellectual History)	MSc, Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate, Livestock Health and Production
Subject Area or Modules covered <i>[if applicable]</i>	Animal Disease (current concepts). Animal Welfare (no candidates). Developing and Monitoring Livestock Production Systems. Economics for Livestock Development and Policy. Principles of Livestock Production. Reproduction and Fertility (no candidates). Research Design, Management and Grant Application Writing. Research Project. Sustainable Livestock Farming in the Environment.
Academic/calendar year covered (e.g. 2015-2016 or 2016)	2017/2018
Date(s) of Board of Examiners meeting	05/12/2018
Date of the report	14/12/2018

1.1 Standards

- (a) The standards set for the award are appropriate for qualifications at this level and in this subject. Yes
- (b) If not, please explain why.

1.2 Student performance

- (a) The standards set for the assessment of student performance are comparable with similar programmes or subjects in other UK institutions with which you are familiar. Yes

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If standards are higher than would be expected, please elaborate.

1.3 Conduct of processes

(a) The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted.

Yes

(b) If not, please explain why.

(c) If processes are of a higher standard, please elaborate.

Yes, all exam questions are double marked and the basis for the allocation of marks is transparent and sound. There are inevitably instances in which the two markers disagree in the allocation of marks (this year solely for answers which fall below the pass standard for the specific question), but in most cases, the agreed mark is sound and biased in favour of the candidate. Marking of tutor marked assignments by a single examiner is cause for concern, as based upon the examples provided, there appear to be large inconsistencies in standards and expectations between courses.

1.4 Area for commendation

(a) Please comment on any particular strengths or distinctive or innovative features in relation to standards and assessment processes of value to external audiences. Please highlight any items of good practice in programme arrangements and/or procedures for external examination.

These are well-established and highly respected courses. The number of modules that must be completed, amount of work and assessment involved with each module, and standards met in the MSc programme probably exceed those of most conventional one year taught or research MSc programmes.

The titles of the individual courses and topics covered in the examinations are highly relevant to sustainable livestock development in lower and middle income countries, and the timeliness of this theme makes them highly pertinent.

(b) Please provide comments on any aspect of the programme that you would like to be conveyed to current students.

Overall, this is an excellent course, which has never been more relevant than it is today, given the need to equip local people with the skills that they need to address local animal health and production challenges, in particular in LMICs. The scope and depth of the exam questions and assessments in most of the subject areas indicate that the course is highly relevant to addressing these needs. It is more important than ever to ensure that the assessment is both rigorous and matches the course work.

Part 2 Standards

(a) Please comment on the coherence and currency of the programme or its component parts. You may want to take into account the alignment of the learning outcomes with the relevant qualification descriptor set out in the applicable qualifications framework.

- Please refer to the [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland \(FHEQ\)](#).
- For the *International Foundation Programme* please refer to the [Qualification and Component Levels](#).
- Where applicable, please refer to the [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

The programme is coherent and current.

(b) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level. Yes

(c) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level as for students at University of London Member Institutions. Not applicable

[This question is aimed at Examiners who are appointed to University of London Boards of Examiners and are also appointed to Boards of Examiners assessing students based at a Member Institution.]

(d) The standard of assessments is comparable to modules of the same level at my own Member Institution of the University of London. Not applicable

[This question is aimed at Intercollegiate Examiners from one of the Member Institutions of the University of London.]

(e) The assessment criteria, marking schemes and arrangements for classification are set at the appropriate level. Yes

(f) Please comment on the standards of student performance. You may want to include:

- the relation to the specified learning outcomes
- candidates' performance in relation to their peers in comparable programmes.

The standards of the students performance in the examination are fairly reflected in the agreed marks awarded. There are differences in the overall levels of performance between certain courses, exemplified by the disproportionate fail rates in Animal Diseases (3 passes and 5 fails) and the Research project (3 passes and 3 fails), compared to a 100% pass rate (10 of 10) in Research Design, Management and Grant Application Writing. The standard of assessment of each course was appropriate, and the discrepancies in pass rates reflect the differences in background and experience of the candidates (Animal Diseases) or logistic and supervisory difficulties (Research project). Nevertheless, the situation raises questions about what the correct level of understanding should be for different courses, and for the different MSc degree, and Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate qualifications in Livestock Health and Production.

Part 3 Programme and assessment design

(a) The aims and learning outcomes for the programme / module(s) are clearly defined and appropriate to subject matter. Yes

(b) Please comment on the appropriateness and balance of types of assessment (*i.e. unseen written exams, coursework, dissertations, etc.*) in relation to

- the subject
- the students
- the respective level of study
- the expected learning outcomes.

Each of the exam papers was straightforward, with few pitfalls or ambiguities in the questions, covering an appropriate balance of topics, which gave an indication of the scope of each course.

Across the board, the model answers were long and extremely detailed. This is helpful from an evaluator's perspective, but unfortunately can create issues with regards to the precision of marking and interpretation of the marking scheme. For some questions where candidates were asked to give examples, the detail provided in the model answer inevitably overlooked certain pertinent and appropriate alternative responses, inadvertently portraying an emphasis on regurgitation of facts ahead of demonstration of understanding of principles in the marking scheme. Criticism is unintended and unhelpful, but could be avoided by providing general headings and lists of key points to be included in the answer, rather than essay style model answers.

Examiners comments were provided for every assessed component of each course. These were astute and helpful in understanding the award of marks.

All of the exam papers were double marked. Our understanding is that when markers agree marks, it is standard procedure to go for the higher when the difference is one mark, and for the median when the difference is more than one point on the scale. There was only one inconsistencies in the application of this rule, which was discussed during the Exam Board meeting.

As in previous years, the Tutor Marked Assessments were only marked by a single examiner.

Once again, there were large discrepancies in the subjective award of marks in the model assessments that were provided. Without going into detail, markers differed greatly in their expectations for discursive writing and for the use of references.

The Research Project course is outstanding and particularly relevant in the context of training local people to address global animal health and management challenges. As during the previous two year, the external examiners were not involved in the examination of the research project, as dictated by University of London regulations. Being an observer during just one oral component examination reiterated the need for the examiners to be clear about each of the headings in the marking scheme for the oral examination, and to conduct the oral examination accordingly. The candidate should be given the opportunity to defend his/her work in each of the areas of the wider context of the work, study design, data analysis, or practical conclusions. The high fail rate in the Research Project is cause for concern. In one case, a candidate was failed with a mark of 48% on her final permitted sitting of this component. The project was undertaken under the theme of epidemiology, and was awarded a fail mark due to a lack of appropriate rigour in data analysis. However, in my opinion, had the project been undertaken under the heading of animal health and production, it would have merited a clear pass mark. This highlights a greater need for supervisory guidance. The subject was discussed at length during the Exam Board meeting and agreement was made to seek a third assessment.

(c) Please comment on the usefulness of study materials and the Virtual Learning Environment in relation to the expected learning outcomes.

It is not possible to judge the effectiveness of the programme based on the standards achieved alone.

(d) Please comment on the overall quality of programme and assessment design and structure.

Extremely robust and exemplary.

Part 4 Assessment Process

4.1 Information

(a) Did you receive all necessary information regarding your appointment?	Yes
(b) Did you receive all necessary information on the programme and assessment (e.g. programme handbooks, programme regulations, module/course descriptions, assessment briefs/marketing criteria)?	Yes
(c) Did you receive this information in good time?	Yes
(d) Did you have sufficient access to any additional material needed to make the required judgements?	Yes

(e) Please comment on the usefulness and relevance of the information sent to you.	
The commitment and helpfulness of the examination and administrative team, Carol Worsfold, Ruth Chandler, and Dr Christine Thurania-McKeever was outstanding and essential.	
4.2 Paper-setting <i>[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]</i>	
(a) Did you receive all the draft papers that you wished to see?	N/A
(b) Was the nature, spread and level of the questions / coursework appropriate?	N/A
(c) Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?	N/A
(d) Please add any other comments on the paper-setting process.	
n/a	
4.3 Marking and sampling <i>[Not applicable to Combined Degree Scheme (CDS)]</i>	
(a) Did you receive the scripts or other assessed work in sufficient time to allow you to make a proper assessment?	Yes
(b) Did you receive a sufficient number of scripts and other assessed work to be able to assess whether the internal marking and classifications were appropriate and consistent?	Yes
(c) Did you see a representative sample of scripts and other assessed work assessed as first class, borderline or fail?	Yes
(d) Were you satisfied with the standard of marking?	Yes
(e) Were you satisfied that the scripts and other assessed work were double-marked? <i>[Assessed work for University of London Track C programmes is second marked and moderated on a sample basis as per the Guidelines for Examinations.]</i>	No
Dissertations / project reports <i>[if applicable]</i>	
(f) Was the choice of subjects for dissertations / project reports appropriate?	Yes
Oral assessment <i>[if applicable]</i>	
(g) Were suitable arrangements made for you to conduct and/or moderate oral components of assessment?	N/A
(h) Please provide any comments on scripts and other assessed work.	
The negative comment about double marking refers to the fact that the course assessments are not double marked. The feedback provided by each of the markers was extremely helpful.	
4.4 Board of Examiners meeting(s) and results	
(a) Were you invited to attend the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
(b) Were you given sufficient notice of the meeting(s) of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
(c) Were you able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting? <i>[Final Board of Examiners' meeting' – a meeting where awards are confirmed.]</i>	Yes
(d) If you were not able to attend the final Board of Examiners' meeting, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on the decisions made by the Board?	N/A

(e) Was the meeting of the Board of Examiners conducted to your satisfaction?	Yes
(f) Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board of Examiners?	Yes
(g) Please provide any comments on the Board of Examiners' meetings and decisions.	
I was given ample opportunity to express my views during the Exam Board meeting. These were considered and dealt with appropriately.	

Part 5 Other Comments

(a) Please provide comments relating to Professional and Statutory Body requirements, if applicable.
These are not professional or statutory exams.
(b) How did this year's procedures/arrangements compare with those of previous years?
As previously, the procedures were exemplary.
(c) Please comment on the extent to which suggestions made by you last year were taken into account.
Discussions have taken place on how to address the disproportionately high fail rate in Animal Diseases. These continued during the Exam Board meeting, and I am reassured that the matter is being addressed. Concerns raised about discrepancies between candidates performance in the Tutor Marked Assessments persist. I strongly recommend double marking of this component.
(d) If this is your last year of appointment, please provide an overview of your term of office as an External/Intercollegiate Examiner for the University of London or the School of Advance Study.
I have nothing other than praise for the excellence of the Distance Learning MSc, Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate, Livestock Health and Production courses. The standards are appropriately high. Throughout my five years as an external examiner on these courses, the organisation of the assessment and examination has been exemplary. It would not have been possible to have undertaken the role of external examiner efficiently without the amazing support of Carol Worsfold, Ruth Chandler, and Dr Christine Thurairaja-McKeever.
(e) Please provide any other comments you may have.
The disproportionately low pass rate in the Animal Diseases course reflects a problem in determination of appropriate standards. The problem is not in the teaching or assessment (which is excellent), but in the fact that what defines postgraduate standards depends largely on the nature of the candidates' undergraduate education. Based on evaluation of the assessments, this course seems to be torn between postgraduate animal sciences standards, as shown in the Tutor Marked Assignment, and postgraduate veterinary standards, as shown in the questions and marking of the examination papers. The relative subjectivity of the different courses and the fact that there are too few candidates for some courses to allow for statistical evaluation of the assessment inevitably hinders the ability to ensure consistent marking. However, these concerns are mostly balanced by the rigour of the marking and detail provided in the clear and helpful marker feedback in the course work and examination essays, ensuring that the results are defensible. There are some inherent difficulties in setting the standards and expectations for the research project, alluded to above.

Professor Neil Donald Sargison
University of Edinburgh
Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies
Easter Bush Veterinary Centre
Roslin
Midlothian EH25 9RG

26 April 2019

Dear Professor Sargison

External Examiner's report for MSc and PG Diplomas in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health 2018

On behalf of the Royal Veterinary College Board of Examiners for Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health, I would like to thank you for your External Examiner's report for the University of London Worldwide MSc and PG Diplomas, in Livestock Health and Production, and Veterinary Epidemiology and Public Health for the 2017-18 academic year.

The External and Intercollegiate Examiner reports form an integral part of the assessment and quality assurance processes. All comments and points raised in the report have been considered and our formal response is outlined below:

Examiner Comment	RVC Response
<p>Standards:</p> <p>1). The disproportionately low pass rate in the Animal Diseases course reflects a problem in determination of appropriate standards. The problem is not in the teaching or assessment (which is excellent), but in the fact that what defines postgraduate standards depends largely on the nature of the candidates' undergraduate education. Based on evaluation of the assessments, this course seems to be torn between postgraduate animal sciences standards, as shown in the Tutor Marked Assignment, and postgraduate veterinary standards, as shown in the questions and marking of the examination papers</p>	<p>Responses to comments:</p> <p>1). All the courses in this Programme are of level 7.</p> <p>The poor performance by students in the Animal Diseases module, was acknowledged by examiners at the exam board meeting. The module will be revisited to determine whether the content that is taught is of the right level and if so, determine where the problem lies between the teaching and the assessment. This review of the module will also address issues raised about the standards of the Tutor Marked Assessments for this module, vis a vis the standards achieved by students in the exam. There are several examiners involved in this module and a number of these examiners together</p>

<p>Programme and assessment design:</p> <p>1). Model answers were long and extremely detailed. This is helpful from an evaluator's perspective but unfortunately can create issues with regards to the precision of marking and the interpretation of the marking scheme. Where students were asked to give examples, the detail provided in the model answer inevitably overlooked certain pertinent and appropriate responses, inadvertently portraying an emphasis on regurgitation of facts ahead of demonstration of understanding of principles in the marking scheme. Criticism is unintended and unhelpful, but could be avoided by providing general headings and lists of key points to be included in the answer, rather than essay style model answers.</p> <p>2). As in previous years, the Tutor Marked Assessments were only marked by a single examiner. Once again, there were large discrepancies in the subjective award of marks in the model assessments that were provided. Without going into detail, markers differed greatly in their expectations for discursive writing and for the use of references. I strongly recommend double marking of this component.</p>	<p>with the Programme Director will undertake the task of reviewing the module.</p> <p>1). Examiners write model answers to cover the key points, with the expectation that occasionally there will be some responses from students that are appropriate but not covered by the model answer. Marks are awarded accordingly for such responses.</p> <p>Model answers are generally for the use of examiners marking the scripts. As the scripts are double marked and where there is a large discrepancy in the marks, the examiners have the opportunity to discuss the required answers.</p> <p>The recommendation to write the model answers in general heading and key points rather than in essay style, will be made to the examiners.</p> <p>2). A feedback template was created to provide guidance to markers on the areas that should be addressed when marking. Whilst this is not as optimal as double marking, it provides direction on areas that markers should focus on in considering TMAs and provides a level of standardisation.</p> <p>Double marking TMAs has been considered by the Course Management Committee and it was not felt that this is a practical way forward for this element of assessment.</p>
---	---

Thank you again for your constructive comments and for the support to the programme over the past five years.

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Christine Thurania-McKeever (Programmes Director)

Cc: Professor Javier Guitian (Exam Board Chair)
Ms. Carol Worsfold (Project Administrator RVC)
Ms. Jessie McGavin (Programme Manager, UoL Worldwide)
Ms. Annemarie Dulson (Quality Manager, UoL Worldwide)